

Charles J. Smith, Newbury.
Healey J. Bashaw, Stowe.

VIRGINIA

Mae R. Bostick, Burkeville.
Garland W. Spratley, Dendron.
Henry H. Elswick, Jewell Ridge.
Abbott D. Gerberich, Pearisburg.
Lillian C. Ruff, Vienna.

WASHINGTON

Elmer J. Braendlein, Bremerton.
Howard C. Roberts, Rosalia.
Alf Christian Willard, Stanwood.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cicero C. Hurley, Anawalt.
Nancy Bethel Martin, Belle.
Oscar R. Conaway, Barrackville.
Rupert B. Mapel, Farmington.
Carroll Miller, Gauley Bridge.
Ernest L. Head, Jenkinjones.
Asa T. Miller, Madison.
Lucien Edward Felty, Rowlesburg.
Fred F. Robey, Shinnston.
Delpha C. Stemple, Thomas.
Jock L. Henderson, Williamstown.

WISCONSIN

Harry L. Williams, Hazel Green.
John J. Hanley, Hudson.
Henry John O'Brien, Montfort.

WYOMING

Mark N. Hanna, Lingle.
Althea E. Rollins, Lyman.
Nellie P. Hopkins, Rawlins.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1936

(Legislative day of Friday, June 19, 1936)

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10:30 a. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 3943. An act for the relief of D. E. Wooldridge;
H. R. 10504. An act for the relief of Booth & Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;
H. R. 11331. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance by the Department of the Interior to the State of Minnesota of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 3, T. 159 N., R. 35 W., fifth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota;
H. R. 12971. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 27, 1935 (Public, No. 73, 74th Cong.), authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Light-house Reservation, Mich.;
H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a reentry permit to Tomio Mori Moto and his readmission upon application while such permit remains valid;
H. J. Res. 608. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1938, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrator; and
H. J. Res. 641. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of expenses incurred in an election contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Twentieth Congressional District of the State of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 81. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture; and

S. 4020. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands in the city of Alameda, county of Alameda, State of California, as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3247) entitled "An act to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost-housing projects, to authorize payments to State and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes."

PORTRAIT OF THE LATE SPEAKER RAINEY

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] for 12 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in these closing moments of the Seventy-fourth Congress to bring to your attention a matter involving the selection of the portrait of the late Henry T. Rainey, who was my Representative in this historic Hall for a period of 30 years. It is with some reluctance that I am compelled to discuss the subject matter at hand because it involves my colleague from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]. However, I should be recreant to a sacred impulse if I did not at this particular time enter a protest to what I feel has been inexcusable and unexplainable delay in the selection of an appropriate portrait of the late Speaker Rainey.

On July 8, 1935, there was enacted into law under the item, "Contingent expenses of the House", an appropriation which reads as follows:

For the purchase of a portrait of Hon. Henry T. Rainey, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, \$2,500, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Committee on the Library.

The chairman of the Committee on the Library is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]. Obviously, the responsibility for making effective the spirit and letter of such a law rests upon his shoulders. No one should underestimate the importance of the duties succinctly set forth in the appropriation measure, and under no circumstances should they be considered lightly or frivolously by any member of the committee.

After the power was vested in this committee by law, artists were invited to paint the portrait of the late Speaker, and I am advised that nine portraits are hanging in the committee room today for examination and inspection. I am further informed that most of them have been there since January 1 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no way interested in the portrait to be selected. That is the function of the committee. However, I am interested, and have been for months, in stirring the committee to action in order that a portrait might hang in the Speaker's lobby before the adjournment of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

On April 28 I wrote a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in which I said, among other things, the following:

The Honorable Henry T. Rainey departed this life in August 1934. When the Seventy-fourth Congress convened, a resolution was adopted charging your committee with the duty of selecting a proper painting of the late Speaker, the same to be hung in the Speaker's lobby, along with portraits of other former Speakers of the House.

I am again calling your attention to the advisability of an early selection of one of the many paintings that you have of Mr. Rainey. I have discussed this matter with some members of the Library Committee, and they advise me that no meeting has ever been called by you for the purpose of determining this very important matter.

The widow of the late Speaker and some of my other constituents are very much interested in having the selection made immediately. I join with them in that request. Certainly, the por-

trait of Henry T. Rainey should be selected and hung in the Speaker's lobby before the Seventy-fourth Congress adjourns. The Members of this Congress are entitled to view that portrait.

Unless a selection is made at once from the various paintings which are now in your office, I shall be compelled to call up this matter on the floor of the House.

On April 29 I received a reply to my letter of the previous day which is as follows:

I have your letter of yesterday. We expect to make the selection of the painting of the late Speaker before the close of this session. It is the plan to invite in three or four of the best art critics in the country to give their judgment to the committee and the selection will be made soon after their visit.

Certain members of the committee advise me that art critics mentioned in the letter have been discussed at various times by the chairman, but their identity and their activities remain unknown. The so-called artists have failed to give to certain members of the committee the benefit of their artistic judgment in passing upon the selection of a proper portrait. I am further advised by members that the question of calling the committee together for making a final decision has been discussed at various times, but today the RECORD discloses that the chairman remains adamant and refuses to do anything about it.

I ask, in all sincerity, why all the uncertainty, the vacillation, and the indecision? Will the gentleman from Illinois please explain such dilatory tactics and the mystery surrounding this selection? Why all of this supine indolence? Why has the chairman loitered upon this important matter as the precious days of the Seventy-fourth Congress passed by? Why should the chairman through such artistic quibbling cause the widow of the late Speaker to become, as she wrote me recently, "weary and heartsick over it"? Why has not the selection been made so that Members of the Seventy-fourth Congress might have had the privilege of viewing the portrait? Even the late Speaker Byrns expressed such a desire. The gentleman from Illinois has been notified by leaders and Members of this House that his duties in this regard should be performed; and yet, like the Rock of Ages, he moveth not. Can it be that the gentleman from Illinois dislikes to give up his private art gallery, or is there some other mysterious reason which only the gentleman can explain?

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I absolve the remaining members of this committee for this delay. Various Members have advised me that they have been ready and willing for weeks to select one of the many portraits in the committee room, but for some unexplainable reason the chairman just cannot find time to do it. I can well appreciate from reading the press that he is an unusually busy man, but no duty during his entire service in Congress has carried with it such an exacting and sacred tie; and if the distinguished gentleman from Illinois wants to do the decent and honorable and proper thing he will call the committee together immediately and without equivocation make a selection. With the utmost sincerity and with some feeling, I say that the delay in hanging the portrait of Speaker Rainey, who in life was a great and good man, is a shame and a disgrace. Yes; it is an insult to his precious memory.

In conclusion, I express the hope that when the appropriation is made for the portrait of the late Speaker, the Honorable Joe Byrns, that we may profit by this dilatory experience by placing a limitation of time as to when the committee work may be finished, or that a special committee be appointed with a chairman who will have a sympathetic interest in the wishes and desires of those who are near and dear to the deceased. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by Capt. E. H. Walter, assistant district engineer of the War Department, delivered before the Propeller Club of Buffalo on June 3.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE SUPPRESSION OF MOB VIOLENCE

Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram which I sent to the Governor of Texas and his reply thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this administration has accomplished wonders for the advancement of the people along many lines. As important and far reaching as has been its work in saving millions of good citizens from starvation and providing employment for the unemployed, it is my opinion that the work of the Department of Justice in stamping out crime, and especially organized gangs of criminals, takes first rank among the outstanding achievements.

While lawless gangs of robbers and murderers have been chased down, brought into court, and convicted, or driven into inactivity, there still remain the Black Legion and mobs of lynchers who commit murder and destroy the peace of our country.

It is my fondest hope and expectation that the horrible crime of lynching will receive the attention of our highest lawmaking body and that this crime, like that of kidnaping, will soon disappear from the records of our country. I am especially interested in the passage and enforcement of a law that will punish the perpetrators of this crime, because the Negro citizens of this country are the victims who suffer most and are largely helpless in our State courts.

However, I am conscious of the fact that there is an awakening in this country against this crime, which is expressing itself more and more. Some time ago President Roosevelt spoke of lynching as being collective murder. Since I have been in Congress I have had occasion to communicate with various Governors when mob violence was threatened or after mobs had done their bloody and shameful work. Some of these officials have been outspoken in favor of law and order. Only yesterday, when it was reported through the Associated Press of the country that 10 colored men in the State of Texas were in danger of being lynched, I sent the following telegram to Governor Allred of Texas and received a most encouraging reply from him:

JUNE 18, 1936.

Gov. JAMES ALLRED,
Executive Mansion, Austin, Tex.:

From press reports we learn that the lives of 10 colored citizens of your State are in grave danger of being snuffed out by a mob. In conversation on the floor of the House a few moments ago with a colleague from Texas, I learn that the temper and passion of the mob is such that the only possible manner in which the lives of these men can be saved is through immediate action of the Governor. Will you not please act at once to give these prisoners such protection as will safeguard their lives against a mob and insure a fair trial in the courts to which all citizens are entitled?

ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
Member of Congress, First Illinois District.

AUSTIN, TEX., June 19, 1936.

Hon. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
Member of Congress:

Answering your wire statement that the only possible manner in which the lives of Negro citizens of this State charged with crime could be saved was through immediate action on my part was incorrect. Am happy to report to you that Sheriff Koehl and other local officers of Wharton County had already acted in very timely fashion and none of these men were in danger. Two State Rangers have been assigned the sheriff. The sheriff advises me there has been no real danger at any time, since there was only natural resentment on part of some of our citizens at brutal murder of one of our officers. You may be assured these men will be given every protection, and if any of them are charged with crime of murder they will certainly be given a fair trial under the constitution and laws of this State.

JAMES V. ALLRED,
Governor of Texas.

I wish to take this occasion, first, of commending Sheriff Koehl, of Wharton County, and his deputies for the exercise of judgment and courage in safeguarding the lives of these prisoners; second, I want to commend Governor Allred

for not only doing his duty by informing himself of the serious situation and keeping in touch with the law-enforcement officers of Wharton County, but for the assurance he gives the public that these prisoners, if charged with crime, will be given a fair trial under the laws of the State. It is my opinion that if this example was followed in all our States lynching, which is the blackest crime on our record today, would cease at once.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a resolution passed by the Young Democratic Club of Alexandria, Va., on the death of the late Speaker Byrns.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to read the following resolution adopted by the Young Democratic Club of Alexandria, Va.:

Be it resolved, That the Young Democratic Club of Alexandria wishes to express its sorrow upon learning of the death of the beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH BYRNS, and the club desires to extend to Mrs. Joseph Byrns and the colleagues of Speaker BYRNS its sincere sympathy in their great loss.

BRIDGEPORT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4719) for the relief of the Bridgeport irrigation district.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this bill covers? As I understand, it adds no expense to the Government.

Mr. COFFEE. It adds no expense to the Government and no appropriation is authorized. It is purely a local matter and provides a means of compromising a situation that exists as between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bridgeport irrigation district. The Secretary of the Interior recommends the bill, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into a contract with the Bridgeport Irrigation District, North Platte reclamation project, by which (a) the United States, in consideration of \$23,286 heretofore paid under the contract of June 14, 1915, between the United States and the district, shall grant to the district a permanent right to the use of water from the North Platte Federal reclamation project under the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), as amended and supplemented, which permanent water right shall entitle the district to divert from the North Platte River a quantity of water equal to three-tenths part of the quantity of water for which provision is made in article 1 of said contract of June 14, 1915, such total quantity of water for diversion by the district to be delivered by the United States under a schedule of delivery reduced in accordance with the provisions of this act; (b) the district shall agree to pay the United States the amount of \$5,628.55; the operation and maintenance charges delinquent under said contract of June 14, 1915, for the years 1926 to 1935, both inclusive, upon the execution of said contract herein authorized; (c) the Secretary shall agree, upon the execution of said contract and its confirmation by the State courts, to cancel the judgment entered on July 30, 1929, against the district and in favor of the United States; (d) the district shall agree to pay to the United States in advance of the delivery of water under said contract one one-hundredth part of such amounts as shall be fixed by the Secretary as operation and maintenance charges in connection with the irrigation works from which said water supply is made available by the United States, such charges to be payable for the year 1936 and thereafter with interest from the due date at the rate of 6 percent per annum if not paid when due; (e) the Secretary shall be authorized to refuse the delivery of water under said contract to the district at any time when any installment in whole or in part (including any interest due thereon) of operation and maintenance charges shall not have been paid at the date provided in subdivision (d) hereof and shall remain unpaid at the date delivery of water is requested under said contract; and (f) the contract of June 14, 1915, shall otherwise remain in full force and effect.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a Senate joint resolution on the Speaker's table. May I inquire whether the Speaker is recognizing unanimous-consent requests to take such matters from the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Not at the present time.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 76 OF THE JUDICIAL CODE WITH RESPECT TO TERMS OF FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT AT TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11217), to amend section 76 of the Judicial Code, as amended, with respect to the terms of the Federal district court held at Tallahassee, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the situation, this is purely a local matter with reference to the term of court in this one district?

Mr. WALTER. This permits the holding of court for 2 weeks during the year instead of 1 week as is provided under the present law.

Mr. RICH. The Judiciary Committee has approved this bill?

Mr. WALTER. It has been unanimously reported by that committee.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 76 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by striking out, after the word "Tallahassee", the words "on the second Monday in January" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "on the second Monday in February and on the first Monday in September."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of lines 3 to 7, page 1, and insert the following:

"That section 76 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The State of Florida is divided into two districts, to be known as the northern and southern districts of Florida. The southern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July 1910 in the counties of Baker, Bradford, Brevard, Citrus, Clay, Columbia, Dade, De Soto, Duval, Hamilton, Hernando, Hillsboro, Lake, Lee, Madison, Manatee, Marion, Monroe, Nassau, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, St. John, Sumter, Suwanee, St. Lucie, and Volusia. Terms of the district court for the southern district shall be held at Ocala on the third Monday in January; at Tampa on the second Monday in February; at Key West on the first Mondays in May and November; at Jacksonville on the first Monday in December; at Fernandina on the first Monday in April; at Miami on the fourth Monday in April; and a term shall be held annually at Orlando, Fla., on the first Monday in October: *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Orlando are furnished without expense to the United States. The district court for the southern district shall be open at all times for the purpose of hearing and deciding causes of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. The northern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July 1910 in the counties of Alachua, Calhoun, Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Levy, Liberty, Santa Rosa, Taylor, Wakulla, Walton, and Washington. Terms of the district court for the northern district shall be held at Tallahassee on the second Monday in February and on the first Monday in September; at Pensacola on the first Mondays in May and November; at Marianna on the first Monday in April; and at Gainesville on the second Mondays in June and December."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCHANT MARINE BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 557

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 8555, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment to the title of the bill be, and the

same is hereby, agreed to; and Senate amendment no. 1 be, and the same is hereby, agreed to with the following amendment: Strike out section 303 of title III of the said Senate amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 557 and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the fact that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Amlie	Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews	Drewry	Kleberg	Richardson
Ayers	Duffey, Ohio	Kloeb	Robson, Ky.
Bacharach	Duffy, N. Y.	Kniffin	Sadowski
Bacon	Dunn, Miss.	Kocialkowski	Sanders, La.
Barden	Eagle	Lanham	Sandlin
Berlin	Eaton	Larrabee	Sauthoff
Binderup	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Schneider, Wis.
Bolton	Ferguson	Lemke	Schuetz
Brennan	Fernandez	Lesinski	Srugham
Brewster	Flesinger	McClellan	Sears
Brown, Mich.	Pitzpatrick	McFarlane	Secrest
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	McGroarty	Sumners, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Gassaway	McLeod	Sweeney
Cannon, Wis.	Gifford	Mahon	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Green	Maloney	Taylor, S. C.
Clalborne	Greenway	Martin, Mass.	Tobey
Clark, N. C.	Greenwood	Maverick	Tolan
Collins	Hamlin	Meeks	Turpin
Cooley	Hancock, N. Y.	Monaghan	Wearin
Cox	Hess	Montague	Weaver
Creal	Higgins, Mass.	Montet	Withrow
Crowther	Hill, Knute	Nelson	Wolfenden
Dear	Hobbs	Nichols	Wood
Deen	Hoepfel	Norton	Zioncheck
Dies	Hollister	O'Connell	
Dirksen	Imhoff	Parks	
Ditter	Kea	Pierce	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirteen Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. O'CONNOR, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule covering consideration of the bill H. R. 8555, the ship subsidy bill. The Rules Committee felt it was necessary to bring it in and have the matter considered in this way in order to expedite adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is said that this is a ship-subsidy bill. It is not. It is a bill to provide employment for American people and American seamen.

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

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman explain to us the difference between this bill and the ship-subsidy bill?

Mr. BLAND. Neither bill was strictly a ship-subsidy bill.

Mr. BIERMANN. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. BLAND. I hope the gentleman will pardon me, as I have only 5 minutes.

A subsidy might be termed a gift. In every provision in the House bill and in every provision in the Senate bill there is only provision to take care of a differential between foreign construction and American construction and American cost of operation and foreign cost of operation. It is necessary to do this to have an American merchant marine for national defense and for the protection of commerce.

This is the greatest problem before the President of the United States today, and I am authorized by the Secretary of Commerce to say that he wants this bill. He wants the bill that has passed the Senate, with the resolution that we are presenting today, in order that we may get away from the ocean-mail contracts and bring the situation down strictly to the differential which carries employment to every State in the American Union.

The essential differences between the House bill and the Senate bill may be briefly analyzed as follows: We cannot go into a detailed analysis, but in the House bill the ship-

owner was required to make an initial payment of 25 percent of the foreign construction cost in building a new ship. The amended bill requires 25 percent initial payment based on the American construction cost.

The determination of the construction differential in the House bill was left to the discretion of the authority, while in the amended bill the amount of the construction differential is fixed at 33 1/3 percent of the American cost, with the possibility of increasing it to 50 percent, if necessary, to take care of the differential between American and foreign construction.

In the House bill there were no limitations on profits placed upon the shipbuilder or shipowner and operator. In the amended bill there are provisions for the recapture of the shipbuilders' profits in excess of 10 percent net. Also in the case of the shipowner and operator profits may be recaptured in the operating subsidy.

The House bill did not provide for the Government building ships for its own account, while in the amended bill, if the plan and program that is determined upon by the maritime commission cannot be otherwise carried out, the Government may build such ships and operate them or offer them for sale or charter to private industry.

You complain of the ocean-mail contracts; I offer the only solution that will be presented for the preservation of an American merchant marine and will take it away from the evils and abuses that have been complained of in connection with ocean-mail contracts. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Has the gentleman a copy of this bill?

Mr. BLAND. I have one copy here that was given me yesterday. I do not know whether there are copies available in the document room or not.

Mr. BOYLAN. I may inform the gentleman that they are not now available. I have sent for a copy of the bill, but could not obtain it.

Mr. BLAND. I wish I could give one to the gentleman. There is a gentleman present over there who has one and states he will lend it to the gentleman from New York.

All I can say is that the people charged with the responsibility, the people in authority, the Secretary of Commerce and the President, need this measure in order to work out the problems that are confronting the American merchant marine.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. I supported the gentleman in keeping in the Post Office and Treasury Department bill the provision to pay the subsidy for these shipowners. I am in favor of a subsidy and I have not the least doubt that many Members in this House are also in favor of that, but here we are asked this morning, under a rule, to vote for a bill when we do not know what the provisions of the bill are. I have just received a copy now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill is available.

Mr. BLAND. I am advised that copies of the bill are now available.

Mr. BOYLAN. How can we intelligently vote on a matter of this kind when we have not even read the bill?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Here is a copy of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. The only answer is that the provisions and the general principles for the preservation and continuance of the American merchant marine are continued in this bill. A merchant marine commission is to be appointed.

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

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman give us some idea of how much this bill will cost the taxpayers of the country? What sort of a charge does it place on the taxpayers and

what demands are to be made? Give us some detailed information.

Mr. BLAND. The detailed information as to that will depend on the construction plan worked out by the commission, which will be submitted and considered; but let me say that the \$22,000,000 that we are now paying for subsidies could be reduced \$5,000,000 if we had modern ships upon the seas carrying our goods, because that excess \$5,000,000 is every day going up through the smokestack because our ships are obsolete.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does not the gentleman think the House ought to have some information about how much this bill carries? The gentleman does not know. It might carry \$100,000,000 per annum.

Mr. BLAND. It could not possibly carry that. It is only that which is necessary for the construction and operation of the ships.

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

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. We must have a merchant marine for our national defense for a starter.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. There is only one thing I want to make sure of, because I am in favor of this legislation. This takes care of these fraudulent mail contracts, where, for instance, 1 pound of mail costs \$110,000 to carry, in that young Roosevelt proposition—a son of former President Theodore Roosevelt. We have not anything like that in this bill, have we?

Mr. BLAND. All of these plans are to be considered by the maritime commission and worked out. A new provision will be worked out based entirely upon the foreign differential and the American differential. American seamen today are walking the streets, and those that are now employed will be added to those that are walking the streets if we defeat this measure.

Mr. CONNERY. And the gentleman from Virginia has been a good friend of the American seamen, I will testify.

Mr. BLAND. I have tried to be.

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

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not live on the seaboard, but I am vigorously for an adequate merchant marine. In passing, may I state that I have been much impressed by the patriotic attitude of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN], who, in the first instance, seemed to be hostile to a proper subsidy bill. In the first session of this Congress this House passed a subsidy bill, for which I voted. A merchant marine is just as essential to the future of America and to its permanence as is agriculture and the continued existence of industry. That fact cannot be stressed too strongly, and, of course, I am unable to dilate on that at this time. The bill that originally passed the House was an unsatisfactory bill in one respect, as I stated at the time. It did not make adequate provision for the protection and development of personnel. Trained men are just as necessary as ships. This bill, which represents the best thought on this question, the most patriotic thought on the question, makes ample provision for the development and protection of an American personnel.

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

Mr. CULKIN. In just a moment. This bill which is proposed here came over my desk about May 14, and on it came the imprimatur and approval of Senator COPELAND, a true friend of the merchant marine; also Senator GUFFEY, who, although inland, has shown an interest in the proposition, and Senator GIBSON, of Vermont. Senator GIBSON, of Vermont, always stressed the issue of personnel. This bill, I repeat, provides for personnel, and thus far under the existing auspices we have had nothing but confusion and confusion worse confounded, not only in the upbuilding of our merchant marine but in the upbuilding of a personnel. The creation of a maritime authority gets the whole matter out of the ruck in which it has been thus far in this administra-

tion as well as former administrations. We have spent several billions, and they have been wasted.

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

Mr. CULKIN. In just a moment. There must be a subsidy if we are to have ships. Japan gives a liberal subsidy, England gives a liberal subsidy, more than is provided in this bill, as is instanced in the case of the *Queen Mary*; Italy gives a liberal subsidy. In fact, under stress of modern conditions, no nation can have a merchant marine on the seas without adequate government contribution. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Has the gentleman read the resolution that he is discussing? Because, if he has he will know—

Mr. CULKIN. I do not yield for an insult. I ask the gentleman to be mannerly, if he can be.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the resolution provides that title III be stricken from the bill, and title III is the only thing that deals with personnel. It is obvious that the gentleman does not know what is in the bill.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman has made many flagrant misstatements with reference to this legislation, and his statement just now is the most flagrant misstatement of all. Section 3 of the bill is now law, and is stricken out for that reason. Is not that true, I ask the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. BLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CULKIN. Page after page of this bill—and I do not have time to discuss them now—makes provision for personnel and for the protection and development of a merchant marine.

Mr. BLAND. And it has minimum man and wage scales.

Mr. CULKIN. Every statutory protection, every protection for the advancement of the personnel both before the mast and on the quarter-deck is provided for in this bill, and that is why we find opposition to the bill from certain quarters. I have no quarrel with anyone who honestly favors a merchant marine by a different procedure, but I say to you that if America is to keep its place among the nations of the earth, if she is to provide adequate transportation for agricultural exports when the tide turns, as it is bound to turn, then we must have American bottoms, and this is the procedure which does it. It gets us out of the rut of officialdom, out of the incompetency and greed of certain groups who have not been patriotic, but who have gained great benefits from the Federal Treasury. These groups who have become accustomed to writing their own ticket are opposing this bill because it speaks emphatically in terms of America and calls the turn on disloyalty and privilege. It puts the whole situation in the hands of a maritime authority who, if they are selected with a view to their experience and background, augurs well and happily for the future of America's merchant marine. I wish I had time to discuss this bill in detail. I say that this bill is the best thought in America of men who believe in a merchant marine—not a merchant marine for the benefit of the operators, but a merchant marine for the benefit of America, for the development of personnel and for the purpose of restoring the American flag to the seas.

Today Japan is outstripping us. England is outstripping us. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars and all we have now is obsolescence in ships and incompetency in personnel. This bill, if enacted into law, in my judgment, will call a halt upon that type of procedure. This bill, if enacted into law, will be a start to place the American merchant marine on the seas, highly developed as to personnel and highly developed as to ships.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. MORAN. Will the gentleman point out that if the bill were passed we would have a 100-percent American merchant marine?

Mr. CULKIN. That is true. Of course, that fact has been overlooked. America has spent these hundreds of millions and our ships are in part manned by Chinamen in the

steward division, foreigners in other divisions. This Senate bill, administered by proper maritime authority, insures an American merchant marine, which will be available in times of stress or in the hour of national defense.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. WEARIN. It is also true, is it not, that a vote against this particular bill would not be a vote against subsidies which already exist, but the defeat of this measure would simply insure a continuation of what has been proved to be a worse system by far than that proposed here, which is an improvement and which we hope will get the results desired in building up a merchant marine.

Mr. CULKIN. I will say to the gentleman that under present auspices the result has been most unhappy. It is one of the blackest chapters in American history. I cannot discuss that in detail, but under this legislation a real American merchant marine will come into being and American personnel will have its place in the sun, respected and upstanding. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARSONS). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House recall the controversy last year in regard to this type of legislation. My position is exactly the same as it has been ever since I have been interested in this legislation. I believe first in the absolute necessity of an adequate merchant marine. I think it is absolutely essential to handle our export business. I think it is absolutely essential in time of war. Without going into details at all, let me start with that fundamental basis, the necessity of an American merchant marine. I want to see the American flag all over the world carrying our exports. I want to see these American ships with American sailors, American seamen, and American officers. I want those seamen and officers to have decent working conditions. Those things are provided for in the unusual labor provisions in this particular bill.

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

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. We had to pay Great Britain a pretty good sum of money for every American soldier that was transported to France during the war.

Mr. MORAN. I am sure the Members will remember that is entirely accurate, and in addition to that millions of dollars' worth of our goods were piled up at the docks on the seaboard and could not be transported overseas during the World War, except at a tremendous overcharge in their cost.

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

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Would not even those who are opposed to any subsidy do better to vote for this bill than to vote against it and maintain the present condition?

Mr. MORAN. Yes. I am opposed to the present situation. I voted against it, and I would vote against it today. I advocated certain amendments last year. Those amendments which I asked for are in this bill. Every important amendment which I fought for last year is in this bill now before the House. I do not mean for a moment that this bill is 100-percent satisfactory to everybody. It is not 100-percent satisfactory to me. I should like to make a few changes in it, but compromise in legislation is what we face at all times. I believe it is the best merchant-marine bill that has been presented to either House of Congress.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the sailors and other working people be benefited by this bill?

Mr. MORAN. Yes; they will. This bill provides an amendment which I presented on the floor of the House which provides for minimum wages and manning scales. No more will we have ships going out with about two able-bodied seamen, the rest to be picked up around the water-

front at starvation wages, who have no conception of the important work they are to perform.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] criticizes this bill because, as he says, no one knows what is in it. He does himself an injustice, as I am sure he is fully acquainted with all the features of this bill and knows full well its many safeguarding features. Of course, I understand fully that certain shipping interests oppose this bill; I have seen their lobbyists running around here. I have so much confidence in the ability of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] that I am convinced that his real trouble is not that he does not know what is in the bill; instead, his trouble is that he does know.

We who are advocating this bill on the floor today have studied this proposition most carefully and are fully informed as to its provisions. Chairman BLAND is certainly as well informed on this subject as any man in either branch of Congress. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] are all members of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; all three of these men are numbered among the ablest Members of the House. Certainly, I do not need to call attention to the marked ability of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN], another member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who is not only an extremely able member but one who has always devoted his talents to fight for the public interest. Men like OTHA WEARIN renew our confidence in our system of government; Iowa will not only serve itself best but perform a signal service to the country by returning OTHA WEARIN to the next Congress.

In view of the fact that I am retiring from Congress, this is the last opportunity I will have to address my colleagues. I leave Congress with two thoughts uppermost. First, I will always remember the friendships I have made here; they are my priceless possession. There are no finer men and women on earth than there are in the Congress of the United States. I appreciate, far beyond my ability to express, the many kindnesses, the consideration, and the wise counsel I have received from such men as the late Speaker BYRNS and Speaker BANKHEAD. Second, this merchant marine legislation has been my greater interest; as I see this bill passing today and realize that it contains every single principle for which I have fought for over 2 years, I feel that I have performed some slight service to my country and to the good people of Maine.

I also take this opportunity to thank the good people whom I have the honor to represent—the citizens of the Second Congressional District of Maine. I am proud of my native State and of its people. I am thinking today of the many Democrats in our party organization in Maine who have worked so generously and so unselfishly for my elections; to them I owe a great debt of gratitude. I am thinking, too, of the many Republicans and independents who placed their confidence in me and aided materially in my election campaigns; my appreciation is immeasurable. In return I have tried to merit that confidence; I have given my best in serving them. While my activity in Congress ends, my interest in public service continues. As I survey the many problems facing our people today, it is my hope that the vast majority of the people of Maine realize the need of honest, able, and patriotic men in the public service, and that Maine will elect to high public office only men who measure up to those standards, men who will look upon public office as a trust and as an opportunity to serve.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the personnel feature of this bill will be stricken out in that it is contained in another bill which was passed last August, the conference report on which was adopted the night before last.

I simply want to take this time to point out that in the personnel feature, now no longer in this bill but in other

legislation, there is contained a provision for continuous discharge books. In other words, every seaman who is to be employed in the American merchant marine must carry a continuous discharge book, which will contain a record of the manner in which he has conducted himself in the past. So that if a seaman goes out on strike—

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARSONS). The Chair will count. (After counting.) Two hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the real purpose behind these continuous discharge books is to establish an effective system of blacklisting of seamen who have exercised their rights as Americans by having gone out on strike for decent living conditions.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. The discharge-book feature is not in this bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is exactly what I have said. However, it is contained in other legislation, and my only regret is that the parliamentary situation was such the other night that I could not oppose this antilabor feature.

Mr. BLAND. The manning and wage scales are in here, but the discharge legislation that we set up provides only for nationality, age, and record, but without a record as to character.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It also provides for a record of his employment.

Mr. BLAND. His ships.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Exactly.

Mr. BLAND. But his rating is able seamen, seamen, cook, steward, or in some other capacity.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But under that rating and by a record of his ships you have made a striking seaman a marked man. On the basis of that, if a seaman has been out on strike he will be carrying with him a notice to every shipping company to the effect that he has been out on strike and the result is going to be that that seaman is going to be discriminated against when he applies for a job. I regret exceedingly that we cannot take up this issue at this time because this feature is eliminated from this bill.

However, the legislation passed last August and accepted the other night, contains this vicious feature. I have only this opportunity to voice my protest. Not only do I protest, but I warn my colleagues that the American seamen are not going to take this legalized blacklisting lying down. They are going to fight, and I pledge myself to help them in that fight.

As to the bill itself, I am going to vote for it. While it is not a perfect bill, while it is not a Government-owned and operated American merchant marine, it is better than the present condition which permits shipowners to receive the benefit of Government money and do with it as they please without any control or regulation and without regard to the passenger or worker. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have followed the development of this legislation with a great deal of interest since the first of the year. I favor many provisions in the bill. I think we have paid for enough merchant marines without having one. This bill charts a new course. I hope the bill will pass. I regret we have not more time in which to discuss it. However, this is probably the closing day of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Under such circumstances it is not the custom of this House to allow time of great length for the consideration of any bill, irrespective of its importance. For approximately 18 months the House and Senate have had time in which to consider a proper merchant marine bill. We know our Navy is virtually helpless if we must depend upon other countries for the auxiliary ships required to support a navy. We know that if our goods moving out and coming in must be carried in foreign bottoms that the

interests of the American people must suffer in many ways. We know that our export plans cannot succeed without an adequate merchant marine. We know that too many of our ships flying our flag are now too nearly manned by foreign subjects not citizens of the United States and that just as soon as trouble develops between our country and other countries those very employees leave our ships like rats and go to the support of their own country's flag, leaving us helpless and without an adequate force to man such ships as we may have. We also know that under present laws it has been the custom and privilege for ship operators to exploit the funds of the United States Treasury, to launch ships unsafe for "safe travel", to sail ships with insufficient crews and untrained employees, to be unfair to their crews in the way of safety and pay. This bill moves in a direction to correct many of these evils. In the coming Congress the bill can be further perfected in the interest of the American people. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, my sentiments in regard to this bill are identical with the sentiments so well expressed by my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN]. As associates on the subcommittee which had charge of the Post Office and Treasury Department appropriation bill, we fought with all our vigor, energy, and resourcefulness to secure payment under the ocean-mail contracts, not that we believed in that law which hung a subsidy on the fiction of ocean mail but because we did have a high and ethical regard for the sanctity and the obligation of contracts, and we believed that the United States Government ought to be honorable enough to live up to its obligations. Having said this, I agree with my friend and colleague that this is a different proposition. I do not believe in buying a pig in a poke, and that is what we shall be doing if we pass this bill. No one in this House has a higher regard than I have for the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. He certainly looks after his constituents with great fidelity and success; but even that gentleman, familiar as he is with the merchant marine, was utterly unable when I questioned him to give any details of this bill or to tell me even in the roughest terms as to the obligations it will impose on the Treasury. I do not think we should buy a pig in a poke. I think we ought to vote this bill down.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that if by our action here today we commit the Democratic Party to the principle of direct subsidy we will reverse all of the precedents of history.

Our Democratic policy on this subject was fixed when Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our party, wrote into the great Declaration the precious doctrine that "all men are created equal", and later when he enunciated the immortal principle of "equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

Others may answer to their own judgments and consciences, but I stand today where I always have stood, and that is on the Jefferson platform. I do not believe, and I never will believe, that it is just or right or in harmony with the philosophy on which the great Democratic Party was founded that we should pass laws imposing taxes on all of the people of the country to insure profits to a favored few, whether those favored few be shipowners or anybody else. Such a doctrine is utterly repugnant to my sense of justice.

The platforms of the Democratic Party for more than a hundred years—National, State, and local—have committed the Democratic Party in the most positive and emphatic way against subsidies of all kinds. Quadrennium after quadrennium our national conventions invoked all of the vigor of the English language in inveighing against subsidies. A Democratic platform without some sort of an antisubsidy declaration was considered unthinkable. Even our last national platform—the platform of 1932—wound up with a splendid finish by reiterating the Democratic philosophy as follows:

In conclusion, to accomplish these purposes and to recover economic liberty we pledge the nominees of this convention the best efforts of a great party whose founder announced the doctrine which guides us now in the hour of our country's need—equal rights to all, special privileges to none.

When this subsidy bill is passed today it will be a historic event. The Democratic Party will junk one of its favorite tenets which has been a cardinal policy of the party for more than a hundred years and that is the policy that has heretofore kept it squarely on record in opposition to subsidies as being un-American and undemocratic. This will be the first time in all of its history, from Thomas Jefferson down to the present, that the party has been committed by legislative action to direct subsidies. It distresses me, and makes me feel very sad, indeed, to see the popular branch of Congress, to which I belong, abandon this just and cherished Democratic principle. I cannot believe that this surrender to favoritism and special privilege will be received with any satisfaction and joy by the masses of the people throughout the country, but on the contrary I believe they will be greatly saddened and disappointed by it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York 4 minutes to use as he may wish.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this resolution because I think it will make the present situation better.

Mr. Speaker, I find that quite a number of Members are inclined to vote against this bill because they think that by voting "no" they are voting against a subsidy. The truth of the matter is that voting "no" is not voting against a subsidy, because a vote against this resolution is a vote to continue subsidy under the fiction of ocean-mail contracts. This bill provides for the cancelation of the ocean-mail contracts not later than June 30, 1937, and for negotiations of settlements; and if they do not agree, they go into the Court of Claims. So we shall get rid of that sore spot that has been so much criticized throughout this Nation by so many persons—the giving of thousands of dollars to carry a few ounces of mail a few hundred miles.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. And we have something in this bill which was never included in any other legislation. We have a provision that 90 percent of the crews must be American citizens, and this commission is to set a minimum wage, which we have never had for American seamen.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it is of advantage to American working people engaged in shipbuilding and in the operation of ships.

The bill has been so amended in the Senate as more nearly to safeguard the funds that are used by this commission. I think it is an improvement over the bill we passed last year, and it certainly will do away with this outrageous ocean-mail contract system, to which we are all opposed.

I hope the membership of the House will not be confused and vote "no", thinking they are voting against a subsidy, because that is not the effect of your vote.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. We have instances of men like John Holleran, who refuse to employ anybody except American citizens, and he is put in competition with other lines unless we pass this kind of a bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is true. We cannot have a merchant marine in this country unless we have this or a similar plan. If we want to wipe our ships off the seas, we can do it by simply destroying this system. We cannot build up a merchant marine without some sort of subsidy, and I think it is much better to have an open and aboveboard plan, such as will be initiated under this bill, than to have this fiction which exists under the ocean-mail contracts by which we charge to the Post Office Department twenty-odd million dollars a year for a service which is not a mail service but simply a fiction and a subsidy.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Why is it necessary to pass this bill in order to repeal the ocean-mail contracts? Why can we not repeal those contracts without inflicting the burden of a heavy subsidy on the people of this country? One is not dependent upon the other.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We could do that, but we would be subject to suit in the Court of Claims on those contracts, and the gentleman knows they could recover in the Court of Claims. We would not get anything. In this bill we are giving the Commission the right to negotiate adjustments and reach a voluntary settlement, which is better than canceling them and getting into a court fight.

Mr. LUDLOW. Of course, I do not advocate the repudiation of existing contracts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN].

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a most excellent statement with reference to this situation and has described it in an able manner. A few Members of the House perhaps are aware of the fact I have been consistently opposed to most subsidies and especially to the ship-subsidy bill which passed this House during the last session. I am in a position now of subscribing to this particular measure in view of the fact I think by so doing I am not necessarily supporting a subsidy as a permanent policy for the Democratic Party, which I would most certainly oppose, but as a preferable situation to the one that prevails under the 1928 act and the corrupt features and contracts we are faced with under the terms of that 1928 act.

Unfortunately, we have an unsatisfactory ship-subsidy law on our statutes. This administration has put up with it thus far despite the fact that we have proved it to be corrupt, at least in its application. Evidently it is going to continue in force over the consistent protest of the able gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN], who has proved himself an authority upon this subject, and myself, unless we pass the pending bill; and of the two, the latter is as much preferable as good weather to bad weather. I am frank to say that I think subsidies are dangerous, but honest systems of subsidy are certainly superior to dishonest systems of subsidy. I trust that neither will ever become a permanent principle of the party of the common people for reasons that I do not have the time to enumerate, not the least of which is the possibility of subsidy wars between nations which have not been discussed before the House, but which carry almost as great a load of dangerous consequences as tariff wars. In this connection it would be well for us to study some recent debates in the British House of Commons, where the possibility of such a situation has been discussed in considerable detail.

Frankly, if I thought it was possible to defeat the appropriation in the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill—and I say this for the benefit of my distinguished friend from Indiana, whose sentiments I can understand—defeat the pending legislation, and at the same time place the American merchant marine on a self-sustaining basis without subsidy, I should prefer that above all things.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEARIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman does not believe in the principle of subsidy, does he?

Mr. WEARIN. No; I certainly do not; and I do not think anyone who votes for this bill is necessarily voting for a subsidy. In my judgment, he is voting to put a stop to the present corrupt program of ship subsidies to which I have been and still am opposed. The pending bill safeguards the public interest better than has ever been done in any legislation of that character with which I am familiar.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I will use the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in the long years I have been a Member of this House I have never seen the stage set for so humiliating and degrading a spectacle as we are about to witness. We

are told we must pass this bill without the opportunity of reading it. When the debate started, printed copies of the bill were not available. That the membership do not understand what is in the bill and what is not in this bill is evident from the fact that gentlemen have discussed features concerning seamen personnel, nationality of seamen on the ships, and so forth, not one word of which will be in this bill when it passes.

Those provisions were passed in this House sometime ago, and the bill containing them is now on the President's desk for his signature. With the exception of two or three Members of the House who have had an opportunity to read the provisions of this bill, partly in print, partly in lead pencil, and partly in typewriting, nobody knows anything about it. No one has had an opportunity to sit down and compare these provisions with the provisions of the bill which the House passed and study the effect of such provisions. We have to pass this bill because we are threatened.

Little children years ago were threatened by what the bogeyman would do "if you don't watch out." Since James Whitcomb Riley's time the bogeyman is now the official score-keeper for the Government, and in his place the children have the "little Black man." So, as if we were immature, we are threatened by a mythical "little Black man", who is elsewhere than in this Chamber. We are told that unless we pass this bill he will close all the post offices of the country on the 1st of July. That is a threat that is worthy to make to little children, but not to Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCKEY. How much of a merchant marine have we today?

Mr. LEHLBACH. We have, I should say, 63 trade routes.

Mr. LUCKEY. Is it not a fact that since the so-called Shipping Board has been established this Government has paid over \$2,000,000,000 in ship subsidies and we still have no merchant marine today?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I presume we have paid out over \$2,000,000,000, taking it from the time that the Shipping Board was created, or since the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 was passed, but a lot of that money was not paid in subsidies. The bulk of that money was lost by Government operations.

We have lost a little money under private operation, but the bulk of the \$2,000,000,000 was lost under Government operation, which is provided for in this bill as an alternative. It has never worked, and after years we have gotten away from it, and from \$100,000,000 a year we have reduced the cost of supporting the merchant marine by the Government to \$22,000,000 a year and we have a merchant marine carrying a substantial portion of our commerce.

Mr. LUCKEY. There is another provision in this proposed measure setting up a commission. How does this commission compare with the old Shipping Board?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It depends entirely upon the choice of personnel for the commission. A shipping board would be a good shipping board if it were composed of good men who understood their business. A maritime commission would be a good commission if it were composed of men who are capable, competent, and understand their business. The set-up of the commission has little to do with the effectiveness of its functioning; it is the men who compose it.

Mr. LUCKEY. In setting up a new commission to take care of this matter, does not the gentleman think we should have more time to study the proposition than we have now?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Certainly. Nobody would dream of passing this bill under the circumstances under which it comes to us, except those who yield to the threats of the "little Black man"—and who is this "little Black man"? He has repeatedly expressed his contempt of the House of Representatives. He has scoffed and tried to set aside a process issued under the authority of the House of Representatives by a committee thereof. A perversion of facts has been used by his committee in order, wantonly and wrongfully, to bring innocent Members of this House to the number of 70 into apparent disrepute—wantonly and wrongfully—men who

were absolutely innocent of anything that could be considered culpable. This is the "little Black man", under whose lash we are going to pass this bill; and, great God, I wish this House had guts enough to stand up against these threats by the "little Black man"—threats that are worthy of only being applied to children. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH].

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, the barometer of the civilization of any nation, of ancient, medieval, or modern times, is dependent upon the progress and development it extends to its merchant marine in times of peace as well as in times of war. The ancient Phoenicians were the Yankees of the east, and their biremes and triremes carried their commerce to all the then known civilizations of the world. Venice built upon the lagoons townships high up on the Adriatic and spread its commerce across the Mediterranean, up the Dardanelles, through the Black Sea, and across the southeastern Mediterranean to Egypt and the Red Sea and thence to the Orient. Because of its powerful merchant marine, Venice prospered through her eastern trade until she became the greatest maritime nation of her time. Her supremacy was challenged by Genoa, Pisa, and Naples, who divided the commerce of the Mediterranean with her. These nations became great because of their merchant marine. In 1497 from the city of Lisbon sailed Vasco de Gama with four vessels around the Cape of Good Hope until he reached Calicut in India. The discovery of an easterly all-sea route to the Orient by the Portuguese crippled the caravan-vessel routes—partly overland, part seaway—of the Venetians and Genoese. The all-water route was cheaper than a mixed land and sea route. Lisbon prospered while Genoa and Venice declined as maritime powers. Spain, through the discoveries of Columbus, then became the mightiest nation of her day because of her merchant marine. Queen Elizabeth, the pride of England, fostered merchant-marine commerce by instigating navigation acts for the protection of English mariners by giving new charters to merchant adventurers and organizing and financing new companies. Through the power of her great merchant marine, she began to carry exports and imports from all the four corners of the globe.

Portugal had found Brazil and the route around the Cape of Good Hope to the Indian and west and south Pacific Oceans. Francis Drake, for England, had entered the Pacific around the Horn. The Hollanders had found the route to the Orient. Spain was busy with the looting of Mexico, Central and South America, and under Philip had taken the Philippines. Trade was the base of all these exploits. The Spice Islands were in the thoughts of every mariner skipper. The famous Spice Islands were sought because there was to be obtained the condiments that would preserve and make palatable the stale and often putrid meat of the times, and that had marvelous medicinal powers, according to the beliefs of that day.

In time England, through the efforts of Drake, Hawkins, and Frobisher destroyed the Spanish Armada, and England became the "mistress of the seas."

From 1789, the foundation of our Government, up to 1860, American built, manned, and owned ships carried the products of our Nation to all ports of the world. There was a steady growth in our sailing merchant marine, mostly vessels of wood, of which we had ample supplies in our abundant forests. Oak, hickory, pine—and nothing devised by man in metal could equal the suitability of Maine pine for masts and spars. England had few forests, but ample coal and iron. Iron for ships and coal for fuel. Naturally, therefore, the British turned to the steamship as their means of carrying the ocean-borne commerce.

The reason the American merchant marine grew so greatly was because of a subsidy given by the Federal Government through its mail contracts.

In the year 1856 the total tonnage of the Great Britain ships amounted to 5,900,000 tons. The total tonnage of all the other nations of the world except the United States at

that time was 5,600,000 tons. And, mark you, my colleagues, the tonnage of the United States in 1856 was 5,600,000 tons, equal to that of all the nations of the world, and second only to that of Great Britain. It was in the year 1856 that the Congress of the United States withdrew its mail subsidies to the Collins Lines and other lines. That was the death knell of the development of the American merchant marine. At that time we carried 80 percent of the exports and imports of our own country to all ports of the world, and when the subsidies were withdrawn, up to the year 1914, the United States merchant marine was almost wiped off the face of the earth. In 1914 we carried only 8 percent of the imports and exports of our agricultural, commercial, and industrial products.

During all these years European governments were not idle. There is not a civilized nation in the world today, and I challenge any Member of Congress to contradict me, that has not built up its merchant marine through aid given, directly or indirectly, by the government to its own nationals for the development of their respective merchant marine. The heavily settled nations on the northwest of Europe have clung to the sea. It was their route to world commerce. They had no great interiors to develop, and the only export market for their surplus goods was by way of the sea, and to the sea they held tenaciously. Each new European vessel that was launched on the Continent was larger and better than those that preceded her, and today foreign moneys that we had given to European countries they have not paid back to us. They have built their great liners, such as the *Queen Mary* of England, the *Normandie* of France, the *Bremen* and *Europa* of Germany, and the *Rex* and *Conte di Savoia* of Italy.

When the World War broke out the United States had only four vessels plying to South America regularly. Most of our American goods, manufactured, developed, and prepared in our country, had to be shipped on foreign vessels, and the foreigners saw to it that deliveries were slow and freight charges high for Americans, while their own national goods were expedited at a lower freight rate.

Mr. Speaker, we have paid hundreds of millions of dollars of American money to the nations of foreign countries in carrying American products in European bottoms. The time has come to put a stop to the situation. When the World War broke out we had no merchant marine to transport our own soldiers and to carry ammunition and other materials necessary to win the war.

Then Congress appropriated the sum of \$3,500,000,000 to build ships to meet the contingencies of the moment. We perfected wooden ships, which are today rotting in the different ports of our country, worthless and useless. Had we contributed from 1856, when we stopped mail subsidies to our American lines, and continued to subsidize our merchant marine as we should have up to the present time we could never have reached the sum of \$3,500,000,000 which we had to appropriate for ships to win the war.

Mr. Speaker, if any Member of Congress wants to cripple our Nation in times of peace as well as in times of war, let him vote against this bill; but if you believe in the welfare, the happiness, and the contentment of our American Republic, vote for this bill, because it contains the following provisions that will make the American merchant marine the greatest in all the world. [Applause.]

First, this bill provides a construction differential subsidy of 33½ percent of the foreign cost of construction. In exceptional cases the maritime authority will have the privilege of going up to 50 percent when four of its members agree. In other words Mr. Chairman, it is 33½ percent cheaper to construct a ship in England than it is in the United States. How can American ships therefore compete with British ships unless we put them upon a basis of parity so far as construction is concerned. Eighty-five percent of this money goes to pay for American labor in the construction of ships by our shipyard companies. Fifteen percent of the money goes to buy material that goes into the construction of ships which is taken from 44 States of the Union.

Second, we grant to the owners and operators of shipping companies an operating differential subsidy which will equalize the difference in the foreign costs of insurance, repairs, wages, and subsistence, which will be spent upon American seamen, and its personnel, who will secure minimum wages and maximum hours of labor to enhance the welfare of our merchant marine. This operating differential will place the American merchant marine on a parity with operating expenses of foreign shipping interests.

Third, if lines do not build ships, then the maritime authority may build and charter them on competitive bids when trade requires and opening of new routes is necessary.

Fourth, the bill further provides for the recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent. One-half would go to the Government and one-half to the reserve fund so as to enable shipping operators to rebuild their ships when they become old and obsolete.

Fifth, this meritorious measure provides for limitation of salaries to only \$25,000 a year. It prevents the siphoning out of profits by holding companies and it prevents these organizations from doing repairs or stevedoring except for themselves.

Sixth, this measure takes the profits out of war by making it mandatory for the Government of the United States to take over ships in emergencies or in times of war and only gives its owner back the actual money that he put in.

Seventh, it provides for a bipartisan board of five members, whose duties shall consist of establishing a long-range program of construction and reconstruction of our merchant marine until it is equal, if not superior, to any nation of the globe. [Applause.]

Eighth, many of the Members of Congress are opposed to ship subsidies because of the abuse that has crept into mail contracts, in which millions have been diverted to improper channels. This bill provides that 90 days after the bill becomes a law the holder of any mail contracts may apply for a change and settlement of his contract to subsidies. If any act of injustice may be directly or indirectly perpetrated against these holders of subsidy contracts, the bill provides that they may sue the Government in the Court of Claims if they are not satisfied with the decision of the maritime authorities.

Mr. Speaker, these regulations are the high spots in the new shipping bill which you are now called upon to vote for. If you vote for this bill and put it across, I am convinced it will place the merchant marine of the United States of America on a parity with the shipping of the world and bring the American flag back to be seen floating high in the air in all the ports of the world, where it was in the past on clipper ships. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have opposed this bill on the floor because they contend it grants subsidies. Let me be frank with you. I have repeatedly voted for subsidies through the medium of the protective tariff to protect the great industries of our Nation. I have continuously been voting for bounties for agriculture and farming interests in our country. Year in and year out we have been voting for indirect subsidies to the bankers of this country through the operation of the Federal Reserve banking system. For the past decade we have given to labor and to the American Federation of Labor, indirectly, subsidies through restricted immigration so they would not have to compete with cheap foreign labor that is constantly seeking admission into our country. Where is there a Member in this House who comes from the South, the Middle West, the Far West, the Northwest, who has not had his particular State enriched through bounties that have been voted in the form of subsidies for flood control—Muscle Shoals, Boulder Dam—and countless other measures too numerous to mention. The time has come when we courageously, fearlessly, and patriotically should vote to develop the merchant marine upon which the prosperity, the happiness, and the future of our Nation is dependent in war as well as in peace. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the total of the world's merchant-marine tonnage today is 36,000,000 tons. Of this tonnage Great

Britain has about 14,000,000; Japan, slightly over 3,000,000; Germany, 2,700,000; France, 2,250,000; Italy, 2,100,000; while the United States has only 600,000 tons of shipping that is less than 10 years old—the smallest of any nation in the world. If you pass this bill, which I sincerely hope you will, it will enable the maritime shipping board to encourage ship construction, ship operation, and help within a decade to make America the foremost merchant-marine nation in all the world. Mr. Speaker, we must have ships. New ships. We must have American ships built by Americans, manned by Americans, and flying the American flag. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I have 5 minutes remaining, but I shall not occupy them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUDLOW) there were—ayes 225, noes 21.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 482) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 482

Resolved, That until otherwise provided by law, the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, additional compensation per annum, payable monthly, to certain employees of the House as follows:

To the clerk to the official reporters of debates, the sum of \$640.

To each of the expert transcribers in the office of the official reporters of debates, \$660.

SEC. 2. The position of janitor in the office of the official reporters of debates is hereby abolished.

SEC. 3. That until otherwise provided by law, the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of \$2,000 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of an assistant clerk in the office of the official reporters of debates, said assistant clerk to be appointed by the official reporters of debates.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 9, strike out the figures "\$660" and insert the figures "\$260."

At the end of the resolution add the following:

"SEC. 4. That this resolution shall take effect as of January 1, 1937."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. Do I understand this is a resolution to put into effect the new rate of salary that was passed the other day in regard to these employees?

Mr. STARNES. I am just now calling up the resolution of authorization.

Mr. SNELL. I thought we passed that the other day.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK TO STENOGRAPHERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 518) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 518

Resolved, That there shall be a clerk to the stenographers to committees, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and to receive compensation at the rate of \$3,360 per annum, payable from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

That upon the appointment of such clerk the position of janitor to such stenographers to committees shall be vacated and no appointment shall be made to such position.

Mr. STARNES. On behalf of the committee, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. STARNES: After the last word in the resolution insert "That this resolution shall take effect as of January 1, 1937."

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH UNNECESSARY RENEWALS OF OATH OF OFFICE BY CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4519) to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will withhold it if the gentleman desires to make a statement.

Mr. MILLER. I just want to say to the gentleman that this bill is asked for by the various departments. The Department of Agriculture and the Veterans' Administration now have a law which saves those departments a great deal of money in the administration of their departmental affairs. It merely makes the same rule applicable to the other departments; that is, where a man working for the Government in a department is demoted or promoted or transferred from one status to another or from one division to another, the necessity of filing an additional oath is obviated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I realize the purpose of the bill, but the situation, as I see it, is this: We are being criticized here for breaking down the effectiveness of our public officials, and decreasing the obligation of those officials to the people whom they indirectly represent. At the present time, as I recall it, the code provides that everyone in the capacity of an employee or official shall take an oath to perform well and truly the duties of the office. I do not attempt to quote it correctly. If the gentleman will recommend that the code be changed to include all offices to which the individual might be appointed, I think I can go along with him.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8368) to enforce the twenty-first amendment, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1935" and insert "1936."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "attempts" and insert "attempt."

Page 2, strike out lines 18 to 23, inclusive, and insert:

"(b) In order to determine whether anyone importing, bringing, or transporting intoxicating liquor into any State, or anyone attempting so to do, or assisting in so doing, is acting in violation of the provisions of this act, the definition of intoxicating liquor contained in the laws of such State shall be applied, but only to the extent that sales of such intoxicating liquor (except for scientific, sacramental, medicinal, and mechanical purposes) are prohibited in such State."

Page 3, strike out lines 9 to 15, inclusive.

Page 3, line 16, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "18 U. S. C." and insert "U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18."

Page 3, strike out lines 20 to 25, inclusive, and lines 1 to 9, inclusive, on page 4, and insert:

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to confer and impose upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and any of his assistants, agents, or employees, and upon any other officer, employee, or agent of the Treasury Department, any of the rights, privileges, powers, duties, and protection conferred or imposed upon

the Secretary of the Treasury, or any officer or employee of the Treasury Department, by this act, or by any law now or hereafter in force relating to the taxation, importation, exportation, transportation, manufacture, possession, or use of, or traffic in, distilled spirits, wine, fermented liquors, or denatured alcohol.

Page 4, line 13, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 4, lines 13 and 14, strike out "18 U. S. C." and insert "U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18."

Page 5, line 9, strike out "8" and insert "7."

Page 5, line 9, strike out "18 U. S. C." and insert "U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "18 U. S. C." and insert "U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18."

Page 6, line 22, strike out all after "contents" down to and including "compound" in line 24, and insert "and the quantity contained therein."

Page 7, line 6, strike out "10" and insert "9."

Page 7, lines 8 and 9, strike out "(39 Stat. 1069; 18 U. S. C., sec. 341)" and insert ", approved March 3, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 27, sec. 123)."

Page 7, line 10, strike out "11" and insert "10."

Page 7, line 12, after "Act", insert "and nothing in this act shall apply to the Canal Zone."

Page 7, line 13, strike out "12" and insert "11."

Page 7, line 18, strike out "13" and insert "12."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, none of the amendments made by the Senate involves a change in policy. They are all either clerical or clarifying amendments.

First. The amendment to subsection (b) of section 3 is for the purpose of meeting objections made to section 3 that it would require the Federal Government to aid in possible discrimination by a State against the product of another State. Subsection (a) of section 3 provides for Federal regulation of the importation of liquor into a State in which all sales of intoxicating liquor containing more than 4 percent of alcohol by volume are prohibited. Subsection (b), however, makes the State definition of intoxicating liquor apply in determining whether liquor is being brought into a State in violation of the act. Presumably it might be possible for a State to define intoxicating liquor as liquor containing one-half of 1 percent of alcohol by volume, and at the same time prohibit sales of such liquor only if it contains more than 4 percent of alcohol by volume. In such a situation a State would receive Federal aid in keeping out beer containing a percentage of alcohol between one-half of 1 percent and 4 percent, although such beer of its own production would be permitted to be sold within the State. The Federal Government thus would be lending its aid in a discrimination by one State against the product of another State. The Senate amendment corrects this situation by making the State definition of intoxicating liquor apply only to the extent that a State prohibits the sale within its borders of the intoxicating liquor which it desires Federal aid in keeping out.

Second. Section 5 is omitted from the bill because section 9 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, passed last year, deals with the disposal of any forfeited liquor and prevents the sale of such liquor. The provisions of section 5 dealing with the manner of sale of forfeited liquor are, therefore, useless.

Third. The amendment to section 6 is for the purpose of bringing about a conformity with existing law relating to the power of the Secretary to delegate to his subordinates his rights and duties relating to the liquor laws. Section 6, as passed by the House, placed the responsibility of enforcing the provisions of H. R. 8368 and sections 238, 239, and 240 of the Criminal Code—relating to the interstate shipment of intoxicating liquor—in the Secretary of the Treasury, through the established machinery of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and his subordinates, while engaged in the enforcement of any law relating to intoxicating liquor, the rights, privileges, powers, and protection relating to intoxicating liquor conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the act of March 3, 1927. It was thought that this section continued in the Secretary of the Treasury the authority conferred upon him under that act, which permitted him to delegate

such rights, privileges, powers, and duties to his subordinates. However, since it was felt that section 6 might be construed to confer and impose such rights, privileges, powers, and duties directly upon the subordinates of the Secretary of the Treasury, and would thus deprive the Secretary of his authority to delegate those rights and duties, the Senate amended section 6 so as to clarify it and remove any possibility of such construction by employing language similar to that now contained in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927.

Fourth. The amendment to section 9 of the House bill eliminates the necessity of stating the percentage of alcoholic content on containers of liquors shipped in interstate commerce. Since H. R. 8368 was introduced the Federal Alcohol Administration Act has been passed. Section 5 (e) (2) of that act prohibits statements of alcoholic content on labels placed on containers of malt beverages. The requirement of a statement of alcoholic content, therefore, in section 9 of the House bill runs counter to the prohibition in the Federal Alcohol Administration Act. In order that there may be consistency with the policy adopted by Congress last year in that act, the Senate amendment dispensing with a statement of alcoholic content is desirable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENROLLMENT OF PRIVATE ACT NO. 349

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 196, to correct errors in the enrollment of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, and to clarify the duties of the Comptroller General in connection with said act.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the numerals "10" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the numerals "20."

Sec. 2. That the payments authorized in section 3 of the said act to be made to the "attorney or attorneys who performed services toward securing provision for the payment herein of the amounts so found" shall be made to Clarence W. DeKnight.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN SERVICE

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8316) to exempt the Indian Service from the requirements of section 4 of the Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the effect of these amendments?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. The Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act of 1934 authorizing the President to transfer disbursements of all funds to central agencies. We introduced a resolution in the House exempting the Indian Service from the order issued by the President, but the Senate amended the resolution so that it does not exempt anything from the Executive order but exempts certain funds from the Appropriation Repeal Act. It excludes private Indian funds from the act. The Treasury Department and the Interior Department both have approved the amended resolution. It will save the Government money if the private Indian funds are kept in the local agencies so that if an Indian wants a pair of shoes at \$2.50 he does not

have to send 1,000 miles to get approval for the purchase but can get it from the local agency.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understand it we passed the bill and these are Senate amendments?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yes; but the bill we passed did not provide that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Has the gentleman taken up this matter with the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. The gentleman means the Senate amendments?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. We had hearings on it originally.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And what the gentleman now is asking is that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Has the gentleman had it up for consideration before his committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yes; I have discussed it with members of the committee and they agree to it. While we prefer the House bill, since it was objected to by the Treasury Department we have agreed to the Senate amendments.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Has the gentleman talked with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. There is no objection to it from the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:
"That section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, approved June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1233), shall not be applicable to funds held in trust for individual Indians, associations of individual Indians, or for Indian corporations chartered under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Amend title so as to read: "An act to modify section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to individual Indian money."

TO DEFINE THE TERM OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 177, to define the term of certain contracts with Indian tribes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so merely for the purpose of getting information on this bill. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma explain the bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. This bill merely makes it possible for the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to extend contracts that were entered into some years ago, where the contracts had a definite time limit. A number of the cases involved are in the courts, and it has taken 8 or 10 years to settle them. There is a question as to whether those contracts are valid. This bill would make it discretionary with the Secretary of the Interior to continue them in force.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understand from the calendar, this bill was referred to the gentleman's committee and acted on by his committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What kind of report came from the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. It was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much is involved in these contracts?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. There is nothing involved. It will not cost the Government anything. These cases are already in the Court of Claims. Even if this resolution did not pass it would not make a bit of difference as to the cost

to the Government, so far as these contracts are concerned, except new contracts would have to be entered into. It is just a question of continuing these contracts rather than entering into new contracts. The Secretary will have discretionary power over these contracts.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understand, then, the claims referred to in this resolution are to be adjudicated in the Court of Claims.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; they are already there and they will be adjudicated anyway.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, these are lawyers' contracts, contracts for the continuation of lawyers' services?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any contracts or agreements heretofore approved by the Secretary of the Interior between the authorities of any tribe, band, or group of Indians and their attorneys for the prosecution of claims against the United States, which provide that such contracts or agreements shall run for a period of years therein specified, and as long thereafter as may be required to complete the business therein provided for, or words of like import, or which provide that compensation for services rendered shall be on a quantum-meruit basis not to exceed a specified percentage, shall be deemed a sufficient compliance with section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (or sec. 81, title 25, U. S. Code): *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall limit the power of the Secretary of the Interior, after due notice and hearing and for proper cause shown, to cancel any such contract or agreement: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to revive any contract which has been terminated heretofore by lapse of time, operation of law, or by acts of the parties thereto.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 9, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. Any existing valid contract heretofore made and approved pursuant to any act of Congress by any tribe, band, or group of Indians with an attorney or attorneys for the rendition of services in the prosecution of claims against the United States under authority of which suit or suits have been filed, and which contains a limitation of time for the completion of the services to be performed may be continued in full force unless a subsequent contract dealing with the same subject matter has been made and approved."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We agreed that this bill should be permitted to be brought up for consideration at this time and withdrew all objections that we may have had, assuming it was a bill that had been regularly passed by the Senate and regularly considered by a House committee. Now, then, there is an amendment offered which may be absolutely contrary to the previous bill. I should like to know what the amendment is about. I think this practice is somewhat improper.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. This amendment is a committee amendment and was added with approval of the Department of the Interior. After the resolution had passed the Senate, on investigation the Department found that an injustice would be done to two tribes, namely, the Creeks and the Seminoles, unless this amendment is added to the bill. The original resolution in the Senate did not take care of those two tribes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Has the amendment been submitted to the House committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Yes; and it has the unanimous approval of that committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ENROLLMENT OF PRIVATE ACT NO. 349

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the action recently taken by the House in passing Senate Joint Resolution 196, to correct errors in the

enrollment of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, and to clarify the duties of the Comptroller General in connection with said act, in order that a committee amendment, which was inadvertently overlooked, may be agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 196.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the numerals "10" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the numerals "20."

Sec. 2. That the payments authorized in section 3 of the said act to be made to the "attorney or attorneys who performed services toward securing provision for the payment herein of the amounts so found" shall be made to Clarence W. DeKnight.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "DeKnight", insert the following: "For services rendered before the committees of Congress and executive officers of the Government during the period of 20 years prior to and including the date of approval of said act, in connection with securing authority for payment of the findings of the Court of Claims therein enumerated: *Provided,* That such payment of 10 percent shall be participated in by such other attorney or attorneys, if any, who, in addition to having appeared in the Court of Claims, shall have rendered services as above described during said period, such participation to be in proportion to the value and extent of services so rendered as determined by the Comptroller General of the United States, to whom all claims for participation in said 10 percent shall be presented within 30 days from the date of approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPILATION OF LIST OF LABOR-SAVING DEVICES, MECHANICAL AND OTHERWISE

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 49 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 49

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor is requested (1) to compile a list of the labor-saving devices, mechanical and otherwise, put in operation in the United States after December 31, 1912, which are still in use; (2) to estimate the number of persons in the United States now unemployed by reason of the use of each kind or type of such devices; (3) to estimate the number of persons who would be employed in the United States in each of the various divisions of industry, commerce, and agriculture, but are not so employed by reason of the use of such devices; and (4) to report his findings in detail in the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress, together with such observations and recommendations as the Secretary deems pertinent and useful. Every officer or employee of the United States is requested to supply the Secretary with such information relating to any matter under investigation or study pursuant to this resolution and contained in the records of the office of such officer or employee as the Secretary may request. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "labor-saving devices" includes any improvement, made after December 31, 1912, of a labor-saving device put into operation on or before such date, and the term "United States" means the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out the words "is requested" and insert "be required."

Page 1, line 3, after "otherwise", insert "such as automatic machinery, machinery in general, conveyors, speed-ups, efficiency methods eliminating loss of time and repetition of motions, monopolies, mergers of industries, and all other means adopted toward reducing the cost of production under our competitive system."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1912" and insert "1920."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "use", insert "and being constantly improved."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "now."

Page 1, line 12, insert "at the time of completion of such a list."

Page 2, beginning in line 1, after the word "devices", strike out all down to and including the word "thereof" in line 20 and insert the following: "or methods in each of the various divisions of industry, commerce, and agriculture in the United States; and (3) to report the findings in properly digested and coordinated detail to the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present or the next following Congress, together with such observations and recommendations as the Secretary deems pertinent and useful. Every officer or employee of the United States shall be required to cooperate and to supply the Secretary with such information relating to any matter under investigation or study pursuant to this resolution and contained in the records of the office of such officer or employee as the Secretary may request. Such a list of labor-saving devices are to be kept up to date from year to year, with such additions and revisions as may be dictated by progress and changes in industry, commerce, and agriculture. For the purpose of this resolution the term 'labor-saving devices' includes any improvements, made after December 31, 1920, of a labor-saving device or method put into operation on or before such date, and the term 'United States' means the United States and all the territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TABER. If the Secretary of Labor is required to do these things, it will cost two or three million dollars. I cannot figure anything else out of this except that we are getting started on a set-up in that Department that will be absolutely uncontrollable as far as future costs are concerned.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. TABER. I withhold my objection.

Mr. CONNERY. They have \$12,000,000 available now under the W. P. A., and the Department of Labor is making this investigation.

In this bill we are asking them to furnish us with certain data that we want transmitted to the Congress. In the next session we are bound to have legislation in connection with labor-saving devices which are throwing people out of employment. As I previously stated, they have \$12,000,000 now.

Mr. TABER. Why does not the gentleman offer a resolution requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish such data as is being compiled by the Secretary of Labor under these allotments from the W. P. A. instead of making this sort of request? It looks like a permanent set-up, and I know from my previous experience that the Secretary of Labor will come before the Congress and ask for additional money. I shall be forced to object unless the resolution is modified along these lines.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman offer an amendment along the lines of his suggestion?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will withhold his request for consideration of this bill until I can prepare the amendment, I shall do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for the moment I shall object.

WHITMAN NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. DE ROUEN. Mr. Speaker I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7736) to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument.

The Clerk read the conference report and 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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7736) to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument, 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 amendment.

RENÉ L. DE ROUEN,
KNUTE HILL,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
ELMER A. BENSON,
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 amendment of the Senate to H. R. 7736, providing for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The Senate receded from its amendment to the bill, H. R. 7736, as passed by the House, which authorizes the appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act and agrees to the bill as passed by the House.

RENÉ L. DEROUEN,
KNUTE HILL,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN RE ADJUSTMENT OF CLAIMS IN CONSTRUCTION OF POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT HEMPSTEAD, N. Y.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2647) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claims of subcontractors, materialmen, and laborers for material and labor furnished in the construction of a post-office building at Hempstead, N. Y.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust on a pro-rata basis in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate the unpaid balance due from the United States under the contract no. TISA-3050, dated March 30, 1932, between the United States and the Brooklyn & Queens Screen Manufacturing Co., Inc., the unpaid claims of subcontractors, materialmen, and laborers for materials or labor furnished at any time in the construction of the post-office building at Hempstead, N. Y., under said contract, which work was completed by the National Surety Co., as surety on the performance bond, before said surety company was placed in the hands of a rehabilitator or liquidator appointed by the Insurance Department of the State of New York, and after the United States had terminated the right of the Brooklyn & Queens Screen Manufacturing Co., Inc., to proceed under said contract. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to settle and adjust the said claims which may be filed and established hereunder without regard to the Government's right of set-off against any indebtedness of the National Surety Co. to the United States in other cases and without regard to the Government's right to priority in the payment of its claim: *Provided,* That no settlement shall issue hereunder until 6 months after the enactment of this act, and no claimant who shall have failed, neglected, or refused to submit his claim to the Comptroller General of the United States within the said period shall share in the benefits of this act. Such allowance as may be made by the Comptroller General as herein provided shall be paid from the appropriations heretofore made for the construction of the building in question. Payments so made shall be charged to the National Surety Co. in the adjustment of the accounts between said company and the United States: *Provided,* That no allowance shall be made pursuant to the terms of this act, unless and until the rehabilitator or liquidator of the National Surety Co. shall file with the Comptroller General written consent thereto.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF STEAM BOILERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PALMISANO submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2953) to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2953) to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, and agree to the same.

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.
WILLIAM H. KING,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
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 House to the bill (S. 2953) to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment no. 1: Section 3 of the Senate bill establishes a boiler inspection service in the engineer department of the District of Columbia, to be composed of a boiler inspector, assistant boiler inspectors, and such other employees as may be necessary for the proper performance of the work. The House amendment struck out "boiler inspector" and inserted "the present inspector and necessary assistant inspectors." The House recedes.

On amendment no. 2: This is a clarifying amendment striking out surplus language; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 3: The Senate bill provided that all such officials and employees constituting the boiler inspection service shall be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The House amendment strikes out that part providing that their compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923. The Senate recedes.

On amendments nos. 4 and 5: Section 6 of the Senate bill provides for an annual inspection by the boiler inspector of all boilers and unfired pressure vessels for which a certificate of inspection is required, except that in the case of a steam boiler or unfired pressure vessel which is regularly inspected at least once a year by an insurance company duly licensed in the District of Columbia, such annual inspection by the boiler inspector may be dispensed with where a report of such inspection by the insurance company shows any such boiler or unfired pressure vessel to be in a safe and insurable condition. Amendment no. 4 provides that where such inspections are made by an insurance company that such steam boiler or unfired pressure vessel must be regularly insured, as well as inspected, at least once a year. Amendment no. 5 provides that the inspection and report by the insurance company shall take the place of inspection by the boiler inspector, instead of leaving it merely permissive, as in the Senate bill. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 6: This amendment is added at the end of section 6 of the Senate bill. It provides that insurance companies shall report to the inspectors the cancellation of insurance of any certificate holder. The Senate recedes.

On amendments nos. 7 and 8: Section 8 of the Senate bill provided, among other things, that steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels located in or upon self-propelled boats or vessels operated under the regulations of any Federal agency or the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from the provisions of this act. Amendment no. 7 struck out the word "self-propelled", and amendment no. 8 inserted after the word "vessels" the words "or other floating equipment", so that such exemption will apply on all such boats, vessels, or other floating equipment, whether or not self-propelled. The Senate recedes.

On amendment no. 9: This is a clarifying amendment providing that the owner or user shall pay the fee required by this act.

On amendments nos. 10, 11, and 12: The last sentence of section 9 of the Senate bill provided that when an inspection report is filed by an insurance company with the boiler inspector, showing that a boiler or unfired pressure vessel has been inspected and found to be in a safe and insurable condition as provided in section 6, there shall be paid to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia a fee of \$1 prior to the issuance of the certificate of inspection. Amendment no. 10 provides that the owner or user of such insured and inspected boiler or unfired vessel shall be exempt from the payment of all fees except the said \$1 fee. Amendment no. 11 is a clarifying amendment providing that the owner or user shall pay the said \$1 fee. Amendment no. 12 provides that no such certificate shall be valid after the boiler or unfired pressure vessel shall cease to be insured by an insurance company authorized as provided in section 6 of this act. The Senate recedes.

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2953) to provide for the inspection, control and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

INSPECTION OF VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4780) to extend the laws governing inspection of vessels and for other purposes. An identical House bill has been reported by the committee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there was passed last year a bill regulating the transportation of dangerous combustibles in harbors. The ports of New York, Philadelphia, and others are very seriously interested. These regulations have been prepared, but the Solicitor of the Department held that under that bill they could not carry them into effect. This measure has been considered by the committee and a unanimous report has been made on an identical House bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. When was it considered by the committee?

Mr. BLAND. A similar bill (H. R. 12951) was considered by the committee and reported to the House on June 8.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It is not on the calendar apparently.

Mr. BLAND. I have the report here.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOLMES. Does this affect in any way the colliers that travel between Virginia and the New England ports carrying coal on deadline, and so forth?

Mr. BLAND. No; it does not affect coal. It affects combustible liquids, gasoline and things of that kind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 52 of the Revised Statutes is amended by inserting after section 4417 thereof a new section designated section 4417a, to read as follows:

"Sec. 4417a. (1) All vessels, regardless of tonnage, size, or manner of propulsion, and whether self-propelled or not, and whether carrying freight or passengers for hire or not, that shall have on board any inflammable or combustible liquid cargo in bulk, except public vessels owned by the United States, other than those engaged in commercial service, shall be considered steam vessels for the purposes of this title and shall be subject to the provisions thereof: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to vessels having on board only inflammable or combustible liquid for use as fuel or stores or to vessels carrying liquid cargo only in drums, barrels, or other packages.

"(2) In order to secure effective provision against the hazards of life and property created by the vessels to which this section applies, the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall establish such additional rules and regulations as may be necessary with respect to the design and construction, alteration, or repair of such vessels, including the superstructures, hulls, places of stowing and carrying such liquid cargo, fittings, equipment, appliances, propulsive machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers thereof; and with respect to all materials used in such construction, alteration, or repair; and with respect to the handling and stowage of such liquid cargo; the manner of such handling or stowage, and the machinery and appliances used in such handling and stowage; and with respect to equipment and appliances for lifesaving and fire protection; and with respect to the operation of such vessels; and with respect to the requirements of the manning of such vessels and the duties and qualifications of the officers and crews thereof; and with respect to the inspection of all the foregoing: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce which transport such liquid cargo by water insofar only as such common carriers are subject to the regulations formulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the provisions of section 233 of the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, 35 Stat. 1135), as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18, sec. 383). In establishing such rules and regulations the Board of Supervising Inspectors may, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, adopt rules of the American Bureau of

Shipping or similar American classification society for classed vessels insofar as such rules pertain to the efficiency of hulls and the reliability of machinery of vessels to which this section applies. In establishing such rules and regulations the Board of Supervising Inspectors shall give due consideration to the kinds and grades of such liquid cargo permitted to be on board such vessel.

"(3) Before any rules and regulations, or any alteration, amendment, or repeal thereof, are approved by the Secretary of Commerce under the provisions of this section, except in an emergency, the said Secretary shall publish such rules and regulations and hold hearings with respect thereto on such notice as he deems advisable under the circumstances.

"(4) No vessel subject to the provisions of this section shall, after the effective date of the rules and regulations established hereunder, have on board such liquid cargo, until a certificate of inspection has been issued to such vessel in accordance with the provisions of this title and until a permit has been endorsed on such certificate of inspection by a board of local inspectors, indicating that such vessel is in compliance with the provisions of this section and the rules and regulations established hereunder, and showing the kinds and grades of such liquid cargo that such vessel may have on board or transport. Such permit shall not be endorsed by a board of local inspectors on such certificate of inspection until such vessel has been inspected by such board of local inspectors, or by any other board or officer of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation designated by the Director thereof, and found to be in compliance with the provisions of this section and the rules and regulations established hereunder. For the purpose of any such inspection approved plans and certificates of class of the American Bureau of Shipping or other recognized classification society for classed vessels may be accepted as evidence of the structural efficiency of the hull and the reliability of the machinery of such classed vessels except as far as existing law places definite responsibility on the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. A permit issued under the provisions of this section shall be valid for a period of time not to exceed the duration of the certificate of inspection on which such permit is endorsed, and shall be subject to revocation by a board of local inspectors whenever such a board shall find that the vessel concerned does not comply with the conditions upon which such permit was issued: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to vessels of a foreign nation having on board a valid certificate of inspection recognized under law or treaty by the United States: *And provided further*, That no permit shall be issued under the provisions of this section authorizing to be on board any vessel, described in the provisions of sections 4472 and 4278 of the Revised Statutes, section 234 of the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, 35 Stat. 1135), as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18, sec. 384), and section 8 of the act of August 2, 1882 (ch. 374, 22 Stat. 189; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 171), any of the materials expressly prohibited to be carried on such vessels by the afore-mentioned provisions.

"(5) Vessels subject to the provisions of this section shall have on board such shipping documents as may be prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce indicating the kinds, grades, and approximate quantities of such liquid cargo, on board such vessel, the shippers and consignees thereof, and the location of the shipping and destination points.

"(6) (a) In all cases where the certificate of inspection does not require at least two licensed officers, a board of local inspectors shall enter in the permit issued to any vessel under the provisions of this section the number of the crew required to be certificated as tankermen.

"(b) A board of local inspectors shall issue to applicants certificates as tankerman, stating the kinds of liquid cargo the holder of such certificate is, in the judgment of such board, qualified to handle aboard vessels with safety, upon satisfactory proof and examination, in form and manner prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, that the applicant is in good physical condition, that such applicant is trained in and capable efficiently to perform the necessary operations aboard vessels having such liquid cargo on board, and that the applicant fulfills the qualifications of tankerman as prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors under the provisions of this section. Such certificates shall be subject to suspension or revocation on the same grounds and in the same manner and with like procedure as is provided in the case of suspension or revocation of licenses of officers under the provisions of section 4450 of this title.

"(7) The owner, master, or person in charge of any vessel subject to the provisions of this section, or any or all of them, who shall violate the provisions of this section, or of the rules and regulations established hereunder, shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

"(8) The rules and regulations to be established pursuant to this section shall become effective 90 days after their promulgation unless the Secretary of Commerce shall for good cause fix a different time."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. JAMES W. DARR

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3405) for the relief of Capt. James W. Darr.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint James W. Darr, formerly a captain, Infantry, United States Army, a captain of Infantry, United States Army, and to place him upon the retired list of the Army as a captain, with the retired pay of that grade: *Provided,* That no back pay, allowance, or emoluments shall become due because of the passage of this act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman states this man was a captain in the Regular Army?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. He was; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. During what period of time?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. He was a captain in the Regular Army and had a dishonorable discharge for some offenses which he committed. It has since been determined he was insane at the time he committed the offenses and he is confined at the present time in a hospital for the insane in the State of Minnesota. This bill has passed the Senate and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOTS IN HARDING TOWN SITE, FLORIDA, ETC.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate 4707, for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida, and for the relief of the heirs of Lewis G. Norton.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am doing so on account of the absence from the Chamber at the moment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who has asked that this matter be held up until he returns.

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

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I believe Mr. RICH will not be back.

Mr. SNELL. I agreed to object to it, and for the present I do object.

STREAM-POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12764) to create a division of stream-pollution control in the Bureau of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is quite an important measure, and I should like to have some explanation made by the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors before unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the gentleman will permit, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. SNELL. That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the wholehearted approval of the Public Health Service of the United States. It is a forward looking piece of legislation, and national in its scope. It provides for a comprehensive plan on a national scale in respect to the water-pollution menace that confronts the entire Union. In addition to that, after that national plan has been worked out, and surveys made in conjunction with the States and the public health departments of the States, then it authorizes grants or loans after the Surgeon General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Budget submits those estimates to the Congress and the Congress agrees thereto. I feel certain that every Member of the House recognizes the imminent danger, unseen, until epidemic arises, that hovers over stream pollution.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman this is a serious question, but whether that should be all done from Washington and go so far as to grant loans, and so forth, without more careful consideration, I have some doubt.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. When it comes to the point of granting aid or a loan, that is done only when such grant or loan has been approved by the State authority.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; of course, that is so, but we are laying the foundation for all this and concentrating this authority to govern this pollution matter entirely in Washington.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. In a way that is true, but it is done under the same philosophy that the Public Health Service work throughout all the States of the Union in respect to rural rehabilitation, and under the Social Security Act.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand it this starts out with a set-up of a million dollars to begin with.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Three hundred thousand dollars annually for 10 years is authorized for the Public Health Service for investigation, and \$700,000 annually for 10 years is authorized to be divided among all the States for a survey and a study upon which the remedial work will be founded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the term of 10 years.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Just one moment. All the industries presumed to be affected by this have agreed to this bill, particularly the paper and pulp industry.

Mr. SNELL. This is establishing such a broad policy, covering the whole country, that I am rather opposed to letting this kind of bill go through without careful attention. I don't know that I am opposed to the principle of the bill, but I think it is a mistake to legislate on such important matters in the closing days of the session by unanimous consent.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to allay the fears of my good friend the minority leader, is it not true that the Public Health cannot operate and would not assume to operate under this bill unless it could have the cooperation of all the States? In other words, the successful operation of this cannot result in the building up of a bureau in Washington, because it has to reach out to all of the States and ramify into all parts of the country.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. May I say that the States cannot meet this as a State proposition. It is an interstate problem, national in scope.

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

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. The bill is restricted to meet a situation covering only the waters over which the Federal Government may have jurisdiction.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes; the navigable streams of the United States and the tributaries thereof.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. To call attention to the fact that a special House Committee on Conservation conducted hearings in the session on several other bills, and that it reached the conclusion that there is very little that the Federal Government could do in the matter of legislating, and that what is needed is the development of the scientific facts relative to pollution and how it could be eliminated and then work through the States. This bill contemplates that form of procedure.

Mr. SNELL. That is a matter that ought to be brought out and fully developed.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DEFINING JURISDICTION OF COURT OF CLAIMS ON CERTAIN INDIAN CLAIMS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 213) defining the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims under the act approved April 25, 1932 (47 Stat. L. 137), and for other purposes.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I reserve the right to object. For the information of the House I desire to state I have gone into this measure with extreme care. Numerous people have come to me and given their reasons why they felt the bill should be allowed to pass. The resolution seeks to construe the original jurisdictional act permitting the Eastern and Emigrant Cherokees and the Western or Old Settler Cherokees to sue the United States in the Court of Claims. My objection is found in that part of the resolution which, while giving the United States the right to receive full credit for all sums advanced in the form of gratuities, and so forth, provides that it must be shown the gratuities, and so forth, must have been paid to them per capita. It is absolutely impossible for the United States to show per capita payments. You will note the report shows the Bureau of the Budget before advancing an opinion on the resolution consulted the Attorney General who calls specific attention to this language. The Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the resolution. I refer briefly to the letter of the Acting Secretary of the Interior which quotes the Court of Claims:

It thus appears not only that plaintiffs' claim has heretofore been determined and adjudicated on the merits by this court and the Supreme Court and paid in full but that such determination and adjudication was made on a correct statement of the account. * * *

In another case the court said:

This case has already been before this court and the Supreme Court and the identical questions have been considered and decided by both courts. The matters for the determination of the court in the original case (40 C. Cls. 252; 202 U. S. 101) were the amounts, principal and interest, due the Cherokee Nation and the Eastern or Emigrant Cherokees under the Slade and Bender account, and those matters were finally settled and determined on March 15, 1910, by payment.

Mr. Speaker, millions have already been paid to these Indians; and if this resolution is passed, I repeat, the United States will be helpless, and the court will be compelled to render judgment in their favor for an amount which no one can now predict, but which will go into the millions.

I reserve my objection for the purpose of giving the gentleman from Oklahoma an opportunity to make a statement, but in the end I will insist upon and renew the objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is intended to correct an error in the Jurisdictional Act passed in 1932, which authorized suits to bring the affairs of the Cherokees to final settlement.

The Indian Committee of the House unanimously reported House Joint Resolution 457, in terms identical with this resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 213, Union Calendar, 1185. The Indian Committee of the Senate reported it unanimously and it passed the Senate without opposition yesterday. I do not see how anyone could object to it.

It is of importance to the State of Oklahoma and involves no appropriation. I regret that the gentleman from Missouri sees fit to insist on his objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADMINISTRATION OF BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY IN VIRGINIA AND NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 12455) to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all lands and easements conveyed or to be conveyed to the United States by the States of Virginia and North Carolina for the right-of-way for the projected parkway between the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks, together with sites acquired or to be acquired for recreational areas in connection therewith, and a right-of-way for said parkway of a width sufficient to include the highway and all bridges, ditches, cuts, and fills appurtenant thereto, but not exceeding a maximum of 200 feet through Government-owned lands as designated on maps heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be known as the Blue Ridge Parkway and shall be administered and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of

Congress approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", the provisions of which act, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended over and made applicable to said parkway: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to connect with the parkway such roads and trails as may be necessary for the protection, administration, or utilization of adjacent and nearby national forests and the resources thereof: *And provided further,* That the Forest Service and the National Park Service shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate and correlate such recreational development as each may plan, construct, or permit to be constructed, on lands within their respective jurisdictions which, by mutual agreement, should be given special treatment for recreational purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Amlie	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Sanders, La.
Andrews	Ferguson	Lehlbach	Sandlin
Ayers	Fernandez	Lemke	Sauthoff
Bacharach	Fiesinger	Lesinski	Schneider, Wis.
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	McClellan	Schutz
Berlin	Focht	McFarlane	Scott
Bland	Fulmer	McGroarty	Sears
Bolton	Gassaway	McLeod	Secret
Brennan	Gifford	McSwain	Sisson
Brewster	Gingery	Maloney	Stubbs
Brooks	Gray, Pa.	Marshall	Sumners, Tex.
Buckler, Minn.	Green	Martin, Mass.	Sutphin
Caldwell	Greenway	Maverick	Taylor, Colo.
Cannon, Wis.	Greenwood	Monaghan	Taylor, S. C.
Cary	Hamlin	Montague	Tobey
Chapman	Hancock, N. C.	Montet	Tolan
Claiborne	Higgins, Conn.	Murdock	Turpin
Collins	Higgins, Mass.	Nelson	Wadsworth
Creal	Hill, Knute	Nichols	Weaver
Crowther	Hill, Samuel B.	Norton	Werner
Cummings	Hobbs	Oliver	White
Darden	Hoepfel	Parks	Williams
Dear	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.	Wilson, La.
Deen	Hollister	Pettengill	Wilson, Pa.
Dies	Hope	Pierce	Withrow
Dirksen	Imhoff	Ramsay	Wolfenden
Ditter	Kee	Ree	Wood
Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Duffey, Ohio	Kieberg	Richardson	Zioncheck
Dunn, Miss.	Kocialkowski	Robison, Ky.	
Eagle	Lanham	Romjue	
Eaton	Larrabee	Sadowski	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). Two hundred and ninety-six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 12455 provides for the administration, and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, connecting the Shenandoah National Park in Virginia and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee.

There might have been some justification for opposing the appropriation of the money with which to construct this parkway. I do not believe there was sufficient justification for that opposition, but now that the money has been authorized and the parkway is under construction, with more than 100 miles of it let to contract and the parkway certain

to be built, any attempt to prevent the maintenance of that parkway by proper governmental authorities seems to me the most unreasonable, absurd, unjustifiable, and untenable position that I have ever known anyone to take.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman just said that this had already been authorized and that they were building it. Will the gentleman give us a little more information in regard to that? That is news to me.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The road was authorized under the National Industrial Recovery Act, title II, section 202, and there are about 100 miles of it now let to contract and perhaps 40 or 50 miles already graded. The money was recently provided in the highway bill for the further construction of the parkway.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman tell me, if the money has been provided and already authorized, why any additional legislation is required?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. Somebody must administer and maintain the road when it is constructed, as a considerable part of this highway goes through forest lands under control of the Department of Agriculture. This parkway should be under the control of the Park Service, which is in the Department of the Interior. The purpose of this bill is simply to give the right of maintenance and administration of the road after it is constructed to the proper governmental agency. It does not provide for a dollar in money. That has already been taken care of. It is simply to take care of the maintenance and administration of it. Suppose we should go ahead and build the road, which we will do, and then do not provide for its maintenance, everyone knows that every dollar of the money would be wasted. It would not be worth a cent to build the highway and then not provide for its maintenance.

Mr. SNELL. Where did the money come from?

Mr. DOUGHTON. First, from the P. W. A. fund.

Mr. SNELL. From the regular highway fund?

Mr. DOUGHTON. As I understand, the money was authorized from the regular highway fund.

Mr. SNELL. I supposed that this had been started with W. P. A. funds. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. The first money that was expended was an allocation of \$6,000,000 from P. W. A. This last authorization, as I understand it, comes from the regular highway fund.

Mr. SNELL. I did not understand that any money out of the regular highway fund had been used for this specific purpose.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will say it matters not what fund it comes from. It is Government money, of course, and in the construction of the road they are employing relief labor. I know that the contractors are required to give preference and employ, as far as possible, relief labor.

Mr. SNELL. One of the points I want to know is whether these funds have come from regular highway funds, as the gentleman from North Carolina stated, or from W. P. A. funds.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I understand that the funds to be used in the future will come from the highway funds. At first \$6,000,000 was set aside from P. W. A. funds. That is my understanding; but, regardless of where the funds come from, the road is under construction and is certain to be built. The only issue before us in the pending bill is the question of its maintenance under proper administration.

Mr. SNELL. You want to be absolutely sure it is going to be built. Is there doubt of that unless it is recognized by some such law as is being proposed at the present time?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This does not have a thing to do with the building of it. I am as absolutely certain of that as I am of standing here.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman says he is sure about it, I know he thinks that way, for he says what he thinks.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The only reason I can see for any opposition to this bill is that it comes from those who are sore

or disappointed over the construction of the road and who feel that in the last hours of Congress, by dilatory tactics, by filibustering, they can prevent giving the Department of the Interior and the Park Service the right to maintain this road. It is the most absurd position I have ever known anyone to take.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The original appropriation, I may say to the gentleman from New York, came from P. W. A., not from W. P. A.

Mr. SNELL. Has anything ever been taken out of the regular road fund for this project?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Last week we passed a special appropriation to build this road.

Mr. SNELL. I should like to have some more information on that point, that there was a special appropriation made last week to take care of this road.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not mean an appropriation; I meant an authorization.

Mr. SNELL. There may be some general authorization, but when it gets down to the proposition of the money having been appropriated, as the gentleman from North Carolina thinks, and I know he thinks it if he says it, we are in disagreement as to that; there is a difference of opinion as to that matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. P. W. A. started it, and there has been some W. P. A. labor used in improvements in the park as local relief projects and some C. C. C. camps were built. There was an authorization of \$10,000,000 to finish the highway between the two parks. This bill provides for the administration of the road when built by an appropriate agency of the Department of the Interior. This bill carries no appropriation or authorization for appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. If this bill is just to provide for maintenance of the road after it is built, why not wait until the road is farther along? It seems to me then would be time enough to pass this authorization.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Jurisdiction over the road must be vested in the proper department.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What would be the use or justification of building a road like this if there is no authority to administer and maintain the road after it is built? I know my good friend from New York would not follow such a policy with his good common sense.

Mr. SNELL. That may be true, but it is a long way between beginning and completing such an immense project as this. The gentleman is looking a long way ahead.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Some portions of the road are being used, are they not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It will be a long time before it is all completed?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It will be perhaps 2 years, but a very fine section of the road has been completed and a great many people from Washington and other towns and cities drive out there to avail themselves of it. It is one of the finest recreational areas in the East. The climate is salubrious and the scenic beauty is unsurpassed. It has no parallel in this part of the country.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not true that now two different departments are involved in the administration of the road?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Absolutely.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This bill simply puts the maintenance in the Interior Department.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; that is correct.

If this bill should be defeated, the only difference it would make would be that the money expended for the construction of this great parkway would be wasted until some future time when Congress was wise enough to provide for its maintenance.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Nobody in this House has higher regard for the gentleman from North Carolina than I. The only thing he has done that did not please me was that awful tax bill we passed last night; but that has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not a thing.

Mr. RICH. This involves a roadway between two parks, 477 miles long, at \$50,000 a mile. The cost of this parkway will be over \$20,000,000. There are now parallel roads down that valley where people can go back and forth from one of these parks to the other, and I cannot see why we should build a parkway at this time. The former bill called for a parkway 800 feet wide, but in this bill it is cut down to 200 feet. I do not know why the change in width.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The right-of-way is 200 feet wide. The State of North Carolina, the State of Virginia, and the State of Tennessee bought this land and deeded it to the Government of the United States in the same way that parks are deeded. There was expended \$12,000,000 by the States of Virginia and North Carolina. I do not have the figure for the State of Tennessee for the purchase of this land which was given to the United States Government.

Mr. RICH. But 800 feet was provided in the previous bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That was only for an easement whereby they might control the situation so as to conform to the purposes of the project.

Mr. RICH. There are these two great parks. Now, why should the taxpayers of this country be asked to keep up a road 477 miles in length between the park in Virginia and the park in North Carolina, when the people of those two States will get the benefit of it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why should the taxpayers keep up the national parks and recreational grounds anywhere?

Mr. RICH. Why put them all down there in Virginia and North Carolina? You have already had the lion's share.

Mr. DOUGHTON. There is only the one.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has never been up in Pennsylvania. I want him to come up there and see what we have in Pennsylvania. We have the finest scenery in the world, Switzerland included.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is one of our great assets, which nature has bestowed upon that section. My good friend from Pennsylvania and the people from the other congested districts of this country will get the benefit of this recreational parkway. They will travel up and down this road and get the benefits that will come from it. I invite my friend from Pennsylvania to fall in line with this project rather than endeavor to throw something in its way.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. This is the same parkway that was formerly known as the Sky Line Highway a year or so ago?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; it has been changed to the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Which you North Carolinians took away from us Tennesseans. Notwithstanding that, I recognize the merit in this bill and I am going to support it, because it connects two of the finest and most picturesque parks in the United States.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We are proud of it, and if Tennessee had been as fair as she is beautiful she would not have opposed North Carolina in the locating of the trail.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true this bill does nothing in the world but place the entire parkway in the hands of one given governmental agency? That is the whole purpose of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is the whole purpose of the bill; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It carries no appropriation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not at all.

Mr. KNUTSON. That will come later.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That has been authorized already.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true there will be inefficiency and much additional cost if we permit this road to be left under the administration of two separate departments of the Government?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; there will be more or less discord and trouble, as there always is when you have two separate agencies of the Government administer any law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was interested in the gentleman's remark about Tennessee being the daughter of North Carolina. I wonder if the gentleman could give us a little more information in this respect?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I may say to the gentleman that I would not have time to do that; however, we are very proud of our daughter.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it true this road will cost approximately \$40,000,000 and that the money is coming out of the regular farm-to-market road fund?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not think it will cost anything like \$40,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this designated as a farm-to-market road?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No, not at all; we already have business roads and farm-to-market roads.

My good friend from Pennsylvania asked why we could not utilize the roads that were already constructed. This road is being constructed as a recreational road.

Mr. RICH. Why does not the gentleman offer a bill prohibiting a lot of these trucks from being on the roads?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why do I not suspend the law of gravitation? I cannot do all of these things like the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have not the power.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is the leader, and we try to follow him when he is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. But the gentleman follows, like Peter, a long way off most of the time.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield? I want to clarify one question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sorry, I have not the time.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the most ridiculous undertaking that has ever been presented to the Congress of the United States. We have fought this thing from the time it came out on the Consent Calendar, through the conference report on the Hayden-Cartwright bill, and now it bobs up here under suspension of the rules within a few hours of what we hope to be the adjourning hour of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

If it is true, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has said, that this work is already being done and that 100 miles of this parkway has already been let, then why are we asking the Congress today for an authorization for this purpose?

Mr. DOUGHTON. An authorization?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Or asking that these activities be coordinated under one head. The gentleman knows, and he knows just as well as he knows he is a Member of the Congress of the United States, that not one cent of the \$10,000,000 which we authorized under the Hayden-Cartwright Act 2 weeks ago can be used for the carrying out of this fantastic scheme until the House puts its stamp of approval on the bill which he has brought up here today.

This creates a parkway 477 miles long—

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not just now. I am afraid the gentleman might get personal just as he did the other day.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has said that I know certain things.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman refused to yield to me when I asked him to yield a few moments ago, when the gentleman was making statements derogatory of my efforts to save the people of the Nation \$48,000,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I hope the gentleman will not misrepresent me.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has time and can represent himself.

The gentleman cannot deny the fact that this parkway is 477 miles long and 800 feet wide except where it goes through national-forest lands.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Eight hundred feet wide?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The road?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; not the road, the parkway; and if there is any question—

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WARREN). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members present, a quorum.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And if there is any question about the length and width of this parkway, let me read from the committee report, which states as follows:

The purpose of the Blue Ridge Parkway is to provide a connecting scenic highway and adjacent roadside recreational area between the Shenandoah National Park in Virginia and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee. The parkway will be 477 miles long and will be located on a right-of-way averaging 800 feet in width—which is being acquired by the States involved and donated to the United States, except where the location is through national-forest areas.

Under the bill, where it goes through national-forest areas, there is a limitation that it shall not exceed 200 feet in width. The distance involved is 477 miles, further than from the city of Washington through New York City—

Mr. MILLARD. And up to Boston.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; on up to Boston.

This is seven-eighths of the distance from the city of Washington to the city of Detroit.

And I charge, and I charge without fear of successful contradiction, that this is a movement to get the Congress of the United States to put its stamp of approval on one of the most colossal steals that has ever been perpetrated upon this House, in that it gives a free highway through Government property connecting these two national parks for the benefit of these States, without any contribution by the States themselves.

The purpose of this act is to give a free highway down through Virginia and North Carolina, and, perhaps, part of Tennessee, without any donation by the States involved.

A companion bill to this is the Natchez Trace bill, which is to be 500 miles long across the State of Mississippi and is to cost \$25,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

This represents a total of \$48,000,000. This is the most visionary thing that has ever been presented to the Congress since the days of Passamaquoddy and the Florida ship canal, and I entreat the House to consider this bill with the same logic and the same reasoning that it considered those two visionary projects.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-two Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Amle	Duffey, Ohio	Kleberg	Peterson, Fla.
Andrews	Dunn, Miss.	Kniffin	Pettengill
Ayers	Eagle	Kocialkowski	Quinn
Bacharach	Eaton	Lambeth	Reed, N. Y.
Bacon	Ekwall	Lanham	Reilly
Barden	Englebright	Larrabee	Richards
Berlin	Ferguson	Lee, Okla.	Robison, Ky.
Bolton	Fernandez	Lehibach	Sadowski
Brennan	Fiesinger	Lemke	Sanders, La.
Brewster	Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Sandlin
Brooks	Gasque	Lewis, Md.	Sauthoff
Buckley, N. Y.	Gassaway	McClellan	Schneider, Wis.
Bulwinkle	Gifford	McFarlane	Schuetz
Cannon, Wis.	Gilchrist	McGrath	Scrugham
Cary	Goodwin	McGroarty	Sears
Chapman	Green	McLeod	Secrest
Claiborne	Greever	McMillan	Stack
Collins	Gregory	Maloney	Summers, Tex.
Creal	Hamlin	Martin, Mass.	Taylor, Colo.
Cross, Tex.	Hancock, N. C.	Maverick	Taylor, S. C.
Crowther	Hess	Monaghan	Tolan
Cummings	Higgins, Mass.	Montague	Turpin
Daly	Hill, Knute	Montet	Wadsworth
Darden	Hobbs	Nelson	Weaver
Dear	Hoepfel	Nichols	Wilcox
Deen	Hollister	Norton	Wilson, Pa.
Dies	Imhoff	O'Connell	Withrow
Dirksen	Jones	Palmisano	Wolfenden
Ditter	Kee	Parks	Wood
Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Patton	Zioncheck
Drewry			

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The Chair makes an earnest appeal to the membership of the House. The Chair has just been informed by the Speaker of the House that final adjournment of this Congress may take place early tonight, provided the membership of the House will cooperate in dispatching certain business that is necessary to be considered. Unless the membership desires to remain on the floor so as to avoid constant points of no quorum being raised, it is going to be impossible for the House to dispose of this business. Many Members here have meritorious measures that are entitled to final consideration. If they are considered, the House has the privilege of voting them down. The Chair, therefore, urges Members to stay on the floor and maintain a quorum during the rest of the afternoon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, according to my understanding the P. W. A. or something of that kind made an allotment to start the construction of this highway free of cost to the States of Virginia and North Carolina, between two parks, the Shenandoah and the Great Smokies. That allotment, according to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has been made and over 100 miles of road contracted for. The gentleman from North Carolina wondered why anyone could possibly oppose this bill even if they opposed the other bill. I say to the gentleman and I say to the House that if the Government of the United States came up into my State and voluntarily spent \$30,000,000 or forty or fifty million dollars upon a highway for us, we ourselves would be very glad to maintain it and we would not ask the Federal Government to do it. Is not that a fair statement and is not that a fair proposition? Federal maintenance of this highway will cost four or five times as much as State maintenance.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the gentleman maintain the roads in the national parks in New York State?

Mr. TABER. There are no national parks in New York State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The people of New York State maintain the national parks in the national forests in New York State?

Mr. TABER. We have not any national forests.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No national forests?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. ROBERTSON. None at all?

Mr. TABER. No. That is a terrible situation, is it not?

Mr. MILLARD. Does not the gentleman feel that we should spend some Federal money in New York State and not so much in the South?

Mr. TABER. Oh, the State of New York went into this forest business and we found it was a failure, and based on that failure the present administration has proceeded along lines in that direction. They have to have a proposition develop into a failure before they go into it. That is the history of the present administration, that is their record. There is not anything more ridiculous than these States coming here today and asking the Federal Government to undertake to maintain these highways forever at a cost of four or five times what it costs the States themselves to maintain them. I thought it was going a very long way, because nothing of that kind is ever done in any of the States whose operations I am familiar with, for the Congress the other day to pass that highway bill with a provision for authorization and for an appropriation. Frankly I think it was an absolute infringement upon any principle of State integrity. We can have no such thing as State integrity unless the States take care of their own activities, and we can have no such thing unless we stop this ridiculous Federal spending.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a connection between parks or parkways some 477 miles in length in the States of Virginia and North Carolina. There is also the Natchez Trace, which does not seem to be mentioned in this, but will come in, too, in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, amounting to something over 500 miles, a total of 1,000 miles in all. This has been started by the Public Works Administration, and now they come to us this year and ask for an appropriation of \$20,000,000 from the highway funds to carry this work on.

This right-of-way is to be 200 feet wide through the parks, 800 feet wide through the other part of the States. The States are to furnish the right-of-way where they have control over the 800 feet. The Government is asked to build this road in its entirety, and now you are trying to pass legislation for Government maintenance. In our State counties furnish the right-of-way for all roads. State roads are constructed at State expense. County roads are paid for by counties.

We furnish the maintenance entirely ourselves, but here we are asked not only to furnish Federal funds for construction of the parkways, but we are also asked to furnish the maintenance after they are constructed. There will be 1,000 miles of parkway that all of the States must contribute for these four or five States, and furnish the maintenance. As we have constructed highways in the past, this does not seem fair to me. This does not seem a fair proposition. Our Committee on Highways in the House turned down this proposition unanimously. There was another proposition to give money to Arkansas for their highways without having it matched by them, something that is not done with any other State in the Union; yet we are giving to that one State their quota of highway money without their matching it. These are propositions that were turned down by our committee.

This bill to furnish the right-of-way and furnish the money for this road was turned down flat by our committee, but when it went to the Senate it was put back in and they overruled us in conference. This is starting a precedent for those States that all the rest must pay for. In the past our highway moneys have been fairly distributed between States on

an area, population, and mileage basis, and it should continue that way. We are going into a new form now.

We are furnishing for the few States the entire amount of money to build their roads, and then we furnish the entire amount of money to maintain them after they are constructed. If we are to build these roads, certainly the States ought to maintain them. They should not ask the Federal Government to do it. If this legislation is not passed, the Park Commission will have to take care of those roads that are in the park, and those that are outside the park the States will take care of.

This superhighway will cost at least \$100,000,000, and all for five States. While all of the States will have to contribute to the expense, New York State will pay 30 percent of the cost and get no return.

We have thousands of miles of farmers' roads throughout the States that need constructing, and what it will cost to construct this road would construct a farm-to-market road such as we construct in New York State once and one-half around the world.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a source of satisfaction to me during my service in the House that very seldom is a sectional issue raised when a matter of legislation is under consideration. I am glad that to most of the Members of this House the stars in the flag that hangs above the Speaker symbolizes to them, as to me, 48 united States, with a united Nation.

My colleague from Michigan says that Virginia and North Carolina are trying to get something free. He is the legislative ambassador for his Michigan automobiles. We sell our cotton abroad. We sell our tobacco and apples abroad. We buy your Michigan automobiles. If the South stopped buying your automobiles, your factories would close and your men would be out of employment.

You say this costs \$48,000,000 and we are trying to get something free. I tell you that the average cost so far has been about \$30,000 a mile; and, if you will multiply 477 by 300, you will find it is less than \$18,000,000.

This bill does not involve any appropriation. Construction will go forward whether we pass this bill or not. We are not trying to get something free. The distinguished economist from New York knows how Virginia and North Carolina contribute to the Federal Treasury. We are no longer paupers. We are in the first seven States of the Nation in contributing to the Federal Treasury.

I call attention again to the gentleman from Michigan that the Manufacturers Record shows that in the last year, in the balance of trade between the North and the South, we, shipping our goods abroad and buying from the North, you had \$1,000,000,000 of advantage in trade relations; yet you tell us that we want to get something free when we want this park for you, for our friends from every State to come and enjoy.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I understand I have 2 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair distinctly asked the gentleman if he desired to use the remainder of his time. The gentleman from Michigan knows that the gentleman who moves to suspend the rules, under the uniform practice of the House, has a right to close the debate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The uniform practice of the House and possibly the rules may conflict in this particular instance, due to the fact that the rules provide there may be 40 minutes' debate, equally divided between those in favor of and those opposing the motion. I have not used my 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, on his own initiative, contrary to the rules of the House, is going to recognize the gentleman from Michigan for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be as courteous in the use of the 2 minutes as the Chair was in granting them to me.

I want to assure the gentlemen from Virginia and North Carolina that there is nothing sectional in this bill. We want you to use our automobiles and we want to buy your cotton, but we want you to build your highways on the same basis that the State of Michigan, the State of New York, or any other State in this Nation has to build their highways. We do not object to giving you, as you do not object to giving us, a Federal grant if you will match the money. We can construct our highways. We, in every other State of this Nation, object to the States of Virginia and North Carolina getting a highway for nothing that they would have to pay for otherwise. There is nothing more to this bill, as I have said than to give these two States 477 miles of highway without a cent of cost to those States. Now, is this in accordance with the spirit of the highway act?

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry; I have not time to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL) there were—ayes 123, noes 47.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 175, nays 125, not voting 124, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]
YEAS—175

Barden	Dickstein	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, Tex.
Barry	Dingell	Lewis, Colo.	Schulte
Beam	Disney	Lucas	Shanley
Belter	Doughton	McAndrews	Shannon
Bell	Doxey	McCormack	Sirovich
Bland	Driscoll	McGehee	Sisson
Blanton	Driver	McLaughlin	Smith, Conn.
Bloom	Duffy, N. Y.	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Boehne	Duncan	McReynolds	Smith, Wash.
Boland	Dunn, Pa.	McSwain	Smith, W. Va.
Boylan	Eckert	Mansfield	Snyder, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Edmiston	May	Somers, N. Y.
Brown, Mich.	Faddis	Mead	South
Buchanan	Farley	Merritt, N. Y.	Spence
Burch	Flannagan	Miller	Starnes
Cannon, Mo.	Ford, Calif.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Steagall
Carter	Ford, Miss.	Moran	Stubbs
Cartwright	Frey	Murdock	Sutphin
Cary	Fuller	O'Connell	Tarver
Castellow	Gambrill	O'Connor	Taylor, Tenn.
Chandler	Gearhart	O'Day	Terry
Chapman	Gildea	O'Leary	Thom
Clark, Idaho	Goldsborough	Oliver	Thomason
Clark, N. O.	Greever	Palmisano	Tonry
Cochran	Gregory	Patman	Turner
Colden	Griswold	Patton	Umstead
Cole, Md.	Hancock, N. C.	Pearson	Utterbach
Colmer	Harlan	Peterson, Ga.	Vinson, Ga.
Connery	Hart	Pfeifer	Vinson, Ky.
Cooley	Harter	Pierce	Wallgren
Cooper, Tenn.	Healey	Rabaut	Walter
Cox	Hennings	Ramsay	Warren
Cravens	Hill, Ala.	Ramspeck	Wearin
Crosby	Hill, Samuel B.	Randolph	Welch
Cross, Tex.	Jenckes, Ind.	Rankin	Werner
Crosser, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn	West
Crowe	Johnson, Tex.	Relly	Whelchel
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	Richards	White
Curley	Jones	Robertson	Whittington
Daly	Keller	Robinson, Utah	Williams
Darden	Kerr	Rogers, Okla.	Wilson, La.
Delaney	Kopplemann	Romjue	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kramer	Ryan	The Speaker
DeRouen	Lambeth	Sabath	

NAYS—125

Adair	Blackney	Church	Crowther
Allen	Boileau	Citron	Culkin
Andresen	Buckler, Minn.	Coffee	Darrow
Arends	Carlson	Cole, N. Y.	Dietrich
Ashbrook	Carpenter	Cooper, Ohio	Dondero
Biermann	Casey	Costello	Dorsey
Binderup	Christianson	Crawford	Eicher

Ekwall	Hope	Main	Rogers, Mass.
Ellenbogen	Houston	Mapes	Rogers, N. H.
Engel	Huddleston	Marcanonio	Russell
Evans	Hull	Marshall	Schaefer
Fenerty	Jenkins, Ohio	Martin, Colo.	Scott
Fish	Kahn	Mason	Seger
Fletcher	Kelly	Massingale	Short
Focht	Kennedy, N. Y.	Meeks	Snell
Fullmer	Kenney	Merritt, Conn.	Stack
Gehrmann	Kinzer	Michener	Stefan
Gillette	Kloeb	Millard	Stewart
Gingery	Kniffin	Moritz	Sweeney
Goodwin	Kvale	Mott	Taber
Gray, Ind.	Lambertson	O'Brien	Thompson
Gray, Pa.	Lamneck	O'Neal	Thurston
Guyer	Lehlbach	Parsons	Tinkham
Gwynne	Lemke	Patterson	Treadway
Halleck	Lord	Pittenger	Wigglesworth
Hancock, N. Y.	Luckey	Plumley	Wolcott
Hartley	Ludlow	Polk	Wolverton
Higgins, Conn.	Lundeen	Ransley	Woodruff
Higgins, Mass.	McKeough	Reed, Ill.	Young
Hildebrandt	McLean	Rich	
Hoffman	Maas	Richardson	
Holmes	Mahon	Risk	

NOT VOTING—124

Amlie	Dobbins	Jacobsen	Peysers
Andrews	Dockweller	Kee	Powers
Ayers	Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Quinn
Bacharach	Drewry	Kleberg	Reece
Bacon	Duffey, Ohio	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	Kociakowski	Robison, Ky.
Bolton	Eagle	Lanham	Sadowski
Boykin	Eaton	Larrabee	Sanders, La.
Brennan	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Sandlin
Brewster	Ferguson	Lesinski	Sauthoff
Brooks	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Schneider, Wis.
Buck	Flesinger	McClellan	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	McFarlane	Scrugham
Bulwinkle	Gasque	McGrath	Sears
Burdick	Gassaway	McGroarty	Secrest
Burnham	Gavagan	McLeod	Sullivan
Caldwell	Gifford	Maloney	Summers, Tex.
Cannon, Wis.	Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.	Taylor, Colo.
Carmichael	Granfield	Maverick	Taylor, S. C.
Cavicchia	Green	Mitchell, Ill.	Tobey
Celler	Greenway	Monaghan	Tolan
Claiborne	Greenwood	Montague	Turpin
Collins	Haines	Montet	Wadsworth
Corning	Hamlin	Nelson	Weaver
Creal	Hess	Nichols	Wilcox
Cummings	Hill, Knute	Norton	Wilson, Pa.
Dear	Hobbs	O'Malley	Withrow
Deen	Hoeppel	Owen	Wolfenden
Dies	Hollister	Parks	Wood
Dirksen	Hook	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum
Ditter	Imhoff	Pettengill	Zioncheck

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BANKHEAD, and he voted "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Drewry and Mr. Montague (for) with Mr. Gilchrist (against).
Mr. Monaghan and Mr. Weaver (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).

Mr. Woodrum and Mr. Bulwinkle (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Maverick with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Green with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Bacon.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Reece.
Mr. McFarlane with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
Mr. McClellan with Mr. Andrews.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Burnham.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dockweller with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Turpin.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Amlie.
Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Schneider of Wisconsin.

Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Dobbins.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. McGroarty.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Sumners of Texas.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Claiborne.
 Mr. Secrest with Mr. Quinn.
 Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Gassaway.
 Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Scrugham.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Deen.
 Mr. Owen with Mr. Haines.
 Mr. Buck with Mr. Peterson of Florida.
 Mr. Hook with Mr. Creal.
 Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Lewis of Maryland.
 Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Carmichael.
 Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois.
 Mr. Peyser with Mr. Sadowski.
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. McGrath.
 Mr. Kocalkowski with Mr. Jacobsen.
 Mr. Knute Hill with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. Ayers with Mr. Fiesinger.
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Parks.
 Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. Eagle with Mr. Duffey of Ohio.
 Mr. Brennan with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.

Mr. HART, Mr. DICKSTEIN, and Mr. GRISWOLD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman qualify?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think I do.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening?

Mr. KNUTSON. I was present part of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS' DAY

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 115, designating the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mother's Day", and for other purposes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill? Does this mean another holiday?

Mr. PFEIFER. No; it simply designates a day to be set aside in which the Gold Star Mothers of America can be recognized. This bill has already passed the Senate and a similar bill was introduced in the House by the late Honorable Stephen A. Rudd and is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. PFEIFER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. It is merely a proclamation that calls for the use of the flag and other display methods in honor of the Gold Star Mothers.

Mr. PFEIFER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Has this bill been reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. PFEIFER. It is pending in the committee.

Mr. SNELL. It never has been reported out?

Mr. PFEIFER. Not yet.

Mr. BOYLAN. If the gentleman will yield, the bill does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Then, tell us just what it does. There are a lot of whereases in the resolution.

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

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that this is the outgrowth of a bill we passed providing for the trip by Gold Star Mothers to visit the graves of their sons buried in France, which bill was introduced by the late Representative O'Connell from New York. That has been followed up by this beautiful idea. No appropriation is involved. It merely authorizes the President to designate the last Sunday in September as a date to be observed in honor of the Gold Star Mothers.

Mr. SNELL. We do not need all these whereases in the resolution.

Mr. BOYLAN. They are there just to dress it up; the gentleman understands.

Mr. SNELL. I understand.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman was chairman of the great convention in Cleveland and has handled many whereases.

Mr. SNELL. I did not have them in resolutions, though.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
 Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. This bill was introduced by the late Congressman O'Connell.

Mr. BOYLAN. It was; it was his thought.

Mr. SNELL. I think the bill should be amended to strike out all these whereases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution designating the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mothers' Day", and for other purposes

Whereas the service rendered the United States by the American mother is the greatest source of the country's strength and inspiration; and

Whereas we honor ourselves and the mothers of America when we revere and give emphasis to the home as the fountainhead of the state; and

Whereas the American mother is doing so much for the home and for the moral and spiritual uplift of the people of the United States and hence so much for good government and humanity; and

Whereas the American Gold Star Mothers suffered the supreme sacrifice of motherhood in the loss of their sons and daughters in the World War: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the Government officials to display the United States flag on all Government buildings, and the people of the United States to display the flag and to hold appropriate meetings at their homes, churches, or other suitable places, on the last Sunday in September, as a public expression of the love, sorrow, and reverence of the people of the United States for the American Gold Star Mothers.

Sec. 2. That the last Sunday in September shall hereafter be designated and known as "Gold Star Mothers' Day", and it shall be the duty of the President to request its observance as provided for in this resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12410) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes."

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1123; U. S. C., title 40, ch. 2A, sec. 238) be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The National Archives shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"The Archivist of the United States may furnish authenticated or unauthenticated copies or reproductions of any of the archives or records in his custody that are not exempt from examination as confidential; of any film or sound record made by The National Archives; and of any film or sound record donated to The National Archives that is not protected by a subsisting copyright, and may charge therefor a fee sufficient to cover the cost or expenses thereof. There shall be no charge for the making or authentication of copies or reproductions furnished to any department or other agency of the Government for official use. When any copy or reproduction furnished under the terms hereof is authenticated by the official seal of The National Archives and certified by the Archivist of the United States, or in his name attested by the head of any office or the chief of any division of The National Archives designated by the Archivist with such authority, it shall be admitted in evidence equally with the original from which it was made."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, beginning in line 1, strike out all down to and including line 9, and insert:

"The Archivist of the United States may make or reproduce and furnish authenticated or unauthenticated copies of any of the documentary, photographic, or other archives or records in his custody that are not exempt from examination as confidential or protected by subsisting copyrights, and may charge therefor a fee sufficient to cover the cost or expense thereof. There shall be no charge for the making or."

Page 2, line 10, insert the word "such" after the words "authentication of."

Page 2, line 12, insert the word "such" after the words "when in."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes in connection with a report I have filed.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman mean he wishes to address the House at the present time?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to clean up the business first, although I am not going to object to the gentleman's request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, yesterday I filed a supplemental report of a select committee of the House, and by this evening copies should be ready for distribution to the Members. The report contains 120 pages. Your committee sought to hold the report down to as few pages as possible, but to even bring it down to its present size required the elimination of many important facts and much information which I had hoped to place before you at this time. The open hearings conducted by this committee consumed over 6,000 pages, and those hearings, which were not public, will total over 10,000 pages.

For nearly 2 years now our committee has worked to bring about the elimination of the abuses and the greatest evil now existing in the United States. These evils are even found to extend to the courts. They have cost investors from fifteen to twenty billion dollars and over 5,000,000 people are directly interested.

The committee has made strenuous efforts to secure favorable legislation to remedy this situation, but the bill was reported at too late a date, as I have pointed out, and it now appears impossible to have it enacted this session. The Judiciary Committee reported the bill unanimously.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman has been informed the Judiciary Committee reported the bill unanimously, he has been misinformed. I may say the bill was passed by the committee with a bare majority of 1.

Mr. SABATH. I was informed the bill was reported unanimously. No minority report has been filed on the bill. I have talked to nearly all of the Members and each of them indicated he had voted in favor of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will eliminate the abuses which exist under the fee system of our courts. The demand for relief is Nation-wide. I realize that the attorneys for the receivers and trustees of these committees and the beneficiaries that are bound to reap millions and millions of dollars, and who will eventually obtain possession, control, and ownership of the best structures and the best buildings in the United States, do not desire this legislation. Oh, yes; their lobbying has been intense and very bitter.

In desperation, in view of the fact that I saw no chance of the legislation being passed at this late hour, I introduced a resolution asking for an additional small appropriation. I admit that the committee has received \$115,000, but I say that every dollar has been expended in the interest of these unfortunate millions of people. Not a dollar has been wasted. I have worked for 2 long years with this committee. We have had many lawyers, many accountants, and many examiners aiding the committee, a large majority of whom served without compensation. Our work has been lauded by nearly every newspaper in the country. It has been approved of by magazines and the various legal papers, such as the legal bulletins and law journals of Yale, Harvard, Columbia,

and other colleges. Our work has been endorsed by real-estate boards and by various other organizations.

I repeat, the only ones who oppose our investigations and this legislation are the few sharpers and the few crooks who desire to reap great benefit and profit at the expense of unfortunate men and women, widows, and orphans. I say it is an outrage and shame that this legislation should not have been reported before, so that action could have been had.

I know that some members of the Accounts Committee, including its chairman, are opposed to an additional appropriation being granted, and some Members have said that we should not ask for one. I had hoped we would not be obliged to do so. Rather, I wished that the work could have been concluded; and if this bill had been passed, as we anticipated, we would not have made this request. I regret that the chairman of the Accounts Committee has not seen fit to grant our request for an additional appropriation.

Our request, remember, is made on behalf of millions of stricken people, on behalf of justice and righteousness. For every dollar this committee has expended there has been at least three to five dollars brought into the Treasury of the United States from income taxes that would not have otherwise been collected. [Applause.]

I am not going to take advantage of the fact that I now have the floor to move to suspend the rules, because I do not act that way. But I appeal to the House, and I appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and to the members of that committee, and ask that they appropriate a small additional sum so that we can go on with this work.

There is one thing I want to bring out at this time. Let it not be thought that if the additional appropriation we now request is not granted the committee will cease to function. The committee has the promise of many attorneys, accountants, and others, to continue the investigations without compensation. They feel, as the committee does, that it is a patriotic duty. Our work will continue, our investigations will go on, until such time as legislation along the lines of the committee's resolution, H. R. 12064, is enacted. [Applause.]

In addition to what I have said, may I present at this point a résumé, including excerpts from reports and articles showing the need for remedial legislation, which I believe will be enlightening.

The many abuses and evils which have been and are now prevalent in the administration of Federal receivership and bankruptcy proceedings are not all of recent origin. Nearly 30 years ago I introduced a resolution to investigate bankruptcy and receivership proceedings and the bankruptcy rings then existent. I recollect that shortly thereafter Judge Peter Grosscup, of Chicago, who appointed his clerk as receiver in most of the bankruptcy proceedings before him, allowed one John M. Harlan, a practicing attorney, a \$200,000 fee as adviser, to which I called attention and which brought about his resignation.

The Bankruptcy Act of 1898 was amended from time to time. Many amendments were introduced to eliminate vicious bankruptcy and receivership rings, but only a few have been enacted. A probable reason for the failure to enact this much-needed legislation in the past is doubtless due to the era of prosperity this country enjoyed, during which period bankruptcy and foreclosure proceedings were reduced to a minimum. However, when financial readjustment became necessary in 1920 and 1921, bankruptcy and receivership proceedings began increasing in volume, with attendant evils.

I called attention to these conditions to the then Attorney General, the Honorable William D. Mitchell, who caused an investigation to be made. Shortly thereafter, the State of New York ordered an investigation which was made by Col. William J. Donovan, and due to the general crash in 1929, and even before that time, hundreds upon hundreds of real estate and other bond issues began to default, and abuses increased so that the district judges of the southern district of New York ordered another investigation. The Irving Trust Co. was recommended as official receiver in all

bankruptcy and Federal receivership proceedings, giving to that company and its own attorneys monopoly over the thousands of equity receiverships and bankruptcy proceedings. To this monopoly, there was a general complaint by the New York bar. A resolution was introduced in this House by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. CELLER], to investigate these newly developed vicious practices and upon the recommendation of the Rules Committee of the House, the Judiciary Committee made it general. The passage of this resolution and the investigation thereunder brought about a change in the conditions in the southern district of New York.

About the same time very serious charges were made against conditions in Chicago, and the Subcommittee of the Judiciary, upon a complaint from the bar association, investigated conditions there. In the original report of that subcommittee it pointed out many outrageous practices, and I wish that each and every Member of this House had the opportunity to obtain and study their report, which brought about the enactment of article VIII of the Bankruptcy Act. This article includes sections 74 and 77B, with which we are presently concerned.

The enactment of sections 74 and 77B, unfortunately, did not stop, as was intended, the deplorable activities and abuses. New and additional evils arose as a result of the passage of section 77B, partly being due to the failure to limit the allowances of fees to receivers, trustees, committees, and other similar groups as otherwise provided in the Bankruptcy Act. Unheard of increases in foreclosure proceedings were commenced, many of which were collusive, unnecessary, and primarily for the purpose of giving the former houses of issue and their self-appointed committees control and possession of these properties, to the misfortune and loss of bondholders and security holders.

Investigations were ordered by the various States that attempted to enact legislation to prevent and eliminate and correct these evils, but it is conceded that the States are unable to cope with this Nation-wide situation.

Upon a petition signed by over 500,000 bondholders requesting relief, this House appointed a select committee to investigate these deplorable conditions for the purpose of recommending legislation that would put a stop to this wholesale fraud and collusion against the millions of investors, who did not look for enrichment in investing their money but sought and wanted a safe investment for the protection of themselves and their families. Now, who are these people? They are the most deserving and frugal citizens of America, who, upon the recommendations of their bankers, probate courts, and so forth, invested their all in these securities.

Yes; they included the benevolent, fraternal, and labor organizations, many of whom invested not only their capital but their reserves as well in these bonds. There are over 5,000,000 individuals, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of members of these organizations which I have mentioned, who have appealed to Congress for relief as they became helpless against the racket of the so-called protective committee, committees organized by unscrupulous houses of issue with the aid of many of the outstanding trust, guaranty mortgage, and investment companies, who appointed their own clerks or members to serve on these committees, none of whom had a penny for their own invested, and adding a few outstanding names for "window dressing" purposes so as to inveigle the early deposit of bonds with them. Instead of these committees being protective committees, in the majority of cases they might properly be designated as "racketeering" committees, as no sooner had they obtained these bonds from the unfortunate and uninformed investors, in most cases their bonds were used as collateral security for loans from their own bankers for the purpose of defraying their own expenses, such as the costly propaganda for the solicitation of bonds, lawyers' fees, appraisal fees, trustees' fees, and many other fees. In fact, in some instances nine different fees were being charged to bondholders. In many instances these committees failed and refused to make any report to bondholders for 2, 3, and 4 years. The reports

they finally did make were of such a nature as to deliberately discourage the unfortunate bondholders and to destroy their last vestige of hope and confidence in their investments.

Through various manipulations and agencies and devices, many of these protective committees, directly or indirectly, obtained and acquired the bonds at the outrageously low prices of 3, 4, and 5 cents on the dollar. In many instances, where the committees made loans against the bonds in lieu of distributing any dividend or making any payment whatsoever to the bondholders, they frequently would receive a notification or certification that the bonds were worthless and had been cremated, there being an amount realized sufficient only to pay their own self-imposed and arbitrarily high fees and expenses. Please remember that many of these bonds were against some of the finest and best properties in the United States, many of which were almost fully occupied, and there could and should have been some reasonable interest paid to the stockholders, but instead of using the revenue to aid these unfortunate bondholders the money was used for committee and lawyers' fees and charges. Taxes remained unpaid, and yet not a single cent was paid to the bondholders. Even in cases where loans were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the money, in the majority of cases, was used for similar purposes.

Our committee within a few months was able to penetrate at least some of these many collusions and ramifications. We found most of these committees, as stated before, were designated and controlled by the bankers, mortgage companies, trust companies, guaranty companies, houses of issue, and their law firms. This committee found that the bondholders were utterly helpless; they were unable to obtain the list of other bondholders, and they themselves were not in a position to combat these shrewd and conniving committees and their influential attorneys.

Even the courts were helpless, as under section 77B the judges themselves were not in a position to investigate or penetrate or analyze these reports filed by the thieving committees and their attorneys and they were dependent upon, and had to rely upon, the fraudulent, conniving and collusive reports, so that many sales of properties were approved by courts where less than one-fifth of their actual value was realized. Yes; in some instances, one-twentieth of their true value or from 4 to 5 cents on the dollar, based on appraisals made by the very houses of issue, as indicated in their prospectus when offering these bonds for sale.

To bring to light and arouse public opinion, our committee held hearings in Chicago, New York, Detroit, Milwaukee, St. Louis, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Miami, Boston, Washington, and, a few weeks ago, in Philadelphia. In some of these cities a great deal of publicity was given to the evidence and the frauds that have been practiced on the public.

It is unfortunate that the bar associations and the outstanding members of the bar have not seen fit to aid or cooperate with the committee. However, the committee has obtained the cooperation of many splendid, able, and unselfish lawyers and accountants to aid it in its tremendous task to bring to light the existing unbelievable conditions.

I actually believe that if all the evidence were brought home to the American people, the confidence in our courts, reputed bankers and banking and investment institutions, and leaders of the bar would be shattered.

The bill which our committee has agreed upon creates a conservator, with deputy conservators in each judicial district. It will eliminate excessive fees. It will protect the security holders without cost to the Government, and will not permit of unconscionable sales and/or plans of reorganizations to be perpetrated. In my last speech I called attention to a few companies and committees, such as the Chicago Title & Trust Co., the Roosevelt Committee, the Straus Committee, the Pounds Committee, the Fisk Tire Co., and so forth. Many others will be cited in our final report.

Our committee endeavored to obtain action before the Banking and Currency Committee in the last Congress and the first session of this Congress, but in order to eliminate any constitutional question we have redrafted the bill as an

amendment to the National Bankruptcy Act so that the bill could be referred to the Judiciary Committee, which is familiar with the abuses, in the hope that the Judiciary Committee would give early and favorable consideration to our bill. Unfortunately, although we urgently appealed in the matter, the bill was not acted upon until Wednesday, June 3.

ABUSES IN REORGANIZATION AND RECEIVERSHIP PROCEEDINGS AND NECESSITY FOR REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

To show some of these abuses arising from receivership proceedings and the necessity for remedial legislation, we quote from a report by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives investigating receiverships and bankruptcies, appointed pursuant to House resolution of June 12, 1933, which held hearings at Chicago during week ended March 23, 1934:

Not knowing how far-reaching or widespread conditions similar to that exposed in Chicago may prevail in the United States, we hesitate at this time to recommend legislation to take care of all of the evils apparent in the northern district of Illinois, but we do feel that we should recommend at least the following for the consideration of the committee:

If the receiver and trustee of a bankruptcy estate are one and the same person, the amount of fees at present allowed by the Bankruptcy Act for both services should be reduced in some manner, because at the present time it results in the payment of duplicate fees for practically the same services, or they may even result in a dissipation of the assets of the estate. It is recommended that the question of the appointment of permanent receivers, to be paid a definite salary with the authority in the court to appoint special receivers in cases where special ability or experience is necessary, the basis of compensation for the same could be determined by the court at the time of the appointment, be seriously considered. If legislation can be enacted to this end, it would result in the saving throughout the country of many millions of dollars every year to the creditors of bankrupt estates, in the saving of costs and expenses in the administration of such estates.

The line of demarcation in these cases between what constitutes collusion and what is merely perfectly proper friendly relationship in order to conserve the debtor's interest is very fine and hard to determine, but the practice is so open to evils that in cases of this character the court should scrutinize very closely the arrangement and be assured that there is absolutely no element indicating collusion in any form at all. Of course, this evil would be remedied were there permanent receivers and were the court to guard carefully the selection of any special assistant receiver. Then, too, it appears to us that in some of these cases this conservation receivership procedure was followed in order to avoid receiverships in the State court.

In all of these cases it is the solemn duty of the court to see that the interests of the creditors are thoroughly safeguarded. That duty should extend to a careful scrutiny of the original arrangement by which the matter is brought within the jurisdiction of the court and a real determination of the fact of the necessity of seeking the jurisdiction of the court. It should extend to the selection of a receiver or a trustee or attorney not based upon any custom in the district and not based upon a friendship or any other influence of a like character. It should be based entirely upon the character and the ability of the person so selected in order that the estate may be most efficiently administered for the benefit of the creditors. That duty should then extend beyond that—it should be the duty of the court to carefully scrutinize the manner of the administration of the estate and not merely to perfunctorily sign orders upon application of the receiver. And, lastly, it certainly is the duty of the court to determine what is proper compensation in matters of this kind, having in view not his friendship for the receiver or the attorney but rather his duty to see that the creditors realize as much as possible from the assets of the estate.

Our investigation discloses a condition in Chicago that amounts to almost criminal negligence in the failure on the part of the courts to properly conserve the property in litigation and in some instances an apparent willing assent to the plundering and sacking of the estate committed to the care and custody of the court, because in many of these cases apparently the whole arrangement was simply to use up the assets in the payment of receiver and attorney fees, with an absolutely utter disregard for the rights of the creditors. Receivers are the trustees of a sacred trust and are called the arm of the court and the attorneys acting for the receivers occupy a position of equal trust. The services of the receiver and of the receiver's attorney should be used to conserve the estate and should not be used to enrich themselves beyond proper compensation.

Your committee feels that any judge that permits such a practice violates the trust which has been imposed on him by the Government and the people and that it is because of this fact that so many of our courts have been brought into disrepute.

During the last 5 years more than \$4,000,000,000 have been lost to creditors throughout the United States in bankruptcy and receivership matters. If, by reason of legislation which the Congress might enact, correcting the present-day evils in our bankruptcy and Federal receivership practice, this loss to creditors

could be materially reduced, it will be seen what a wonderful work the Congress will have done; and this can be done. Equity receiverships and bankruptcy matters have degenerated into nothing more or less than a pure, simple racket which should be stopped by congressional legislation and congressional action.

OPINIONS OF JUDGES REGARDING FEES

A brief review of a few of the opinions as recently expressed by Federal courts on this subject may prove of interest.

United States District Judge Caffey, southern district of New York, in the matter of the New Rochelle Coal & Lumber Co., debtor (28 Am. B. Reports, 209), held:

It is the duty of the court to keep expenses to the debtor or to a debtor's estate carefully within rather narrow limits.

United States District Judge Nields, district of Delaware, in the matter of National Department Stores, Inc., debtor (11 F. Supp. 633), in an opinion filed July 1, 1935, said:

The court is not without instruction in making allowances. Last April the Supreme Court declared:

"Extravagant costs of administration in the winding up of estates in bankruptcy have been denounced as crying evils."

Recently our own circuit court of appeals adopted language of the Supreme Court:

"We were desirous of making it clear by your action that the judges of the courts, in fixing allowances for services to court officers, should be most careful, and that vicarious generosity in such a matter could receive no countenance."

The circuit court of appeals followed with the words:

"This warning of the Supreme Court against 'vicarious generosity' has also been sounded by other Federal courts."

Formerly the idea prevailed that attorneys were entitled to greater compensation when employed in a receivership or bankruptcy case than when serving private interest. In reality, receivers and attorneys are officers of the court. As public servants, their compensation should never be as large as the compensation of those engaged in private employment. By such considerations debtors may be relieved and creditors and stockholders served.

Where numerous persons participate in rendering one service susceptible of being rendered by one person needless duplication results, which should not form the basis of compensation.

United States District Judge Hamilton, in re Kentucky Power Corporation (11 Fed. Supp. 528), in an opinion rendered August 12, 1935, in part, said:

Exorbitant fees cause the people to set up bureaus in the executive branch of the Government to pass on their rights and to formally approve and supervise corporate reorganizations and the issue of securities. Much is said by members of the legal profession about bureaucracy and the intrusion of the executive branch of the Government into the judicial fields. If the courts were more prompt in disposing of matters brought before them, and attorneys were less eager to receive exorbitant fees, the cry against bureaucracy would not be so blatant and the legislatures would not be so often importuned by members of the bar to pass acts defining the practice of law and prohibiting the laymen from invading the legal field.

The exorbitant fees allowed by courts to lawyers and excessive allowances to receivers in the Federal courts have so aroused litigants as to cause the Congress to appoint a committee to investigate the courts of the land. Section 77B provides a simple and convenient method for the reorganization of financially distressed corporations. The salutary benefit of this act will be destroyed, and it will become a disused statute, unless the judges of the Federal courts carefully scrutinize the claims of attorneys and committees for allowances for services and allow only reasonable fees based on services rendered.

In the matter of the Paramount-Publix Corporation, Judge Coxe, United States district judge for the Southern District of New York, in an opinion rendered October 23, 1935, said, in part:

There is no warrant under the statute for the granting of allowances for unnecessary services or expenses.

An editorial in the New York American of December 26, 1935, states the point well:

It permits lawyers retained by nobody, bankers, who are themselves responsible for overcapitalization ending in collapse, and all kinds of self-appointed and nondescript committees to "muscle in" on distressed properties and, as "preferred creditors", literally to run away with money belonging to somebody else.

PLANS OF REORGANIZATION

Conniving and scheming in reorganizations may best be illustrated in the language used by Judge Holley, in the matter of Rosenbaum Grain Co., debtor (28 Am. R. Repts., N. S. 451), wherein the debtor filed a petition requesting the court to appoint, first, a committee to represent the

creditors and, second, a committee to represent the stockholders in a reorganization proceeding:

In a great majority of the cases presented to the court the creditors of the corporation are widely scattered, bonds having been sold to the public generally, and very frequently large numbers of persons of small means hold bonds in quite small amounts. These creditors have great difficulty in protecting their interests, and the holder of a thousand-dollar bond cannot afford to employ counsel to represent him in the proceedings. As a result, bondholder and creditor committees have been organized which have solicited the deposit of bonds or other evidence of indebtedness with power of attorney to represent the holder in all proceedings. In a great majority of cases, probably, these bondholders' committees are composed of men of integrity and ability, who, in the performance of their duty, have but one object in view, the protection of those whose interests they represent. In a great many cases, however, the bondholders' committee is set up by the debtor itself, or by individuals who promoted the organization of the debtor and the sale of its securities. Many of these committees have been extravagant and wasteful. They request the court sometimes to appoint a trustee nominated by the committee and at other times to continue the debtor in possession. If the debtor remains in possession, it is frequently unwise in its management of the property, expends money, and incurs liability far beyond the necessities of the business. The trustees recommended by the committee often charge excessive fees in connivance with the members of the committee and contract bills far out of proportion to the services rendered. In some cases the property has been deliberately mismanaged for the purpose of enabling the debtor to secure a better settlement with its creditors.

As a result of such practices great public scandal has arisen, and there has been much newspaper publicity and many legislative investigations. The public has come to distrust all committees, lumping the good with the bad, though there is no doubt that a very large proportion of the committees are honestly and faithfully performing the duties imposed upon them.

The court is generally in the dark as to the method of the organization of the committees and of the manner in which the committee conducts the affairs of the debtor. Likewise it can know little of the real merit of the plan of reorganization presented. A plan which appears perfectly fair on its face may, as a matter of fact, be outrageously unjust. The court has to rely on the statements of the interested parties, on the reports made to it by creditor or stockholder committees, and the statements of creditors in open court when the plan is presented. The individual creditors, those holding small amounts of the securities of the debtor, cannot afford to be represented in court. If the creditors' committee has done its word honestly and capably, the court can rely upon the reports presented by the committee. If, however, the work of the committee has been of a different character, the court may be very easily misled and confirm a plan which should have been rejected.

It is exceedingly important, therefore, that the court have its own representative on the stockholders' and creditors' committees. Further, it is necessary that the court have control of the committee and have the right to remove any member who, either through negligence or dishonesty, fails to perform the duties of his office. In this case the court has such a representative on each committee, and by the terms of the draft order presented the creditors' committee as a whole is under the jurisdiction of the court.

To illustrate the interest of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the work of your committee we quote excerpts from letters of the Honorable Guy T. Helvering, Commissioner of Internal Revenue Bureau:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C.

HON. A. J. SABATH,
Chairman, Select Committee to Investigate
Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: * * * There has been referred to me a letter from the Chicago office of your committee stating that during your investigation of defaulted real-estate bonds there has been uncovered what are believed to be several evasions of income tax, particularly insofar as members of bondholders' protective committees are concerned.

The letter states that there has also been uncovered what is believed to be an act of fraudulent representation which resulted in a refund of approximately \$85,000 to the Chicago Title & Trust Co. as receiver for H. O. Stone & Co.

I wish to assure you that this Bureau will give your committee its utmost cooperation and will be highly appreciative if your committee will refer additional information which it feels should be investigated by this Bureau.

The Attorney General has been requested to file an action for the recovery for the refund previously made (\$85,000).

The continued cooperation of your committee and its representatives is greatly appreciated.

A subsequent letter stated:

I wish to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation of the spirit of cooperation displayed by the committee and members of its staff in making available to the Bureau informa-

tion pending to the question of income-tax liability not only in the case of this particular individual matter but also in numerous instances.

COOPERATION OF JUDGES OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

To illustrate, we quote from a letter received recently from the Honorable Ernest A. O'Brien, of the Federal court at Detroit, Mich.:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN,
Detroit.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I desire to acknowledge my debt of gratitude for the services that your representatives of the House Special Investigating Committee in this city has rendered to me.

I trust that I will be able to have the facilities of your committee in other matters now pending, as I am convinced they will be of great help to the court.

I wish to compliment you on the work already accomplished and with your continued success in your endeavors.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST A. O'BRIEN,
United States District Judge.

In the case of the Pierrepont Hotel matter, Federal Judge Moskowitz, of Brooklyn, sent the following:

I'd like a brief report on this particular reorganization case from the Sabath committee.

The court wants to extend its thanks for the fine cooperation and the splendid results obtained. The Sabath committee has done a fine job.

Federal Judge Mack, of New York, in commenting about activities of this select committee in connection with the Fox Metropolitan case, stated:

The fine work being done by the Sabath committee unfortunately may never be known to the bondholders.

Some of the other letters are:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY,
Newark, N. J., September 3, 1935.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of the 16th ultimo relating to the activities of your committee and enclosing a copy of Judge O'Brien's letter was received.

I am glad to know that your objects are in full conformity with my own views. You may rest assured that you and your associates will have my full and unstinted cooperation in the work which is being undertaken in this district.

Thanking you for writing me and trusting you will feel free to call upon me for any service you may desire, I remain

Very truly yours,

GUY L. FARE.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI,
St. Louis, September 4, 1935.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
1136 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of recent date, tendering the service of your committee, was received. We will be glad to have the assistance of your committee in the difficult and trying matter of these corporate reorganizations.

Thanking you for your kindness in writing me, I am,
Yours sincerely,

CHARLES B. DAVIS,
United States District Judge.

A number of judges of the United States district courts are now including in their orders that notices of hearings as well as copies of pleadings be provided this select committee. A copy of such order reads as follows:

Ordered, that a notice of such hearing shall be given to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and to the Sabath committee, by the debtor, by causing a copy of this order to be mailed to them on or before the _____ day of _____.

COMMITTEE, IN CAPACITY OF MEDIATOR, SAVES MILLIONS TO BOND-HOLDERS

OCTOBER 4, 1935.

HON. A. J. SABATH,
Chairman, Select Committee to Investigate
Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations:

Congratulations and thanks for the splendid service rendered by your committee in the matter of the National Press Building Corporation reorganization. Due in great part to you and your committee's forceful and fair persuasion, agreement was reached by all parties in interest several days ago, and the plan of reorganization was approved yesterday of Judge Luhring. Again may

we thank you, and will you please extend these thanks to Messrs. Blaustein, Comer, and Thomas for the intelligent handling of this difficult matter?

BASCOM N. TIMMONS,
Chairman, Building Reorganization Committee,
National Press Club.

LEGISLATION

In a report on the administration of bankruptcy estates submitted by counsel, Col. William J. Donovan, in the matter of an inquiry into the administration of bankrupt estates, conducted before Hon. Thomas D. Thacher, judge of the United States District Court of the Southern District of New York, under order of said court and under date of March 6, 1929, he, in part, states:

The investigation, although prior to the enactment of section 77B, developed the many abuses existing in reorganizations, and in this report radical changes were recommended for the administration of bankruptcy estates. There were even at that time thrust upon the courts administrative duties which they were not equipped to meet, nor competent to perform and which they should not be expected to discharge. They sought to eliminate this condition, and as a result of their report and recommendations, radical changes were made in the State of New York.

As a result of the recommendations made by Colonel Donovan to the district judges of the southern district of New York, the Irving Trust Co. was selected as an official receiver and trustee in bankruptcy and Federal receivership proceedings. But shortly thereafter nearly the entire bar of the State of New York protested this monopoly of the Irving Trust Co. Hon. EMANUEL CELLER then introduced a resolution to investigate these conditions in New York; but upon the request of the Rules Committee of the House, the Judiciary Committee of the House broadened its investigation to include all districts throughout the country. This investigation was made, and resulted in many changes being brought about.

Colonel Donovan in this report further stated:

These responsibilities should be centralized in the executive branch of the Government. The creditors will not exercise these responsibilities; their admitted exercise by the courts has been ineffective, burdensome, and generally inefficient; has produced a multitude of rules and legalistic formalities; and has resulted in the criticism of the bench itself. Trustees should be supervised and licensed or subject to approval by the executive branch of the Federal Government. The Bankruptcy Act contemplated an orderly and economical liquidation of the estate of a bankrupt and not the performance of administrative duties by highly paid attorneys.

In the President's message to the Senate and House of Representatives on February 29, 1932, he stated:

The Federal Government is charged under the Constitution with the responsibility of providing the country with an adequate system of administration of bankruptcy estates. The importance of such a system to the possible life of the community is apparent.

A sound bankruptcy system should operate, first, to relieve honest but unfortunate debtors of an overwhelming burden of debt; second, to effect a prompt and economical liquidation and distribution of insolvent estates; and, third, to discourage fraud and needless waste of assets by withholding relief from debtors in proper cases.

For some time the prevailing opinion has been that our present Bankruptcy Act has failed in its purpose and needs thorough revision.

The present Bankruptcy Act is defective in that it holds out every inducement for waste of assets long after business failure has become inevitable. It permits exploitation of its own process and wasteful administration by those who are neither truly representative of the creditors nor the bankrupt.

May I not say that important as these recommendations are we must all keep before us the thought that effective administration of the law in a republic requires not only adequate and proper machinery, honest and capable officials, but above all a citizenry imbued with a spirit and respect of law.

H. R. 12064—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS, CONSERVATOR IN BANKRUPTCY ACT INTRODUCED BY HON. A. J. SABATH

A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, to aid the courts in the administration thereof, protect bondholders in reorganizations, compositions, and extensions, and prevent excessive charges and loss of assets

(a) (1) The Comptroller of the Currency is designated as the conservator in bankruptcy.

(2) The conservator is authorized to act as trustee, custodian, or receiver. The conservator is empowered to conduct investigations in such matters as he may deem neces-

sary or as the court may request in proceedings under 74 or 77B.

The conservator is given sufficient powers to enable him to have full knowledge and a check on the entire proceedings and administration of estates in 74 and 77B so as to make available to the district courts complete facts and to relieve district courts of unnecessary administrative burdens.

(3) The conservator is authorized to prescribe and publish rules and regulations.

(4) The conservator is empowered to administer oaths, take evidence, and require attendance of witnesses and production of books by subpoena. The court may upon application of conservator, issue an order to produce books, papers, documents, and give evidence, and any failure to obey such order may be punished by the court as a contempt.

(b) In any proceeding under section 74 or 77B commenced after the effective date of this act, in the event the judge does not determine to continue the debtor in possession, the judge shall appoint as trustee, custodian, or receiver—

(1) The conservator; or

(2) An authorized trustee from a panel of trustees qualified for such service to be selected and designated in advance by the conservator; or

(3) In any particular case, if it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the court that the conservator or the panel cannot properly or adequately function because of unusual circumstances peculiar to the case, then some person not authorized may be appointed. This also applies to any vacancy in pending proceedings.

(c) Pursuant to appropriate orders or rules of procedure which shall be prescribed by the court the conservator shall be given due notice of all proceedings. The conservator shall have the right to be heard upon all questions with respect to which the debtor, any creditor, any stockholder, or any intervening party in such proceeding may be heard.

(d) No composition, extension proposal, or reorganization plan under section 74 or 77B shall be confirmed unless the conservator has either approved plan or, if disapproved, has been given an opportunity to be heard on his objections. The conservator shall approve plan or proposal if he finds it to be fair and equitable after thorough study.

(e) The conservator shall have the right to propose a plan or amendments to a plan of reorganization.

(f), (g), and (h) The conservator may approve or disapprove the provisions and limitations of—

(1) Deposit agreement.

(2) Protective committees and their personnel.

(3) Solicitation of proxies, assents, deposits, consents.

Provision for fine of \$5,000 and imprisonment of 2 years may be imposed for willful violation of any solicitation of proxies, consents, authorizations, dissents in respect of any composition, proposal, or reorganization plan without—

(1) Prior submission of plan to conservator.

(2) Full disclosure of material facts.

(3) Approval of personnel and deposit agreement by conservator.

No court of bankruptcy shall have jurisdiction to permit protective committee to intervene or to make allowances for remuneration to protective committee unless the petition is accompanied by certificate of conservator approving its personnel and committee agreement under which such committee is acting. Section (g) also provides conditions under which conservator may disapprove of either committee personnel or agreement. Such disapproval is made subject to review or appeal to circuit court.

(i) (1) No allowance for fees, expenses, or other remuneration to be paid to anyone in reorganization proceedings unless petition is first submitted to conservator and is accompanied by conservator's report either approving or disapproving and conservator is given an opportunity to be heard with respect to objections.

(j) No petition to institute a proceeding under section 74 or 77B may be approved if debtor is under receivership in any other court unless opportunity is given for conservator to be heard on question of good faith.

(k) The conservator shall be entitled to costs of administration of services to be paid out of debtor's estate under plan of reorganization of the estate in accordance with rules and regulations of conservator.

(l) The conservator may examine any proceedings where reorganization plan has been confirmed since January 1, 1935, and report his findings and recommendations to court.

(m) Provides for appeals by any committee or member thereof aggrieved by an order of the conservator disapproving the provisions, limitations, or membership of such committee.

The conservator shall certify and file in court a transcript of the record on which the order complained of was entered. Upon filing of such transcript, court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside such order in whole or in part. Also provides that any findings of fact or other orders of the conservator may be reviewed in the same manner as provided in the case of a report of a referee or special master.

(n) Bill applies generally to proceedings which involve liabilities of over \$50,000 evidenced by at least 10 credit instruments owned by at least 10 persons.

SEC. 2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to finance such reorganizations, compositions, or extensions if approved by the Conservator.

SEC. 3. Amend Bankruptcy Act to include in the definition of "equity receivership" any proceeding to foreclose a lien on property.

The Subcommittee of the Judiciary, in its report herein referred to, said:

We are of the opinion that legislation be enacted to prevent collusive receiverships (and similarly other collusive suits and acts) * * *. If by reason of legislation which the Congress might enact correcting the present-day evils in our bankruptcy and Federal receivership proceedings, this loss to creditors could be materially reduced, and it will be seen what a wonderful work that Congress would have done, and this can be done. Equity receiverships in bankruptcy matters have degenerated into nothing more or less than a pure and simple racket which should be stopped by congressional legislation and congressional action.

In a report of the counsel to the chairman of the special committee to investigate receivership proceedings and administration of justice in the United States courts, he (Mr. Percival Jackson) again reiterates the various abuses prevalent in reorganizations, and he likewise recognizes the necessity for governmental supervision. In further substantiation of our contentions, we quote from this report as follows:

Whether it be in an equity receivership proceeding, or be entitled in proceedings under section 77B, if from the outset the debtor and the committee are colluding in the interests of the debtor, if there has been no attempt at an honest and complete investigation, if in the preparation of a plan, there has been no honest representation of security holders, the task of the honest judge in seeking to protect the security holders becomes an impossible one. There is no inherent virtue in section 77B that avoids these abuses. Nothing is furnished to the judge by section 77B to supply him with means, facility, training, or experience for independent investigation, understanding, and correct determination of the numerous, intricate, and technical details of stock and bond issuance and exchange, or the many accounting and appraisal details necessary for correct determination of the technical and administrative matters visited upon him by plans of reorganization.

Following an investigation under section 21A of acts preceding the reorganization, the veil of collusion and fraud which has marked the adoption of plans in equity receivership proceedings can readily be pierced by an independent and intelligent investigation of a plan of reorganization offered in a 77B proceeding, provided such investigation is made by a competent and honest agency that has the confidence of the court and adequate means for making a comprehensive and searching scrutiny of the plan and the factors behind it.

Such an investigation should be factual, not legal or judicial. It must be thorough, and for that purpose requires the judicial power of subpoena and examination of witnesses. The investigating function is administrative rather than judicial. It should be preparatory to and supplemented by the judicial hearing provided for in section 77B. Properly and fully made it will largely render unnecessary considerations of intervention and questions of adequacy or honesty of representation of security holders. Adequately reported to the court and aided by the later exercise of the judicial function it will enable the judge, trained to consider factual and legal problems placed before him and to determine controversies arising therefrom, to determine the fairness of the plan, to consider and protect the interests of the minority, independently of any interested or influenced opinion of the majority, in a substantial and effective and not in a perfunctory or formal way. This

method will furnish an agency to which the judge may, in the first instance, transmit the subjects which occur to him for investigation in connection with the plan, to which interested parties may convey their suggestions and objections and should meet with the approval of the numerous judges and lawyers who feel that the referees should play a part in the administration of section 77B.

The suggestions herein contained, however, will be futile unless the agency selected exercises its own skill and initiative in making such investigation and particularly will be rendered useless in given cases unless the scrutiny is made by investigators skilled in the intricacies of stock and security issuance and exchange and of security markets.

If, in addition, we establish a permanent agency, such as hereinbefore suggested, to supplement the efforts of the judges and to punish violations of the act, we may reasonably expect surcease from the existing abuses.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORTS, LAW REVIEWS, MAGAZINES, EDITORIALS, AND NEWSPAPER ITEMS

In an article appearing in the Columbia Law Review, volume 34, no. 7, November 1934, Mr. Joseph L. Weiner said:

Specifically, no consideration was given to the broader question, whether the reorganization machinery should be left where it was, subject only to a certain amount of judicial scrutiny. The increasing volume of business in the Federal courts makes it extremely difficult to believe that the Federal judges will be able to carry out with thoroughness the duties imposed upon them by the act. Nor was sufficient consideration given to the possibility, suggested long ago by Chief Justice Taft, of eliminating the present provisions for the appointment of receivers or trustees and substituting a paid official at either a salary or statutory rate of compensation.

In an article in the Harvard Law Review, volume 47, no. 4, January 1934, by William O. Douglas, professor of Yale School of Law, he said with respect to protective committees:

Speaking generally, there has long been a need for reform and regulation of the practices of protective committees. This need has not been peculiar to railroads—in fact, it has probably been less acute there than in other types of reorganizations. The need for increased regulation has not been due primarily to the incompetent or to the fraudulent proclivities of committee members. Rather, the need has arisen because the committee has been constituted by the inside groups, those affiliated with or drawn from the old management or financial interests associated with it. Often the interests of these members have been clearly those of speculative equity groups, not motivated solely or dominated by the urge to protect the interest of the securities which they represent.

Through the use of security holder lists, peculiarly or solely available to them, they have in effect employed the committee as a device to perpetuate their own control, to protect themselves from attack by the security holders, and to enhance their own opportunities for further profit. Under these circumstances, the small security holder stood little chance to gain the real protection which any local system should afford him. * * * It is clear that his real protection was to be found in a fraudulent organization composed of others like himself * * *. But the usual result was that these widely diffused and disorganized minority never mobilized * * *. Or, if an organization did result, it was too often effectuated by incompetent and piratical group of the legal profession who as often as not did the security holders even more disservice than would the old management or financial group. Though the demand was insistent, there has never emerged in this country any permanent agency rendering a continuous service to these widely scattered minorities. We have had to date no private organization comparable to the Shareholders' Protection Association in England, permanently organized for respectable and competent patrol duty.

[From an article in the Harvard Business Review, vol. II, 1932-33]

By Philip G. Phillips

Committee work is costly, obscure, blocked by selfishness and unfairness, and in most instances there is a lack of relationship between result and intelligent planning. The individual bondholder is dissatisfied with the result and feels that there is a satisfactory and assured method neither for the open investigation of all the facts nor for a hearing of individual protests.

To add to his difficulties the individual investor now has to deal with not only one committee, but in many instances there are three or four in the field acting as rivals and accusing each other of selfish motives. It is not the fault of the committees; it is the fault of an antiquated makeshift method of reorganization.

THE PROPOSED SOLUTION

It is proposed that the present machinery for the rehabilitation of corporate securities be so amended that no reorganization plan be finally adopted, and no fees paid to committee or counsel, unless the plan has been approved by a board of impartial "arbitrators" before whom all the relevant facts shall be disclosed and before whom the individual bondholders and all other interested parties shall have the right to appear in order to protect their interests. Such a scheme was tried out in the reorganization of the securities of G. L. Miller & Co., and Judge Julian Mack sat as arbitrator with marked success.

The plan would not be difficult to carry out. Every deposit agreement need but contain a clause providing that before a plan of

reorganization or fees of committee or counsel could become final they would have to be approved by a board of arbitrators. Bondholders would be given notice of the hearing date and of the plan and fees proposed. The arbitrators would have full power to modify or amend the plan, and the hearing would be so conducted that all the facts would be presented. Incidentally, a further check might be given the bondholder by providing that disputes between bondholder and committee, concerning such matters as the right to withdraw, etc., be also submitted to a board of arbitrators, while the "horse trading" elements could be brought more into the open by the committee submitting to arbitration any disputes with creditors, etc., whenever possible.

But we should not stop there. It is further proposed not only that the arbitration check should be used after plans of reorganization are proposed but also that a similar check be provided by business as soon as a default occurs, thereby eliminating the need for committees in many instances.

There are many instances today in which reorganizations are put through and new loans procured at the prohibitive rates prevailing merely because the bondholders cry for action. If the committees could but obtain the consent of an impartial board to delay—could only communicate to all the interested parties that an impartial board had found, for example, that reorganization on the particular property at the present time was the height of folly—the bondholders should be satisfied. And if only there had been a board in the first place on such properties, there would have been no committees in many instances.

BENEFITS OF THE PLAN AND OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

It is not submitted that this plan will furnish a final panacea to our reorganization difficulties. Undoubtedly there is a tremendous need for changes in the terms of securities and for legislation which will prevent delays and waste incident to modern reorganization. The problem, however, is one of the present; we must deal with the securities at present outstanding and we cannot tarry until remedial legislation finds its slow way into our statutes.

The process proposed will at the very outset restore the confidence of the public in reorganization plans, eliminate the controversies arising through suspicion of ulterior purposes and unfair enrichment, assure endorsement for any fair and equitable plan of readjustment or reorganization, eliminate huge and unnecessary fees, and thereby convince the bondholders that they are receiving the full measure of their just rights. There should be no difficulty in having the bondholders accept the process.

It would undoubtedly test the sincerity and disinterestedness of committees and houses of issue, but honest committees and houses of issue have been trying to find help from the dilemma and should welcome the change. The dishonest ones might object that it was but an unnecessary adjunct to the committee process, but that objection can easily be met. Committees may still confine their activities to "horse trading", but they are furnished with a judicial adjunct entirely distinct and apart from anything now in existence. The obscure elements entering into a reorganization are brought into view and a method for finding a relationship between result and intelligent planning is obtained.

[From American Bar Association Journal, February 1935]

(By John Hanna, member of the District of Columbia Bar and New York Bar)

It is a question whether the Bankruptcy Act as a whole does not remain seriously defective because nothing has been done to set up new administrative machinery in the various districts and to provide for its supervision. The failure of those concerned to agree upon methods for the choice of trustees, its authority, and compensation of referees, and Federal inspection and regulation has thus far prevented new legislation upon these topics. The present situation in these respects cannot be regarded as satisfactory.

In a letter from the county of New York district attorney's office, dated New York, May 26, 1936, to your committee, Re People against Commonwealth Bond Corporation, Clark G. Kuney and Edward A. Sauter, who were convicted for grand larceny, in the first degree, there was stated as follows:

It is hoped that your committee will include the above-mentioned activity in its report to the Congress, for had it not been for your investigation and our prosecution, these defendants might still be unpunished. When such report is made please be good enough to send a copy to the writer.

Quoting from the Philadelphia Record of Monday, May 25, 1936:

NEW MORTGAGE QUIZ BY BAR ASSOCIATION IS URGED BY STONEY—COMPLETE PUBLIC PROBE OF LAWYERS' ACTIVITIES IS DEMANDED

A demand that the Philadelphia Bar Association launch a complete public inquiry into the affairs of the Philadelphia Co. for Guaranteeing Mortgages was made here yesterday by Michael J. Stoney.

The Sabath committee held hearings here 3 days last week. At the hearings officials of the Philadelphia Co. were accused of plundering the savings of 100,000 investors, who put \$132,000,000 into bonds guaranteed by the company. A \$35-a-week clerk admitted he was the straw man in the signing of \$40,000,000 of per-

sonal surety bonds. Officials of the company admitted they guaranteed as gilt-edged securities, bonds on properties already in default on taxes.

Quoting from the Philadelphia Record of Tuesday, May 26, 1936:

UNITED STATES GRAND JURY TO INVESTIGATE MORTGAGE CASE—PANEL EXPECTED TO BE DRAWN AT ONCE TO STUDY RECEIVERSHIP—WASHINGTON TO AID—McAVOY PROMISED HELP IN PROBE OF DATA BARED IN SABATH QUIZ

United States District Attorney Charles D. McAvoy will launch a special Federal grand-jury investigation of the Philadelphia Co. for Guaranteeing Mortgages, he announced last night.

He will appear in the United States district court here today to ask for appointment of the grand jury.

The court is expected to order it impaneled immediately.

PROMPT ACTION PLANNED

"The jury will begin investigation of the \$132,000,000 company as soon as possible", McAvoy declared. "Procedure for empanelling a special grand jury is the same as that for a regular grand jury", he pointed out. "The grand jury will be asked to act on disclosures at last week's hearings of the Sabath congressional committee concerning the company's bankruptcy, receivership, and reorganization which", McAvoy said, "would seem to indicate a continuous criminal conspiracy to defraud investors." Approval of the grand-jury investigation was given by the Department of Justice in Washington. Announcement that Washington authorities would cooperate with any inquiry pursued by McAvoy was made by Assistant Attorney General Brien McMahon.

[From the New York Post, Tuesday, Jan. 28, 1936]

CONTINUE THE SABATH COMMITTEE

Some 4,000,000 American investors, most of them small investors looking for a safe place to put their savings, sank \$10,000,000,000 in real-estate bonds before the depression. Eight billion dollars of these bonds are now in default.

A House committee headed by Congressman SABATH has been probing for a year into the causes of these defaults and into the often crooked "protective" committees set up in many of the reorganizations growing out of these defaults.

Continuation of the investigation for at least another year is essential to protect owners of these bonds and to prevent a repetition of the same evils in the future. The few thousands required for this work is chicken feed beside the millions at stake.

The Sabath committee hearings have served several important purposes. The committee has turned the spotlight on the shameless misuse of "other people's money" by insiders. The committee has slowed up the racket of fake "protective" committees.

Above all, the foundation is being laid for the enactment of remedial legislation. We must not have a repetition of scandals when it was found that the proceeds of real-estate bond sales—instead of being invested in real estate—had been secretly used for speculation in the stock market.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be an additional 1,000 copies of this report printed on account of the demands that are being made for such copies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to take that matter up with the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. SABATH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein some extracts from this long report for the benefit of the Members so that they may obtain a great deal of valuable information with respect to the work the committee has done.

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

There was no objection.

SERVICE CHARGES ON RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12876) to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of resettlement or rural rehabilitation projects; to authorize payments to States, political subdivisions, and local taxing units in lieu of taxes on such premises; and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acquisition by the United States of any real property heretofore or hereafter acquired in connection with any resettlement or rural rehabilitation project heretofore or hereafter constructed with funds allotted or transferred to the Resettlement Administration pursuant to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or any other law, shall not be held to deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction in and over such property, or to impair the civil rights under the local law of the tenants or inhabitants on

such property; and insofar as any such jurisdiction has been taken away from any such State or subdivision, or any such rights have been impaired, jurisdiction over any such property is hereby ceded back to such State or subdivision.

Sec. 2. Upon the request of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any other local taxing unit, in which any such project, described in section 1, has been or will be constructed, the Resettlement Administration is authorized to enter into an agreement, and to consent to the renewal or alteration thereof, with such State or political subdivision thereof, or other local taxing unit, for the payment by the United States of sums in lieu of taxes. The sums payable under any agreement with a State or political subdivision thereof, or other local taxing unit, in any year with respect to any project shall not exceed an amount equal to what the tax of the State of political subdivision thereof, or other local taxing unit, would have been if such property were taxed to the same extent as other real property.

Sec. 3. The receipts derived from the operation of such projects, described in section 1, in addition to the moneys appropriated or allocated for such projects, shall be available for such payments in lieu of taxes and for any other expenditures for operation and maintenance (including insurance) of such projects. To provide for such payments and expenditures, the Resettlement Administration is authorized from time to time to retain out of such receipts such sums as it may estimate to be necessary for such purposes.

Sec. 4. In the disposition or operation of any such projects, described in section 1, the Resettlement Administration is authorized to fix the selling prices or rents, or both, in such amounts and at such rates as it shall determine to be necessary in order to make such projects available to those families who are unable to pay sufficient moneys to induce private enterprise to supply adequate, safe, and sanitary housing, and other necessary resettlement facilities, notwithstanding that the selling prices or rental rates so fixed may not provide for repayment in full of the funds expended in connection with the projects.

Sec. 5. In connection with any such project, described in section 1, the Resettlement Administration is authorized to dedicate land for streets, alleys, and parks, and for any other public use or purpose, and to grant easements.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "in connection with any resettlement or rural-rehabilitation project" and insert in lieu thereof "for any resettlement project or any rural-rehabilitation project for resettlement purposes."

Page 2, line 11, after the word "local", insert "public."

Page 2, line 24, beginning with the last word, strike out all down to the end of line 4, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such sums shall be fixed in such agreement and shall be based upon the cost of the public or municipal services to be supplied for the benefit of such project or the persons residing on or occupying such premises, but taking into consideration the benefits to be derived by such State or subdivision or other taxing unit from such project."

Page 3, beginning with line 14, strike out all of section 4.

Page 4, line 1, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "4."

Page 4, line 2, after the word "administration", insert " , with the approval of the President."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALIFORNIA STATE PARK SYSTEM

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4634) to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system and consider the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to valid rights existing on the date of this act, the State of California may within 5 years select for State park purposes by legal subdivisions all or any portion of the public land not reserved for public purposes in the following townships:

T. 9 S., R. 9 E.; T. 9 S., R. 10 E.; T. 10 S., R. 9 E.; T. 10 S., R. 10 E.; T. 10 S., R. 11 E.; T. 11 S., R. 9 E.; T. 11 S., R. 10 E.; and T. 11 S., R. 11 E., San Bernardino meridian.

Upon the submission of satisfactory proof that the land selected contains characteristic desert growth and scenic or other natural features which it is desirable to preserve as a part of the California State park system, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause patents to issue therefor: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all coal, oil, gas, or other mineral contained in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and

remove the same at such times and under such conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That any patent so issued shall contain a provision reserving to the United States, for the use of the United States and its permittees, including Imperial irrigation district, the perpetual right to flow or permit water to flow over or pond or permit water to be ponded upon any part of the lands so patented with right to go upon same and to locate, relocate, construct, reconstruct, and maintain any works necessary or convenient to the full use thereof, including telephone and electrical transmission lines, and shall also contain provision for reversion of title to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that for a period of more than 1 year the land has not been used by the State for park purposes: *And provided further*, That in order to consolidate park areas or to eliminate private holdings therefrom lands patented hereunder may be exchanged with the approval of and under rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for privately owned lands in the area hereinbefore described of approximately equal value containing the natural features sought to be preserved hereby. The lands so acquired to be subject to all the conditions and reservations prescribed by this act, including the reversionary clause hereinbefore set out.

The bill was ordered to read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE IOWA FARMER AND THE TARIFF

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein certain excerpts and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, for generations the Republican Party has contended that the American producer, whether engaged in farming or manufacturing, should be entitled to have preference in our own markets. The Democratic Party during all this period has favored free trade, which means no duty upon foreign products, or a low duty for revenue purposes.

The position of the two parties in regard to the subject are just about as far apart as they have been at any time during the past three-quarters of a century.

Recently, the Department of Labor made an investigation concerning wage levels in the foreign countries of the world, and in substance found that wages in Great Britain were about 40 percent of the wage paid in the United States; that wages in France and Germany were about one-third of that paid here; and in the remainder of Europe the daily wage was about one-fourth of that paid in our country.

This branch of the Government also reported that the wage level in Central and South America was about one-fifth of our own, and in Japan and China one-tenth to one-twentieth of the wages paid for the principal branches of employment in the United States.

While we do not have accurate figures in relation to land values in new countries, such as Canada, Australia, and Argentina, yet we do know that the selling price of land in the countries mentioned is from one-third to one-tenth of the amount paid for comparable land in our country.

Another element in this study is the cost of transportation, and it is known that freight can be and is shipped by water for one-fifth to one-tenth of the rate charged by railroads.

Having in mind the foregoing advantages which accrue to those engaged in farming in the low cost in the countries mentioned, it then becomes highly important to the farmer in Iowa, and in the farming section of the country, to devise plans of operation so that he can obtain a fair value for the livestock, grain, and dairy products which he must market in competition with the low price and low-cost commodities imported from foreign lands.

The Republican Party has been, and now is, fully aware of the severe competition which the American farmer must meet in competing with the countries mentioned. This party, through tariff acts, has placed duties upon the importation of such foreign products over the active and constant opposition of the Democratic Party.

As a part of this statement I am incorporating tables taken from a document prepared by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives entitled "Comparison of Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930."

Schedule 7, agricultural products and provisions, shows the rate of duty placed upon the importation of foreign farm products. These rates on farm products are written in three parallel columns so that the rates can be readily ascertained. As the Democratic Party wrote the Tariff Act of 1913, the name of that party will appear above

that column. As the Republican Party was in control of the Government when the 1922 and 1930 Tariff Acts were passed, the name of that party will appear above the two columns containing the rates provided in these laws.

As schedule 7, which contains the agricultural items, is rather extensive, I have picked out a few of the most important items, such as livestock, dairy products, and grain, thus making the table both concise and clear in regard to these products. They are as follows:

SCHEDULE 7.—Agricultural products and provisions

Para- graph, act of 1930	Classification	Rates of duty		
		Republican		Democratic, act of 1913
		Act of 1930	Act of 1922	
101	Cattle—			
	Weighing less than 700 lbs. each.....	2½ cents per lb.....	1½ cents per lb. ¹	Free. ²
	Weighing 700 lbs. or more each.....	3 cents per lb. ²	2 cents per lb. ²	Free.
	Beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen ⁴	6 cents per lb.....	3 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴
	Tallow.....	½ cent per lb.....	½ cent per lb.....	Free.
	Oleo oil.....	1 cent per lb.....	1 cent per lb.....	15 percent. ⁴
	Oleo stearin.....	1 cent per lb.....	1 cent per lb.....	Free.
	Dried-blood albumen:			
	Light.....	12 cents per lb.....	Free.....	Free.
	Dark.....	6 cents per lb.....	Free.....	Free.
702	Sheep, lambs, goats.....	\$3 per head.....	\$2 per head.....	Free. ⁷
	Mutton and goat meat, fresh, chilled, or frozen ⁴	5 cents per lb.....	2½ cents per lb.....	(10 percent. Free. ³
	Lamb, fresh, chilled, or frozen ⁴	7 cents per lb.....	4 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁹
703	Bacon and hams.....	3¼ cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free.
	Lard.....	3 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.....	Free.
	Compounds and substitutes.....	5 cents per lb.....	4 cents per lb.....	Free.
	Pork, fresh, chilled, or frozen ⁴	2½ cents per lb.....	¾ cent per lb.....	Free. ⁹
	Shoulders and other pork, prepared or preserved.....	3¼ cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁰
	Swine.....	2 cents per lb.....	½ cent per lb.....	Free.
706	Meats, fresh, chilled, frozen, prepared, or preserved, n. s. p. f. ⁴	6 cents per lb. but not less than 20 percent.....	20 percent ¹¹	Free. ¹³
707	Whole milk:			
	Fresh.....	6½ cents per gallon ¹⁵	2½ cents per gallon ¹⁵ ¹⁶	Free. ¹⁴
	Sour.....	6½ cents per gallon ¹⁵	1 cent per gallon ¹⁵	Free. ¹⁴
	Cream, fresh or sour.....	56.6 cents per gallon ¹⁶	20 cents per gallon ¹⁷	Free. ¹⁴
	Skimmed milk, fresh or sour ¹⁸	2½ cents per gallon.....	2½ cents per gallon.....	Free. ¹⁴
	Buttermilk.....	2½ cents per gallon.....	1 cent per gallon.....	Free.
708 (a)	Milk, condensed or evaporated:			
	In air-tight containers ¹⁹ —			
	Unsweetened.....	1.8 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
	Sweetened.....	2¼ cents per lb.....	1½ cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
	Other.....	2.53 cents per lb.....	1½ cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
708 (b)	Dried whole milk ²⁰ ²¹	6½ cents per lb.....	3 cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
	Dried cream ²¹	12½ cents per lb.....	7 cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
	Dried skimmed milk ²¹ ²²	3 cents per lb.....	1½ cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
	Dried buttermilk ²¹	3 cents per lb.....	1½ cents per lb.....	Free. ¹⁴
710	Cheese and substitutes therefor.....	7 cents per lb. but not less than 35 percent.....	5 cents per lb. but not less than 25 percent. ²³ ²⁴	20 percent. ²⁴
711	Birds, live:			
	Chickens, ducks, geese, turkeys, guineas ²⁵	8 cents per lb.....	3 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.
	Baby chicks of poultry ²⁶	4 cents each.....	3 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.
	All other n. s. p. f.—			
	Valued at \$5 or less each.....	50 cents each.....	50 cents each ²⁷	Free.
	Valued at over \$5 each.....	20 percent.....	20 percent.....	Free.

¹ Weighing less than 1,050 pounds each.
² Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Cattle 30 percent, par. 12.
³ Weighing 1,050 pounds or more each.
⁴ "Chilled or frozen" added by act of 1930.
⁵ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: 2 cents per pound.
⁶ All other animals oils.
⁷ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 (par. 13): Sheep, 1 year old or over, \$2 per head; less than 1 year old, \$1 per head.
⁸ Goats included under all other domestic live animals suitable for human food n. s. p. f.; goat meat, n. s. p. f.
⁹ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Fresh or frozen mutton, lamb, and pork; 2 cents per pound.
¹⁰ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f., 25 percent.
¹¹ Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.
¹² Provided, That no meats of any kind shall be imported (none of the foregoing meats shall be admitted (act of 1913)) into the United States unless the same is healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food and contains no dye, chemical, preservative, or ingredient which renders the same unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food, and unless the same also complies with the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that, after entry into the United States in compliance with said rules and regulations, said meats shall be deemed and treated as domestic meats within the meaning of and shall be subject to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 674), commonly called the "meat-inspection amendment", and the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 768), commonly called the "Food and Drugs Act", and that the Secretary of Agriculture be and hereby is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this provision (paragraph [act of 1913]), and that in such rules and regulations the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe the terms and conditions for the destruction (for food purposes [act of 1913]) of all such meats offered for entry and refused admission into the United States unless the same be exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor in such rules and regulations. (Acts of 1913 and 1922.)
¹³ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f., 25 percent.
¹⁴ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon; cream, 5 cents per gallon; milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other process, including weight of immediate coverings, 2 cents per pound.
¹⁵ Provided, That fresh or sour milk containing more than 7 percent (act of 1922) and 5½ percent (act of 1930) of butterfat shall be dutiable as cream, and fresh or sour cream containing more than 45 percent of butterfat shall be dutiable as butter (acts of 1922 and 1930). Skimmed milk containing more than 1 percent of butterfat shall be dutiable as whole milk (act of 1930).
¹⁶ 3¼ cents per gallon, by Presidential proclamation, effective June 13, 1929, under sec. 315.
¹⁷ 30 cents per gallon, by Presidential proclamation, effective June 13, 1929, under sec. 315.
¹⁸ Skimmed milk, fresh or sour, not specially mentioned in the acts of 1922 and 1913. Dutiable at rates for whole milk under act of 1922.
¹⁹ Hermetically sealed containers, act of 1922.
²⁰ Whole milk powder, act of 1922, not specially provided for in act of 1913.
²¹ Provided, That dried skimmed milk containing more than 3 percent of butterfat and dried buttermilk containing more than 6 percent of butterfat shall be dutiable as dried whole milk; and dried whole milk containing more than 35 percent of butterfat shall be dutiable as dried cream (act of 1930).
²² Cream powder, act of 1922.
²³ Skimmed milk powder, act of 1922.
²⁴ Emergency tariff act of 1921: Butter and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound; cheese and substitutes therefor, 23 percent.
²⁵ Cheese having the eye formation characteristic of the Swiss or Emmenthaler type, 7½ cents per pound, but not less than 37½ percent ad valorem, by Presidential proclamation, effective July 8, 1927, under sec. 315.
²⁶ "Poultry" acts of 1922 and 1913.
²⁷ Live bobwhite quail, 25 cents each, by Presidential proclamation, effective Nov. 2, 1925, under sec. 315.

SCHEDULE 7.—Agricultural products and provisions—Continued

Para-graph, act of 1930	Classification	Rates of duty		
		Republican		Democratic, act of 1913
		Act of 1930	Act of 1922	
712	Birds, dead, dressed or undressed, fresh, chilled, or frozen: ⁴			
	Chickens, ducks, geese, guineas.....	10 cents per lb.....	6 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb. ²⁸
	Turkeys.....	10 cents per lb.....	6 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb. ²⁸
	All other.....	10 cents per lb.....	8 cents per lb.....	30 percent. ^{28, 29}
	All the foregoing, prepared or preserved in any manner and not specially provided for.....	10 cents per lb.....	35 percent.....	Free. ³⁰
713	Egg albumen:			
	Dried.....	18 cents per lb. ³¹	18 cents per lb.....	3 cents per lb.
	Frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.....	11 cents per lb. ³¹	6 cents per lb. ³²	1 cent per lb.
	Egg yolk:			
	Dried.....	18 cents per lb. ³¹	18 cents per lb.....	10 percent.
	Frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.....	11 cents per lb. ³¹	6 cents per lb. ³²	10 percent.
	Eggs of poultry, in the shell.....	10 cents per doz.....	8 cents per doz.....	Free.
	Whole eggs:			
	Dried.....	18 cents per lb. ³¹	18 cents per lb.....	10 cents per lb.
	Frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.....	11 cents per lb. ³¹	6 cents per lb. ³²	2 cents per lb. ²⁸
714	Horses and mules:			
	Valued at not more than \$150 per head.....	\$30 each ³³	\$30 per head.....	10 percent.
	Valued at more than \$150 per head.....	20 percent ³³	20 percent.....	10 percent.
722	Barley:			
	Flour.....	2 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb. ³⁴
	Hulled.....	20 cents per bush. ³⁵	20 cents per bush. ³⁵	1 cent per lb.
	Malt.....	40 cents per 100 lbs.....	40 cents per 100 lbs.....	25 cents per bush. ³⁴
	Patent.....	2 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.
	Pearl.....	2 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.
	Unhulled.....	20 cents per bush. ³⁵	20 cents per bush. ³⁵	15 cents per bush. ³⁴
723	Buckwheat:			
	Flour and grits or groats ³⁷	½ cent per lb.....	½ cent per lb.....	Free.
	Hulled or unhulled ³⁷	25 cents per 100 lbs.....	10 cents per 100 lbs.....	Free.
724	Corn or maize, including cracked corn.....	25 cents per bush. ³⁸	15 cents per bush. ³⁸	Free. ³⁹
	Grits, meal, and flour, and similar products.....	50 cents per 100 lbs.....	30 cents per 100 lbs.....	Free.
726	Oats, hulled or unhulled.....	16 cents per bush. ⁴⁰	15 cents per bush. ⁴⁰	6 cents per bush. ⁴⁰
	Oatmeal, rolled oats, oat grits, and similar oat products.....	80 cents per 100 lbs.....	80 cents per 100 lbs.....	30 cents per 100 lbs.
	Unhulled ground oats.....	45 cents per 100 lbs.....	45 cents per 100 lbs.....	15 percent.
729	Wheat:			
	Crushed or cracked, and similar wheat products, n. s. p. f.....	\$1.04 per 100 lbs.....	78 cents per 100 lbs. ⁴²	Free. ⁴⁴
	Flour and semolina.....	\$1.04 per 100 lbs.....	78 cents per 100 lbs. ⁴²	Free. ^{43, 44}
	Unfit for human consumption.....	10 percent.....	30 cents per bush. ^{41, 42}	Free. ⁴⁴
738	Cider.....	5 cents per gal.....	5 cents per gal.....	2 cents per gal.
	Vinegar.....	8 cents per proof gal. ⁴⁵	6 cents per proof gal. ⁴⁵	4 cents per proof gal. ⁴⁶
763	Grass seeds and other forage crop seeds: ^{47, 48}			
	Alfalfa.....	8 cents per lb.....	4 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Alsike clover.....	8 cents per lb.....	4 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Crimson clover.....	2 cents per lb.....	1 cent per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Red clover.....	8 cents per lb.....	4 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	White clover.....	6 cents per lb.....	3 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Ladino clover ⁵⁰	6 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Sweetclover ⁵⁰	4 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Clover, n. s. p. f.....	3 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Millet.....	1 cent per lb.....	1 cent per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Orchard grass ⁵⁰	5 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Rye grass ⁵⁰	3 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Timothy.....	2 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Hairy vetch.....	3 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Other vetch ⁵⁰	1½ cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Bentgrass (genus <i>Agrostis</i>) ⁵⁰	40 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Bluegrass ⁵⁰	5 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	Tall oat ⁵⁰	5 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
	All other grass and forage-crop seeds, n. s. p. f. ⁴⁸	2 cents per lb.....	2 cents per lb.....	Free. ⁴⁹
779	Hay.....	\$5 per short ton.....	\$4 per long ton.....	\$2 per long ton
	Straw.....	\$1.50 per short ton.....	\$1 per long ton.....	50 cents per long ton.
	Broomcorn.....	\$20 per short ton.....	Free.....	Free.
	Rice straw and rice fiber.....	\$10 per short ton.....	Free.....	Free.

⁴ "Chilled or frozen" added by act of 1930.

²⁸ Including the weight of the immediate coverings or containers.

²⁹ Game birds, dressed.

³⁰ * * * meats of all kinds, * * * preserved, not specially provided for in this section.

³¹ "Whether or not sugar or other material is added."

³² 7½ cents per pound, by Presidential proclamation, effective Mar. 22, 1929, under sec. 315.

³³ "Unless imported for immediate slaughter."

³⁴ Patent barley.

³⁵ Of 48 pounds.

³⁶ Of 34 pounds.

³⁷ "And grits or groats" and "hulled or unhulled" added by act of 1922; grits held free as flour under act of 1913.

³⁸ Of 56 pounds.

³⁹ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.

⁴⁰ Of 32 pounds.

⁴¹ Of 60 pounds.

⁴² Rates increased to 42 cents per bushel on wheat, to \$1.04 per 100 pounds on wheat flour, semolina, crushed or cracked wheat, and similar wheat products not specially provided for; and decreased to 7½ per cent on bran, shorts, and by-product feeds obtained in milling wheat, by Presidential proclamation, effective Apr. 6, 1924, under sec. 315.

⁴³ Provided, That wheat shall be subject to a duty of 10 cents per bushel, that wheat flour shall be subject to a duty of 45 cents per barrel of 196 pounds, and semolina and other products of wheat, n. s. p. f., 10 per cent, when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on wheat or wheat flour or semolina imported from the United States.

⁴⁴ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Wheat, 35 cents per bushel; wheat flour and semolina, 20 per cent.

⁴⁵ Provided, That the standard proof for vinegar shall be 4 per cent by weight of acetic acid.

⁴⁶ The standard proof for vinegar shall be taken to be that strength which requires 35 grains of bicarbonate of potash to neutralize 1 ounce troy of vinegar.

⁴⁷ Other forage crop seeds, act of 1930.

⁴⁸ "Provided, That no allowance shall be made for dirt or other impurities in seed of any kind" (act of 1930. Similar provision in act of 1922).

⁴⁹ All grass and flower seeds, n. s. p. f.

⁵⁰ Ladino clover, sweetclover, orchard grass, rye grass, other vetch, bent-grass (genus *Agrostis*), bluegrass, tall oat, new in act of 1930.

From the foregoing, it will appear that the Democratic Party placed almost every farm product of the North on the free list, or on a very low-duty basis, whereas, the Republicans in writing the 1922 and 1930 Tariff Acts placed moderate or high duties upon foreign farm products. The foregoing should be satisfactory proof as to the position of these two political parties in regard to protecting the American farmer from too severe competition from the countries producing farm products upon levels one-half lower than such

products can be produced by the American farmer, his wife, and family.

Another item is schedule 11, which deals in wool and wool products. A table is also herein set out which will show that the Democrats placed wool upon the free list; and again the Republicans came to the rescue and placed a duty of 20 to 35 cents per pound upon wool imported from foreign countries, Australia importing large quantities of wool in the face of the duties mentioned. This tabulation is taken from the same source as the table quoted above.

SCHEDULE 11.—Wool and manufactures of¹

Para- graph, act of 1930	Classification	Rates of duty		
		Republican		Democratic, act of 1913
		Act of 1930	Act of 1922	
1101 (a)	Wools: ² Donskoi, Smyrna, Cordova, Valparaiso, Ecuadorean, Syrian, Aleppo, Georgian, Turkestan, Arabian, Baghdad, Persian, Sistan, East Indian, Thibetan, Chinese, Manchurian, Mongolian, Egyptian, Sudan, Cyprus, Sardinian, Pyrenean, Oporto, Iceland, Scotch Blackface, Black Spanish, Kerry, Haslock, and Welsh Mountain; similar wools without merino or English blood; all other wools of whatever blood or origin not finer than 40s; and hair of the camel:			
	In the grease or washed.....	24 cents per lb. ³	Free. ⁴
	Scoured.....	27 cents per lb. ³	Free. ⁴
	On the skin.....	22 cents per lb. ³	Free. ⁴
	Sorted, or matchings, if not scoured.....	25 cents per lb. ³	Free. ⁴
	<i>Provided</i> , That a tolerance of not more than 10 percent of wool not finer than 44s may be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 40s: <i>Provided further</i> , That all the foregoing may be imported under bond in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury and under such regulations as he shall prescribe; and if within 3 years from the date of importation or withdrawal from bonded warehouse satisfactory proof is furnished that the wools or hair have been used in the manufacture of yarns which have been used in the manufacture of press cloth, camel's hair belting, rugs, carpets, or any other floor covering, or in the manufacture of knit or felt boots or heavy fulled lumbermen's socks, the duties shall be remitted or refunded: <i>And provided further</i> , That if any such wools or hair imported under bond as above prescribed are used in the manufacture of articles other than press cloth, camel's hair belting, rugs, carpets, or any other floor coverings, or knit or felt boots or heavy fulled lumbermen's socks, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on any such wools or hair so used in violation of the bond, in addition to the regular duties provided by this paragraph, 50 cents per pound, which shall not be remitted or refunded on exportation of the articles or for any other reason. ⁵			
	Wools, not improved by the admixture of merino or English blood, such as Donskoi, native Smyrna, native South America, Cordova, Valparaiso, and other wools of like character or description, and hair of the camel:			
	In the grease.....		12 cents per lb.	
	Scoured.....		24 cents per lb.	
	Washed.....		18 cents per lb.	
On the skin.....		11 cents per lb.		
1102 (a)	Wools, n. s. p. f., not finer than 44s:			
	In the grease or washed.....	29 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	Scoured.....	32 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	On the skin.....	27 cents per lb. ³	30 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	Sorted, or matchings, if not scoured.....	30 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
<i>Provided</i> , That a tolerance of not more than 10 per centum of wools not finer than 46s may be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 44s.				
1102 (b)	Wools, n. s. p. f.:			
	In the grease or washed.....	34 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	Scoured.....	37 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	On the skin.....	32 cents per lb. ³	30 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	Sorted, or matchings, if not scoured.....	35 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	Free. ⁴
	Hair of the Angora goat, Cashmere goat, alpaca, and other like animals:			
	In the grease or washed.....	34 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	15 per cent. ⁴
	Scoured.....	37 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	15 per cent. ⁴
	On the skin.....	32 cents per lb. ³	30 cents per lb. ⁴	15 per cent. ⁴
	Sorted, or matchings, if not scoured.....	35 cents per lb. ³	31 cents per lb. ⁴	15 per cent. ⁴

¹ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Par. 19. Wool and hair of the kind provided for in paragraph 18, when advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, and manufactures of which wool or hair of the kind provided for in paragraph 18 is the component material of chief value, 45 cents per pound in addition to the rates of duty imposed thereon by existing law.

² Under the act of 1922, wools improved by the admixture of merino or English blood were dutiable in the grease or washed, at 31 cents per pound of clean content.

³ Of clean content.

⁴ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: Par. 18. Wool, commonly known as clothing wool, including hair of the camel, angora goat, and alpaca, but not such wools as are commonly known as carpet wools: Unwashed, 15 cents per pound; washed, 30 cents per pound; scoured, 45 cents per pound. Unwashed wools shall be considered such as shall have been shorn from the animal without any cleaning; washed wools shall be considered such as have been washed with water only on the animal's back or on the skin; wools washed in any other manner than on the animal's back or on the skin shall be considered as scoured wool. On wool and hair provided for in this paragraph, which is sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece, the duty shall be twice the duty to which it would otherwise be subject, but not more than 45 cents per pound.

⁵ Act of 1922: *Provided*, That such wools may be imported under bond in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury and under such regulations as he shall prescribe; and if within three years from the date of importation or withdrawal from bonded warehouse satisfactory proof is furnished that the wools have been used in the manufacture of rugs, carpets, or any other floor coverings, the duties shall be remitted or refunded: *Provided further*, That if any such wools imported under bond as above prescribed are used in the manufacture of articles other than rugs, carpets, or any other floor coverings, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on any wools so used in violation of the bond, in addition to the regular duties provided by this paragraph, 20 cents per pound, which shall not be remitted or refunded on exportation of the articles or for any other reason.

While our good Democratic friends were placing most out the table, from the same source, showing the duties of the northern farm products upon the free list, they which they placed upon this product, and which have did not forget to give attention to tobacco, which is been continued through fairness and generosity of the almost exclusively a southern product. I am setting Republicans.

SCHEDULE 6.—Tobacco and manufactures of

Para- graph, act of 1930	Classification	Rates of duty		
		Republican		Democratic, act of 1913
		Act of 1930	Act of 1922	
601	Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 35 ¹ per cent of wrapper tobacco, and all leaf tobacco the product of 2 or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together—			
	Unstemmed.....	\$2.275 per lb.	\$2.10 per lb.	\$1.85 per lb. ¹
603	Stemmed.....	\$2.925 per lb.	\$2.75 per lb.	\$2.50 per lb. ¹
	All other tobacco manufactured or unmanufactured, n. s. p. f.....	55 cents per lb.	55 cents per lb.	55 cents per lb.
605	Scrap tobacco.....	35 cents per lb.	35 cents per lb.	35 cents per lb.
	Cigars, cigarettes, cheroots of all kinds.....	\$4.50 per lb. and 25 percent.	\$4.50 per lb. and 25 percent.	\$4.50 per lb. and 25 percent.
	Paper cigars and cigarettes, including wrappers.....	\$4.50 per lb. and 25 percent.	\$4.50 per lb. and 25 percent.	\$4.50 per lb. and 25 percent.

¹ The percentage specified in Tariff Act of 1913 and the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 was 15 percent.

² Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: \$2.35 per pound. (See footnote 1 above.)

³ Emergency Tariff Act of 1921: \$3 per pound. (See footnote 1 above.)

It might interest you to also know that when the 1930 Tariff Act was passed the vote was recorded by party affiliation, as follows:

Vote on 1930 Tariff Act, House of Representatives

For:	
Republicans	244
Democrats	20
Total for	264
Against:	
Democrats	140
Republicans	7
Total against	147

¹ Most of the 20 Democrats voting for the bill came from the States of Louisiana and Florida, and they were interested in protecting sugar and fruit.

It would take volumes to carry the criticism and objection to the last tariff act, made by Democratic Members of the Congress and their leaders, and they have until recently insisted that they expected to repeal the measure.

However, through the reciprocal trade treaties, boring undercover, without public hearing so those interested might appear and voice objection, these secret treaties are negotiated, and are cleverly and consistently selling out the protection the northern farmer has had under the last Republican tariff act.

So that the farmer may have the latest information concerning the "trade out" to which he has been subjected, I am inserting a table taken from a publication issued by the United States Tariff Commission entitled "Changes in Import Duties Since the Passage of the Tariff Act of 1930", and this table is arranged the same as the tables hereinbefore inserted.

SCHEDULE 7.—Agricultural products and provisions

Par. no.	Articles	Rate changed	Effective proclaimed duty	Effective date and basis of change
701	Cattle, weighing less than 175 pounds each.....	2½ cents per pound.....	1½ cents per pound.....	Jan. 1, 1936; Canadian agreement.
701	Cattle, weighing 700 pounds or more each and not specially provided for.....	3 cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	Do.
701	Cows, weighing 700 pounds or more each and imported specially for dairy purposes..... <i>Provided</i> , That none of the foregoing entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in excess of the quantities respectively specified below in any calendar year after 1935 shall be subject to the above provisions: Cattle, weighing less than 175 pounds each: ¼ of 1 percent of the average annual total number of cattle (including calves) slaughtered in the United States during the calendar years 1928 to 1932, both inclusive (51,933 head). Cattle, weighing 700 pounds or more each and not specially provided for: ¾ of 1 percent of the average annual total number of cattle (including calves) slaughtered in the United States during the calendar years 1928 to 1932, both inclusive (155,799 head). Cows, weighing 700 pounds or more each and imported specially for dairy purposes: 20,000 head.	do.....	1½ cents per pound.....	
707	Cream, fresh or sour..... <i>Provided</i> , That fresh or sour cream entered for consumption in excess of 1,500,000 gallons in any calendar year after 1935 shall not be subject to this provision.	56.6 cents per gallon.....	35 cents per gallon.....	Do.
711	Birds, live: Chickens, ducks, geese, turkeys, and guineas.....	8 cents per pound.....	4 cents per pound.....	Do.
712	Birds, dead, dressed or undressed, fresh, chilled, or frozen: Chickens and guineas.....	10 cents per pound.....	6 cents per pound.....	Do.
714	Horses, unless imported for immediate slaughter, valued at not more than \$150 per head.....	\$30 per head.....	\$20 per head.....	Do.
716	Honey.....	\$0.024 per pound (from Cuba). \$0.20 per bushel of 56 pounds (from Cuba).	\$0.012 per pound (from Cuba). \$0.10 per bushel of 56 pounds (from Cuba).	Sept. 3, 1934; Cuban agreement.
724	Corn or maize, including cracked corn.....	16 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.	8 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.	Do.
726	Hulled oats, unfit for human consumption.....	25 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.	15 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.	Jan. 1, 1936; Canadian agreement.
734	Apples, green or ripe.....	8 cents per pound.....	4 cents per pound.....	Do.
763	Grass seeds and other forage crop seeds: Alfalfa..... Alsike clover..... Sweetclover..... Timothy..... Bluegrass.....	do..... 4 cents per pound..... 2 cents per pound..... 5 cents per pound.....	do..... 2 cents per pound..... 1 cent per pound..... 2½ cents per pound.....	Do. Do. Do. Do. Do.
764	Other garden and field seeds: Beet (except sugar beet)..... Cabbage..... Carrot..... Kale..... Mangelwurzel..... Radish..... Spinach..... Turnip..... Rutabaga..... Flower..... All other garden and field seeds not specially provided for.....	4 cents per pound..... 12 cents per pound..... 4 cents per pound..... 6 cents per pound..... 4 cents per pound..... 4 cents per pound..... 1 cent per pound..... 5 cents per pound..... do..... 6 cents per pound..... do.....	3 cents per pound..... 6 cents per pound..... 3 cents per pound..... do..... 2 cents per pound..... 3 cents per pound..... ½ cent per pound..... 4 cents per pound..... do..... 3 cents per pound..... do.....	Feb. 1, 1936; Netherlands agreement. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do. Do.
771	White or Irish seed potatoes, certified by a responsible officer or agency of a foreign government in accordance with the official rules and regulations of that government to have been grown and approved especially for use as seed, in containers marked with the foreign government's official certified seed potato tags, when entered for consumption during the period— From Dec. 1 to the last day of the following February, inclusive, in any year..... From Mar. 1 to Nov. 30, inclusive, in any year..... <i>Provided</i> , That such potatoes entered for consumption in excess of an aggregate quantity of 750,000 bushels of 60 pounds each in the 12-month period beginning on Dec. 1 in any year shall not be subject to this provision.	75 cents per 100 pounds..... do.....	60 cents per 100 pounds..... 45 cents per 100 pounds.....	Jan. 1, 1936; Canadian agreement. Do.

With a free-trade or low-tariff President and a Cabinet even more pronounced in this respect than their chief, and who have direct charge of negotiating these secret treaties, and with an overwhelming Democratic Congress, which has not lifted its hand in one instance to assist the farmer in this contest, or to protest or to stay such treaty action, who would claim that the farmer can get assistance from a Democratic administration? If a jury was called upon to render a verdict on such facts, being instructed to follow the evi-

dence, I insist we would agree that there would be little doubt as to the finding of the jury. Will Democratic alibis be accepted in the face of the incontrovertible facts above set forth?

A short time ago farmers from eight of the principal agricultural States met at Sioux City, Iowa, and passed clear and decisive resolutions against the reciprocal-tariff policies of the Roosevelt administration. They did this because they were informed as to the tremendous increase in importation

of farm products. Here I am inserting a table to show the great increase in farm imports under the benevolent foreign-trade policies of the present administration.

	1932 imports	1935 imports
Corn.....bushels.....	347,627	43,242,293
Oats.....do.....	58,786	10,106,903
Wheat.....do.....	10,026,320	27,438,870
Barley, malt.....pounds.....	52,532,636	320,622,537
Rye.....bushels.....	87	9,642,523
Tapioca.....pounds.....	130,000,372	202,112,319
Hay.....tons.....	13,858	67,171
Soybeans.....pounds.....	36,568,700	107,463,044
Cottonseed.....do.....	1,058,945	59,743,572
Butter.....do.....	1,052,598	22,674,642
Cattle.....number.....	95,407	364,623
Hogs.....pounds.....	28,875	3,414,317
Fresh pork.....do.....	1,657,500	3,922,609
Hams, bacon, etc.....do.....	3,015,489	5,297,335
Frech beef.....do.....	796,594	8,584,114
Canned meats.....do.....	24,638,261	76,653,242
Total meat products.....do.....	45,706,926	115,059,124
Eggs, in shell.....dozen.....	243,784	432,076
Dried yolks.....pounds.....	726,400	3,952,664
Frozen yolks.....do.....	422,060	1,199,772
Egg albumen.....do.....	1,275,790	1,876,445
Wool and mohair.....do.....	56,535,176	202,732,658
Dried milk.....do.....	596,448	2,743,349
Hides.....do.....	188,013,286	303,475,633
Inedible molasses.....gallons.....	155,888,307	235,161,684

Think how many American farmers would have prospered if these gigantic imports of foodstuffs had been raised on their farms.

Think how many farmhands would have had honest work instead of relief.

Think how much cheaper to you and me, as consumers, the home-raised product would have been as compared with the foreign-raised product which was shipped here, long distances, from overseas.

In connection with the sharp reduction in farm duties made by the present administration, with a southern Secretary of State in charge of negotiating the reciprocal trade treaties, it is interesting to observe that no reductions have been made on any important product raised in the southern part of the country. The northern farmer, without notice or without an opportunity to object, was sacrificed whenever a treaty was made. This statement is confirmed by the quotations recited above, from schedule 7, Agricultural Products and Divisions, of the document entitled "Changes in Import Duties Since the Passage of the Tariff Act of 1930."

The present administration is urging the reduction of crops and livestock in the Mississippi Valley and other farming sections, but is sponsoring a program of irrigation and reclamation in the West, and has already started projects which will cost \$2,000,000,000 when completed. This program will prove as harmful to the farmer who is now in business as the reduction of duties on farm imports.

This policy is unsound and will bankrupt more farmers in the area where these projects are to be located and will produce surplus farm crops to break down the prices of products from farms now in operation. Most of these projects were not approved by the Congress but were started by the President with funds at his disposal, without restrictions.

The farmer in Iowa and in the great agricultural section of the so-called prairie States is faced with this practical situation: Are corn and wheat, cattle, hogs, and sheep to take a second place, or back seat, and allow the cotton and tobacco farmer to have charge of agricultural legislation?

The facts set out in the foregoing tables cannot be disputed, even though they present a picture that is not favorable to the major or most important agricultural interests of the country.

As a farmer, do you propose to ride in the back seat, or do you prefer to sit in the front seat and hold the lines, or the wheel?

THE VETERAN AND THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein certain excerpts and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the past there has been considerable said and written as to which political party has been more friendly to the American veteran—the Republican or the Democratic. Partisans usually deal in conclusions or unsupported assertions; hence I prefer to submit a letter on this subject from Hon. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, dated at Washington, D. C., on June 19, 1936, and supplement the same by tables accompanying such letter.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 19, 1936.

HON. LLOYD THURSTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THURSTON: This is in reply to your letter of June 13, 1936, requesting a tabulated statement showing the number of special pension bills passed by the Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses, respectively.

There is enclosed herewith a table giving the information which you have requested. There have been included all private acts, those by way of omnibus pension legislation and individual private bills. For your convenience there has also been given the aggregate number of private bills comprehended within the omnibus pension legislation for the separate Congresses.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

Private pension bills, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses

Private	Subject	Date
SEVENTIETH CONGRESS		
135	Omnibus pension bill, increase pension Civil War.....	May 15, 1928
178	do.....	May 24, 1928
210	Omnibus pension bill, increase pension soldiers and sailors other than Civil War.....	May 28, 1928
227	Omnibus pension bill, increase pension other than Civil War.....	May 29, 1928
391	Omnibus pension bill, increase pension Civil War.....	Feb. 20, 1929
392	Omnibus pension bill, increase pension veterans other than Civil War.....	Do.
426	Wood, Leonard, increase of pension to Louise A. Wood.....	Feb. 28, 1929
433	Wilson, Edith Bolling, grant pension.....	Do.
444	Allen, Alonzo Duward, compensation.....	Mar. 1, 1929
453	Fulper, Wm. H., Government insurance to Etta Pearce Fulper.....	Do.
470	Byrne, Leo, compensation for Reserve officers' training, injuries as student.....	Mar. 2, 1929
492	Poore, Raymond F. (XC-541245), reimburse Timothy Henlon \$28.50 for funeral expenses.....	Do.
502	Goode, Wm. F., reimburse for medical and hospital expenses.....	Do.
504	Sanger, Paul E., \$5,000 insurance to Maude A. Sanger, mother.....	Do.
554	Callahan, Francis X., emergency officers' retirement benefits.....	Do.
558	Mathison, Chas. W. (XC-223119), relief of parents of.....	Mar. 4, 1929
565	Omnibus pension bill, pension to soldiers and dependents other than Civil War.....	Do.
566	Helms, John J., adjusted-compensation benefits..... (Total number of special acts incorporated in omnibus bills, 7,569.)	Do.
SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS		
22	Omnibus pension bill, Civil War widows and dependents.....	Apr. 18, 1930
30	Milner, Drinkard B., emergency officers' retirement benefits.....	May 14, 1930
32	Pettersson, Viktor, \$1,500 insurance to heirs.....	May 16, 1930
35	Omnibus pension bill, Civil War veterans, widows, and dependents.....	May 19, 1930
38	Omnibus pension bill, veterans, widows, and dependents of veterans other than Civil War.....	May 23, 1930
64	Burke, Charles L., insurance to foster mother, Frances Linker.....	June 9, 1930
66	Omnibus pension bill, Civil War veterans.....	Do.
89	Omnibus pension bill, Regular Army soldiers and sailors.....	June 13, 1930
286	Hudson, James M., \$50 pension and honorable discharge.....	Jan. 29, 1931
287	Manske, Henry, compensation for line-of-duty injuries.....	Do.
308	Chatkoff, Herman Lincoln, hospital treatment and compensation.....	Feb. 5, 1931
330	Cramton, Alonzo, \$30 pension to widow, Lois Cramton.....	Feb. 13, 1931
342	Omnibus pension bill, Civil War veterans, widows, and children.....	Feb. 17, 1931
343	Omnibus pension bill, Civil War veterans.....	Do.
346	do.....	Do.
347	Omnibus pension bill, Regular Army, Navy, etc.....	Do.
475	Greene, Frank L., \$150 per month pension to widow, Jesse R. Green..... (Total number of special acts incorporated in omnibus bills, 5,743.)	Mar. 4, 1931
SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS		
1	Omnibus pension bill, Civil War.....	Feb. 4, 1932
11	MacDonald, Harriet, compensation and hospitalization (citizenship).....	Mar. 16, 1932
114	Ballard, Grover Cleveland, \$246.72 reimbursement for reamputation of leg.....	July 1, 1932
238	Thayer, Sydney, Jr. (C-1367324), emergency officers' retirement benefits.....	Mar. 2, 1933
244	Eopolucci, John E., insurance to mother, Annie Eopolucci..... (Total number of special acts incorporated in omnibus bill, 428.)	Do.
SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS		
194	Artz, Frank J. (SC-648836), Civil War veteran, pay estate \$300 back pension.....	June 6, 1934

Private pension bills, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses—Continued

Private	Subject	Date
SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS		
341	Cannell, John S. (XC-160793), to grant line of duty for death cause; allow adjusted compensation to dependents.	Aug. 29, 1935
435	Bingham, Wilson G. (C-1396225), emergency officers' retirement benefits.	Mar. 16, 1936
439	Spry, James Steward (XC-632516), insurance to widow, Lydia C. Spry.	Apr. 10, 1936
244	Cruikshank, Marcus S., pay E. Jeanmonod, undertaker, for expenses incurred in preparation of body for burial and shipping to United States.	Aug. 20, 1935

This table shows the number of pension bills passed during the Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth sessions of the United States Congress.

The Seventieth Congress contained a majority of Republican Members in both the House and Senate, and at that time a Republican was President. The total number of bills passed during this session was 7,569.

The Seventy-first Congress also contained a majority of Republicans in both the House and the Senate, under a Republican President, and the number of pension bills passed was 5,743.

While a Republican President was in office during the Seventy-second Congress, the House contained a Democratic majority, and the Senate was but nominally Republican. The total pension bills passed by this Congress were 428.

The Seventy-third Congress, which took office under President Roosevelt, had a large Democratic majority in both the House and the Senate. The two sessions of that Congress were actively engaged in legislative matters for many months, but enacted only one pension bill for the veterans.

Likewise, the Seventy-fourth Congress, under President Roosevelt, had a membership containing three times as many Democrats as Republicans, but only four pension bills were passed during the many months this Congress was in session, and one of these bills was to reimburse a foreign undertaker.

To summarize the attitude of the Republican and Democratic Parties, by acts or deeds, rather than by campaign promises, it appears that the last two Congresses under Republican control—the Seventieth and Seventy-first Congresses—passed 13,312 pension bills for veterans or their dependents, or an average of 6,656 for each of the two Congresses.

The Seventy-second Congress was under the joint control of the Republican and Democratic Parties, and the number of special pension acts dropped to 428, about one-fifteenth of the average under the two preceding Republican Congresses.

The Seventy-third Congress, coming to power under Roosevelt, with a large Democratic majority in both the House and the Senate, passed just one pension bill.

The Seventy-fourth Congress, being the second Congress under Roosevelt, had more than three times as many Democratic as Republican Members in the House of Representatives, the Senate having even a greater proportion of Democratic power, and according to the table above submitted, passed just four pension bills.

To summarize the pension bills passed by the Democratic Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses bring forth a magnificent total of five bills, or an average of two and one-half from each Congress. It may be proper, although disappointing, to compare the Democratic average just mentioned, 2½, with the Republican average of 6,656—2,400 to 1.

It must be remembered that the foregoing figures have been compiled from tables furnished by officials of the present Democratic administration. So much for precise, definite facts.

While the same Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Democratic Congresses, acting under the dictation of President Roosevelt, were refusing to consider many meritorious bills concerning errors in discharge papers and other technical bars against relief or aid for veterans, these same Democratic Congresses had ample time to appropriate huge sums of

money for relief and employment of aliens, several hundred thousand, if not two or three million in number. Doubtless many of this number had served in enemy armies during the recent war. An American veteran would seldom obtain Federal employment unless he would take a pauper's oath, or could show he was the subject of relief.

It might be interesting, even humiliating, to add that the present administration during that last session of the Congress was able to defeat a proposal to exclude aliens here illegally from relief or employment. Notwithstanding the long-established policy of other nations in positively refusing to feed, clothe, or shelter noncitizens, Republicans were unable to write in a provision to prohibit alien relief and employment.

It will be recalled that the present administration sponsored and jammed through the Congress the so-called economy bill, which removed several hundred thousand veterans from the pension rolls and unfairly reduced allowances to other veterans. Harsh regulations were announced requiring evidence that could not possibly be obtained, thereby penalizing veterans who had served prior to the World War. New regulations requiring strict construction of evidence submitted by World War veterans were next required.

It was only a few months later that the National Recovery Act was inaugurated, and as soon as the many codes were promulgated and funds from assessments and penalties were pouring in, it was disclosed that some of the part-time N. R. A. officials were drawing salaries of twenty and even thirty and forty thousand dollars each for a few months' services each year, mainly in increasing the prices of the necessities of life. To date no one has heard of any reduction or reclaiming any portion of the exorbitant salaries paid to these temporary officials. The Government contractors, whether for battleships or public buildings, and all the big concerns enjoying guaranteed or plus contracts, some with profits above wartime, received these preferences within a short time after the paring knife had been applied to the allowance of the veteran.

The foregoing contains only a few instances out of a great many that might be enumerated. Republicans invite veterans to examine the records of the two political parties in respect to this subject.

In closing, it might be pertinent to suggest that the veteran read the two messages written by President Roosevelt, accompanying his two veto messages on the bonus. These documents can be obtained from any Member of the Congress or from the Government Printing Office.

DIVISION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL IN THE BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 12764) to create a Division of Water Pollution Control in the Bureau of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Bureau of the Public Health Service a Division of Water Pollution Control. Such division shall be in charge of a director, who shall be a commissioned engineer officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Such engineer officer, while serving as director, shall have the rank of an Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, subject to the provisions of law applicable to assistant surgeon generals in charge of administrative divisions in the District of Columbia of the Bureau of Public Health Service.

SEC. 2. (a) The Division of Water Pollution Control shall, after careful investigation and in cooperation with the agencies of the several States authorized or designated by law to deal with water pollution, prepare a comprehensive plan for eliminating or reducing the pollution and improving the sanitary condition of the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto. In the development of such comprehensive plan due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters and promote their use for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life, recreational purposes, agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses and for this purpose the Division of Water Pollution Control is authorized to make joint investigations with the aforesaid agencies of any State or States of the condition of any waters either navigable or otherwise and the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or deleterious substances which may adversely affect such waters.

(b) The Division of Water Pollution Control shall encourage cooperative activities by the several States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to water pollution; encourage compacts between the several States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; collect and disseminate information; make available to State agencies the results of surveys, studies, and experiments conducted by it and other agencies, public and private; assign experts in its employ or, with the approval of the head of the department or agency concerned, in the employ of any other department or agency of the Government; and furnish such assistance to State agencies as may be authorized by law.

Sec. 3. The Division of Water Pollution Control, upon request of any State health authority or authorities and subject to the approval of the Surgeon General, shall conduct investigations and make surveys of any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State; drainage-basin authority, community, or municipality with a view to effecting a solution of such problem or problems, and shall make definite recommendations for the correction or elimination of the conditions found to exist.

Sec. 4. The Public Health Service shall prepare and publish, from time to time, reports of such studies, investigations, and surveys as shall be made under the authority of this act, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of pollution of the waters of the United States.

Sec. 5. Any State, municipality, or other public body which is discharging untreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into waters of any area is hereby declared to be eligible to Federal aid in the form of grants-in-aid and/or loans for the construction of necessary remedial-treatment works, in accordance with plans approved by the respective State board or department of health and by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Such loans and grants-in-aid shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, subject to the following limitations: (1) Loans or grants-in-aid shall be made only upon the certification of the State board or department of health having jurisdiction and with the approval of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and (2) no grant-in-aid shall be made in respect to any project of an amount in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the cost of the labor and materials employed upon such project, including the cost of preparation of plans and the carrying of same into execution.

Sec. 6. Any person discharging untreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste deleterious to the waters within any area is hereby declared to be eligible to Federal aid in the form of loans for the construction of necessary remedial-treatment works in accordance with plans approved by the respective State board or department of health and with the approval of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Such loans shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, subject to the following limitation: Loans shall be made only upon the certification of the State board or department of health having jurisdiction and upon approval of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Sec. 7. The Surgeon General shall make estimates of the amount of money required each year for the extension, under the provisions of sections 5 and 6, of Federal aid in the form of grants-in-aid or loans to any States, municipalities, or other public bodies or in the form of loans to persons within any area. The Surgeon General shall transmit such estimates through the Secretary of the Treasury to the President, who shall transmit the same to the Congress, together with any recommendations he may deem advisable. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 5 and 6. Grants and loans provided for in such sections shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe for projects approved under such sections provided they have been approved by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1936, and for each year thereafter the sum of \$300,000 to defray the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the Division of Water Pollution Control in the Bureau of the Public Health Service and to be used for the investigations made under this act.

Sec. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$700,000 annually for 10 fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1936, to be paid to the States for expenditures by or under the direction of their respective State boards or departments of health in the promotion, investigation, surveys, and studies necessary in the prevention and control of water pollution; this sum to be allotted, under the supervision of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, to the States in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 10. (a) For the administration of this act the Secretary of the Treasury may, upon recommendation of the Surgeon General, appoint, such engineers, attorneys, experts, research assistants, examiners, and consultants as may be necessary, and fix their compensation, in the manner provided by law for appointment and compensation of such personnel of the Public Health Service; and the Surgeon General is authorized to transfer, assign, or detail to the division, from any other division of the Public Health Service, such professional and scientific personnel as may be available.

(b) Such clerks, stenographers, and other employees as may be necessary to discharge the duties of said division shall be ap-

pointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and he shall prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to their duties as he may find necessary.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury with the consent of the Secretary of any other department of the Federal Government may utilize such officers and employees of said department to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. The appropriation from which they are paid shall be reimbursed from the appropriations made pursuant to section 9 of this act to the extent of their salaries and allowances for service performed while so engaged.

Sec. 11. When used in this act the term "person" means an individual, a partnership, a private corporation, an association, a joint-stock company, trust, or estate.

Sec. 12. If any provision of this act is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 13. This act may be cited as the Water Pollution Act.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-three Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 133]

Amle	Doutrich	Hollister	Nichols
Andrews	Drewry	Hook	Parks
Ayers	Duffey, Ohio	Imhoff	Peterson, Fla.
Bacharach	Duncan	Kee	Quinn
Bacon	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, Md.	Reed, N. Y.
Berlin	Eagle	Kerr	Robinson, Utah
Bolton	Eaton	Kleberg	Robson, Ky.
Brennan	Englebright	Kocialkowski	Sadowski
Brewster	Faddis	Kopplemann	Sandlin
Brooks	Farley	Lanham	Sauthoff
Bulwinkle	Ferguson	Larrabee	Schneider, Wis.
Burdick	Fernandez	Lee, Okla.	Schuetz
Caldwell	Flesinger	Lemke	Sears
Cannon, Wis.	Fish	Lesinski	Secrest
Carmichael	Fitzpatrick	McClellan	Steagall
Carter	Focht	McFarlane	Summers, Tex.
Cary	Gambrill	McGrath	Taylor, Colo.
Chapman	Gasque	McGroarty	Taylor, S. C.
Claiborne	Gassaway	Maloney	Tobey
Collins	Gifford	Martin, Mass.	Tolan
Cooley	Green	Maverick	Weaver
Culkin	Haines	Monaghan	Wilcox
Cummings	Hamlin	Montague	Wilson, Pa.
Darden	Hancock, N. C.	Montet	Withrow
Dear	Hess	Moran	Wolfenden
Deen	Hill, Knute	Moritz	Wood
Dies	Hobbs	Mott	Zioncheck
Ditter	Hoepfel	Nelson	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 63

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses shall adjourn on Saturday, the 20th day of June 1936, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 558

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. SNELL to act as the committee to wait upon the President.

STREAM-POLLUTION CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 12764?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts to 20 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are now dealing with one of the most serious problems with which our country must deal within a very few years, if not now. There has been a tremendous demand all over the country for the past 4 or 5 years, if not longer, for some effective measure to be put in force that will eventually stop the pollution of inland waters. Of the hundreds and thousands of cities and towns all over this country, an average of not more than one out of a hundred has any means whatever of treating or controlling its sewage, and it is being entered into the streams to pollute the waterways for the towns and cities and people who reside on the river below them.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. For a short question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman please explain section 6 of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall ask the gentleman from Kentucky, the author of the bill, to explain the details of the bill at the proper time. I have only 3 minutes. A number of bills have been presented. Industries in many cases have voiced their opposition to any measure that would put them to any extreme expense. The plan that is proposed here has been agreed to by all of the industries that have been represented before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The paper and pulp industry and all of them have agreed to make no opposition to this bill. It places the matter in the Public Health Department of the Government to work out plans with States, with counties, with municipalities, with industry, with agriculture, and all the elements all through the country that will be applicable to every navigable river and its tributaries in the United States.

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

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, this bill slumbered in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since the day it was introduced, May 19. A week ago last Monday the chairman of our committee asked that it be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. During the time the bill was pending before our committee I, and probably many other members of the committee, had communications in opposition to the legislation. The objection, in my opinion, is that this is just another entering wedge whereby another Federal Bureau is going to dictate to the various States of the Union the policies that they must carry out in connection with their rivers and lakes, and that it sets up another Federal aid unit which is innocent in its beginning but which may lead to an annual appropriation for years to come of several hundred million dollars, just the same as we are appropriating now under the Federal Highway Act.

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

Mr. HOLMES. I decline to yield at present. Personally I would have no objection to a bill of this kind and I would not voice anybody else's objection providing that it were more of a fact-finding board that would give to the States the necessary information the Government may find out in connection with its investigation of navigable streams.

When you say "navigable streams", that is as far as the Federal Government has any right to go.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And streams that pollute navigable streams.

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; I was coming to that. But in this bill you add tributaries thereto that pollute navigable streams.

I know each municipality and each State, and I think the majority of them have very efficient public health service. I think in years past they have taken a great deal of trouble in the development of their own rivers and in keeping from pollution the rivers and lakes within their own boundaries.

I am of the opinion that the Federal Government is going to dictate the policy of how that municipality or State shall plan its own development of its water supply, its purification plants, and many other things that enter into the question of the care of the streams and lakes within the boundaries of a State.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the gentleman yield now for a question?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. FLETCHER. How would the gentleman solve this problem, then, since he objects to the plan that is outlined here?

Mr. HOLMES. In the first place, I am absolutely opposed to establishing any more bureaucracies in Washington with dictatorial power over home rule and self-government of the 48 States.

Mr. FLETCHER. How would the gentleman solve this situation? The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. HOLMES. I believe each representative State should solve its own problem. I believe we have brains enough in our various States to clean up any pollution which may occur in any of our navigable streams.

Mr. FLETCHER. We have not been able to do it in Ohio.

Mr. HOLMES. That may be true in some instances, but I believe the public health commissioner of the State of Ohio has authority under the law. If they want to clean it up, then can clean it up.

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

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Do they not have a Democratic administration in the State of Ohio, and have they not had a Democratic administration for a number of years?

Mr. HOLMES. I would not want to say that that was responsible for their not being able to clean up the pollution in their streams.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For instance, in a river like the Ohio River there is no State which has jurisdiction to control that river. It is an interstate river, with some seven or eight States bordering on it. No one State can control it.

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

Mr. HOLMES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the exercise of the proper police power of the State, can it not say to these corporate industries that are discharging waste into the navigable streams that they must stop?

And as far as municipalities which are discharging their effluent and sewage into the streams everywhere, they are entitled under the provision made in the one and a quarter or one and a half billion dollar bill to get such relief as is necessary. Then they first ought to exhaust their bonding power to build treatment plants, sewage plants, and all that sort of thing, before they discharge this effluent into the streams.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All that can be worked out in this plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The trouble with the antipollution law is that it never has been enforced by any State agency. The States have too often blinked at the fact that there is pollution, and let it go on. The responsibility rests squarely upon the enforcing agencies of the States.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for that observation. There is a great deal in what he says.

Section 5 of the bill provides—

Any State, municipality, or other public body which is discharging untreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into waters of any area is hereby declared to be eligible to Federal aid in the form of grants-in-aid and/or loans for the construction of necessary remedial treatment works.

We can go to almost any one of our smaller or larger streams and we will find there may be many industries along

the streams, discharging material into the rivers which pollute the rivers. At the same time we go along the various streams and we will find communities and towns themselves discharging sewage, a great deal like the city of Washington has done in the Potomac River. It happens right here in the great Capital of the United States, where they discharge raw sewage into the Potomac River. The blame for that pollution should be placed upon the municipality, but the commissioner of public health, under the public-health laws of the State, in my opinion, has authority to clean up those situations as they arise from time to time.

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Does not the gentleman recognize that this is a national problem and that the States cannot handle it? Even the elimination of pollution at a certain point does not inure to the benefit of those who live there. For instance, the elimination of pollution at Cincinnati may not inure at all to the people of Cincinnati, but to the south, in Indiana and Kentucky and farther down the river. For that reason it becomes a national problem.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate that.

This bill also provides that any private person who has a factory on such a stream, which factory is discharging any residue into the river, also may obtain a loan from the Federal Government to build treatment works, and so forth, to clean up the situation.

I am not advised as to whether the committee has held hearings on this bill this past week. I have not seen anything to that effect.

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

Mr. HOLMES. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We held hearings for several days.

Mr. HOLMES. This week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; on the 20th, and back there. The committee considered four or five bills. We had a hearing this week also, but I will explain this in my own time, for I do not want to take the gentleman's time.

Mr. HOLMES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLISTER] and several others appeared—Members who had introduced bills—all of which were referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. When we came to a consideration of the Vinson bill, we found it had not been referred to our committee, but we held hearings anyway.

Mr. HOLMES. From my correspondence with waterworks associations I was under the impression that the gentleman had not held hearings on this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hold a copy of the printed hearings in my hand.

Mr. HOLMES. The New England Water Works Association, at a meeting held on February 20 last, passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved, That the New England Waterworks Association, at its meeting held February 20, 1936, go on record as being opposed to any legislation placing the regulation of stream pollution under Federal control, and that the New England Waterworks Association advise each New England Senator and Representative in the United States Congress to this effect, and also to the effect that the New England Waterworks Association desires that Federal activities in matters of stream pollution be limited entirely to fact finding and cooperation with the State authorities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL of Alabama). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes; gladly, for a brief question.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does my distinguished friend realize that it was his namesake, the great Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, who almost 100 years ago started the principle of taking care of pollutions and infections, being the pioneer crusader in that work; and that typhoid, dysentery, and all other diseases that are today prevalent all over the United States are due

to the fact that people drink this water that is contaminated with typhoid germs, dysentery bacillus, and other organisms?

Mr. HOLMES. Replying to the gentleman from New York, I may say that Massachusetts has tried to follow Dr. Holmes' example for many years.

Mr. SIROVICH. But we are talking of water whose source is contaminated, navigable streams flowing through the several States. It is the duty of the Nation under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution to help protect those States against such sources of danger to health.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate also, the fact that this is just the beginning of another great Federal-aid program which eventually will mean another wholesale raid on the Treasury when the respective States should handle this particular problem themselves.

[Here he gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

Amle	Doutrich	Kee	Owen
Andrews	Drewry	Kerr	Palmisano
Ayers	Duffey, Ohio	Kleberg	Parks
Bacharach	Dunn, Miss.	Kocialkowski	Peterson, Fla.
Bacon	Eagle	Lambertson	Quinn
Berlin	Eaton	Lanham	Reed, N. Y.
Binderup	Englebright	Larrabee	Richards
Bolton	Faddis	Lee, Okla.	Robison, Ky.
Brennan	Ferguson	Lemke	Sadowski
Brewster	Fernandez	Lesinski	Sanders, La.
Brooks	Fiesinger	Lord	Sandlin
Buckley, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	McClellan	Sauthoff
Bulwinkle	Gambrill	McFarlane	Schneider, Wis.
Burch	Gasque	McGehee	Schuetz
Cannon, Wis.	Gassaway	McGrath	Scrugham
Cary	Gifford	McGroarty	Sears
Clalborne	Green	McLeod	Secrest
Clark, Idaho	Greenway	Maas	Taylor, Colo.
Collins	Haines	Maloney	Taylor, S. C.
Creal	Hamlin	Martin, Mass.	Tobey
Culkin	Harlan	Maverick	Tolan
Cummings	Hess	Mitchell, Ill.	Weaver
Darden	Hill, Knute	Monaghan	Werner
Dear	Hobbs	Montague	Wilcox
Deen	Hoepfel	Montet	Wilson, Pa.
Dies	Hollister	Moran	Withrow
Dingell	Hook	Moritz	Wolfenden
Disney	Hope	Nelson	Wood
Ditter	Imhoff	Nichols	Zioncheck

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this bill advocated by the gentleman from Kentucky. I have cooperated with Governor Curley, of Massachusetts, in trying for the past year to get funds from the Federal Government to do away with pollution of the Merrimack River in Massachusetts. There are four large Massachusetts cities on that river—Lowell, Lawrence, Haverhill, and Newburyport. These cities are vitally affected through the pollution of this river. The Massachusetts Congressmen, in cooperation with the Governor of Massachusetts, endeavored to get a trunk sewer put through which would do away with this pollution and purify the waters of the Merrimack, which is a navigable river and under the control of the United States Government.

If this bill, which is advocated by the gentleman from Kentucky, passes it will mean an opportunity for Massachusetts under Federal health and State health officers to obtain funds to do away with this pollution which should have been done away with long ago.

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

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I understand, this bill applies to all the navigable streams of the United States.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And their tributaries.

Mr. CONNERY. The public health should come first in this country. We must take care of the people's health. With the passage of this bill we can make a start toward that much-desired end in eliminating stream pollution and thereby protecting the health of our people, who must drink this water where in many cases it is their only water supply.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the bill passes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], with reference to the situation pertaining to the Merrimack River, which flows from the State of New Hampshire into the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We have another large river up there in the old Granite State, the Connecticut River, which flows in both Vermont and New Hampshire, and, notwithstanding some opposition rumors, I have tried in vain to find any logical argument against the passage of this bill.

I have heard it suggested that this bill takes away State rights. I yield to no Member of this House in my determination to preserve State rights to the fullest extent and to prevent the Federal Government's usurpation of such rights. As a matter of fact, this legislation fully and adequately preserves those rights. It simply provides for cooperation by the Federal Government with all the States in the preparation of a comprehensive plan for the reduction and elimination of pollution and the improvement of sanitary conditions in the navigable waters of the United States and streams tributary thereto.

Just as we know and appreciate the virtues of clean minds, souls, and bodies, let us show our appreciation of clean waters throughout the Nation by the prompt enactment of this legislation. It will encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to water pollution; encourage compacts between States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution and assist the people of America as a real health guaranty for generations yet unborn. Let us enact this bill into law today. It will make our navigable streams and the streams flowing thereto clean and pure and promote health and comfort throughout the length and breadth of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, in all the years I have been a Member of this body I have known no other measure as valuable, even remotely, to the health and the well-being of the people of this country as is the one pending before us at this time.

There is not a single water supply in the entire United States that is not menaced by pollution constantly passing into that water supply. Some of our friends on this side have expressed concern over the creation of another Federal bureaucracy within this Government. So far as I have been able to interpret the language in the bill, no such thing will occur. There is nothing in the bill that gives the Federal Government any control whatsoever over any State or any municipality in the entire United States. It simply provides for cooperation between municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And also industries.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes, and industries.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House ought to know enough about the Bureau of Public Health to appreciate the fact that within that organization there are scientists who have devoted their entire careers to the solution of these problems which confront the people of practically every municipality and every State in this Union. There is no contribution which could be made which would be more valuable to

them and to the generations to come than bringing about proper sanitary conditions and insuring an available and pure water supply in our lakes and streams. There are many cities located upon navigable streams, or tributaries thereof, which, through the splendid manufacturing institutions of various kinds, are by reason of the peculiar nature of their activities, compelled to dispose of certain refuse or byproducts in those streams.

I have in mind particularly chemical plants and sugar-beet processing plants, because such institutions are located in communities and upon rivers with which I am familiar.

I know, for instance, that at least one of the great chemical plants of the country, which is located in the district I represent, and at least one of the sugar factories located in the town in which I live, have for a considerable period of time been spending their money and cooperating in every possible way with the public-health authorities of the State of Michigan in seeking some solution of the problem brought about by the activities of these splendid institutions so necessary to the welfare and prosperity of the communities in which they exist.

Notwithstanding the most painstaking efforts of our local authorities, our State authorities, and the men at the head of these business organizations, the progress we had hoped to make has not been possible. This indicates to me that something more must be done. We must enlist the services of every department of this Government which can in any way contribute to the solution of these perplexing problems, and that is exactly what this bill proposes to do.

The bill expressly provides that the Federal Government, through the Bureau of Public Health, shall cooperate with the States and the municipalities. Such work as is done, such activities as are engaged in, will be supervised by the State authorities. The most scrupulous advocate of State rights can find nothing in this bill which will in any way conflict with his views on this subject. As a matter of fact, it seems to me through the encouragement given in the bill to the various States to cooperate with one another in the solution of this great problem, the Federal Government acts only as the liaison agency bringing about the coordination of the activities between the States.

I am informed by the chairman of the committee that every businessman familiar with the provisions of this bill is heartily in favor of its enactment. I can understand why this would be so.

Mr. Speaker, I give my complete and unqualified endorsement to this bill, and I trust the vote of the House in its behalf will be overwhelming.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the elimination of water pollution, the object of the bill under consideration, is a matter of supreme national importance. I know of no legislation that could be enacted that would inure to the health and happiness of the people more than legislation of this character. The situation in reference to the elimination of pollution from our streams and waters is fast approaching a crisis.

Science has devoted much effort to the purification of water. Tomes have been written upon this subject and great advance has been made in this respect. The waterworks plants of our larger cities treat the water for turbidity in the great settling and coagulating basins. The water is filtered, aerated, chlorinated, and otherwise treated, and by the application of scientific processes we have made water potable which has contained a very large percentage of sewage. However, the time is fast approaching by reason of the increasing pollution of our streams when these scientific processes will no longer be able to meet the conditions that will exist. We must consider in the future not only methods of purification but to a far greater extent we must devote our time and effort to the elimination of stream pollution to meet the conditions that will confront us. Let me cite a specific instance which will indicate the great interest I have in this subject.

My district extends from approximately 40 miles above Cincinnati on the Kentucky side of the Ohio River to within a very short distance of the corporate limits of the city of Louisville, a distance of approximately 140 miles. Every county save one in the district I represent is bounded on the north by the Ohio River. Across from Cincinnati on the Kentucky side of the river there are 170,000 people. Cincinnati and its vicinity have a population of approximately 600,000. The Ohio River is one of the most highly improved rivers in the Nation for purposes of navigation. It is locked and dammed, and these dams constitute pools in the river—pools which in the summertime become stagnant and offensive. There is a pool at Cincinnati which extends from Coney Island 7 or 8 miles above the city, to Fernbank, a few miles below the city. Into that pool are drained the industrial waste and domestic sewage of 750,000 people, and out of that pool comes the water supply of those people.

The larger towns by the application of scientific processes, which are very costly, may to a certain extent overcome the effects of this pollution. But even they, if conditions continue to become worse, will not long be able to purify this sewage-impregnated water for drinking purposes. The great danger comes to the smaller towns, which are unable to maintain expensive and scientific water plants and which give the water insufficient treatment. Therein lies a great menace to the health of our people, and unless something is done before long epidemics may break out that will cost much in life and health and untold millions in money. The primary object of this legislation is to secure safe and potable water for our people, and this is a matter of supreme importance. However, the rivers and the waters of our Nation have other potential qualities that cannot be overestimated. Men have naturally sought the water courses to build their habitations. They sought them because of their beauty, because they furnished a means of transportation, because bathing in the clear streams brought cleanliness and refreshment. The rivers were attractive to wildlife. Here the animals of the forests and plains came to quench their thirst and to seek the refreshment the rivers afforded. I well remember as a boy how the migratory wild fowl stopped to rest on the waters of the Ohio River in their migrations north in the spring and south in the fall. Since the rivers have become polluted these wild fowl shun them. You may look in vain for them today.

Formerly the rivers were teeming with fish that furnished not only a fine food supply but also splendid sport to the fisherman, but the same causes that have driven away the wild fowl have destroyed the fish.

The solution of this problem is national in its scope. Frequently the elimination of stream pollution at the point where the money is expended and the improvement made will not inure to the benefit of the people who reside in that vicinity, but its beneficial effects will be felt by those who may reside at far-distant points. The object of this bill cannot be attained unless a comprehensive plan is adopted to eliminate the pollution of the entire stream or body of water.

To do this it may be necessary for the States to enter into compacts with each other for that purpose. The Constitution provides that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State. This, of course, was a wise provision, because if there were no restrictions on the compacts into which States may enter they might supplant by their compacts the provisions of the Constitution itself. There certainly can be no objection to allowing States to enter into compacts for the general welfare of their citizens where the compacts are not in derogation of the powers of the National Government.

The things with which we come in daily contact always make the greatest impression upon us. The place I have called home since my childhood has been in sight of the Ohio River. I have often observed how wonderful that river is in its beauty, its recreational value, its attractiveness to wildlife, the recreation and pleasure it could afford the sportsman, the diversified recreation it could furnish to the people.

Thomas Jefferson, who was not only a profound philosopher but who had a deep appreciation of the beautiful, said:

The Ohio is the most beautiful river on earth. Its current gentle, waters clear, and bosom smooth and unbroken by rocks and rapids.

When you see this beautiful river now turned into an open sewer because of the carelessness and indifference of our people it should inspire us to do everything we can to restore to it and the other rivers and waters of our country their great potential value for the health, the welfare, and the happiness of our people. This can be done.

It is undoubtedly true the Public Health Service of the Nation is deeply interested, but the physical prevention of the pollution of our rivers and waters in the last analysis must be met by a comprehensive plan prepared by competent civil engineers. I hope such a plan will be formulated and work started as soon as possible for this most meritorious and necessary purpose.

Respective of party affiliations or the districts we represent we would be recreant to our plain duty if we do not use every effort to eliminate stream and water pollution. Nothing should be of more interest to the people or more greatly involve their future health and happiness than the elimination of the pollution of the water that they are as dependent upon as upon the air they breathe.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, in considering this bill, H. R. 12764, providing for the Federal Government's cooperation with the States for the purpose of eliminating the deplorable health menace resulting from stream pollution, I am reminded of the "good neighbor" policy recently enunciated by President Roosevelt.

If ever there was an opportunity for the Members of this Congress, regardless of party affiliation, to legislate in the spirit of the policy of "the good neighbor", it is in this legislation we have now under consideration.

NO CAUSE FOR FEAR

Referring to the nervous concern of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] relative to the fear of bureaucracy, which he conjures up in his overlucid imagination, certainly he should have no fear along that line, because this legislation makes no provision whatever for any new bureau. Furthermore, the gentleman's own party spokesman, the late Mr. Hoover, while serving as President, sponsored more bureaus and new commissions of all kinds than any previous occupant of the White House.

If I thought this legislation would create or encourage bureaucracy I would vote against it. I am fed up on bureaucracies and on tax-eating bureaucrats. But there is no new bureau contemplated in this bill at all, as I understand it. The so-called bureaucrats will not have anything to do with it.

RIVERS DO NOT STOP AT STATE LINES

The fallacious arguments that the States can handle this murderous stream-pollution menace answers itself when you consider the fact that sewage-polluted inland streams, carrying the poison of death from one community to another, do not stop at State boundary lines.

Streams like the Ohio River carry pollution collected from tributaries at Pittsburgh, Wheeling, and other towns and cities along its banks. These streams carry their germ-laden waters across State boundary lines into other States, and these States, in spite of all they have been able to do, have failed to control the menace of stream pollution. The result has been tragedy and death.

My own State, Ohio, has tried its very best to solve this problem. It should be obvious to anyone that States cannot do this job without the cooperation of the Federal Government.

STREAM POLLUTION A MURDEROUS MENACE

If the lives of our citizens were endangered by a foreign foe we would instantly rally every available resource necessary for their protection. This disease menace carries un-

seen poison in polluted streams that threatens entire communities with life-destroying epidemics, which, as the testimony shows, endanger the lives of thousands of defenseless people.

The problem is extremely serious. Its solution compels us to put into practice President Roosevelt's policy of the "good neighbor" as a matter of self-preservation, for the history of all epidemics has made it clear to us that epidemics, resulting from stream pollution or any other cause, are no respecters of State boundary lines.

President Roosevelt's "good neighbor" policy should be the motivating policy back of this type of legislation proposed in H. R. 12764 and the motivating policy back of all other types of legislation conceived in the interest of the common good.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT SAID

It was this idea which the President had in mind when making the speech he delivered at his home in Hyde Park. On that occasion President Roosevelt said:

I like to think of our country as one home in which the interests of each member are bound up with the happiness of all.

We ought to know by now that the welfare of your family or mine cannot be bought at the sacrifice of our neighbor's family; that our well-being depends in the long run upon the well-being of our neighbors.

The "good neighbor" idea as we are trying to practice it in our international relations needs to be put into practice in our community relationships.

That speech from which I have just quoted was made before the committee reported out this legislation we are now considering. But no argument has been made on the floor of the House today more directly applicable to the solution of this stream-pollution problem than are these words spoken by the President at Hyde Park.

I should like to see associations of good neighbors in every town and city and in every rural community of our land—

Said the President—

Such associations of sincere citizens, like-minded as to the underlying principles and ideas, would reach across the lines of creed or of economic status.

It would bring together men and women of all stations to share their problems and their hopes and discover ways of mutual and neighborly helpfulness.

PHILOSOPHY OF GOLDEN RULE ENACTED INTO LAW

In passing this legislation today, authorizing the Federal Government to cooperate with the States in protecting their citizens against the death-dealing menace of stream pollution, we will be legislating in the spirit of the President's own words, because we will be helping to "share the problems and the hopes" of those whose lives are endangered by stream pollution, and we will be making a practical application of the philosophy of "mutual and neighborly helpfulness."

The philosophy of the "good neighbor", expressed in the President's speech, has been the motivating philosophy dominating the personal relations and public service of President Roosevelt from the beginning of his great career of usefulness to his fellow men.

In the early youth of an individual it often is possible accurately to predict the type of person into which that individual will develop and foretell the kind of leader he will become in his manhood years ahead.

MR. SNYDER'S EXPERIENCE WITH ROOSEVELT AT HARVARD

That this is true of President Roosevelt in relation to the "good neighbor" philosophy which is being expressed in this legislation under consideration was vividly impressed upon me not long ago when a friend of my boyhood, Mr. Harvey R. Snyder, came to my office. Harvey R. Snyder and his brother, J. Royal Snyder, 1206 Williamson Building, Cleveland, are two of Ohio's best-known attorneys. Both are Harvard men. Harvey R. Snyder played right end on the Harvard football team.

Mr. Snyder is widely known in Ohio and throughout the country for his active fraternity work and his leadership in the Pythian and Masonic Orders. The day he related the following incident to me Mr. Snyder was in Washington to participate in the ceremonies initiating President Roosevelt into the Order of Knights of Pythias.

ROOSEVELT HAS ALWAYS LIVED THE "GOOD NEIGHBOR" PHILOSOPHY

Discussing President Roosevelt's philosophy of the good neighbor, Mr. Snyder, who, by the way, is a Republican, said:

When I first went to Harvard I had an interesting experience with Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was then a student there. Even then he demonstrated in his association with his fellow students that he was daily living the "good neighbor" philosophy which he is now living as President of the United States.

I was raised on a farm and entered Harvard with little money and practically no acquaintances or friends among the students, said Mr. Snyder. I was greatly handicapped in my efforts to keep up with the members of my class in French. I spoke German, but the French language seemed extremely difficult for me to learn. I was falling behind. My French professor was a native of France. He had a doctor's degree from the University of Paris. He talked French so rapidly that it sounded to me like the rat-ta-tat of a machine gun. I had had only a very short period of intensive study in French in order to meet entrance requirements.

My failure to comprehend the questions asked by the French professor and the consequent embarrassment and inability to reply in French, created a sympathetic interest of a fellow-classmate who spoke French fluently. This tall, broad-shouldered, athletic fellow student possessed a most engaging personality. He had traveled in Europe during his vacations in the several preceding years. By his special study and his contact in travel he had attained a very keen ear for spoken French and he could also speak French fluently. My humiliation and embarrassment aroused within this other student, with the friendly smile and sympathetic understanding, a desire to assist me, his less fortunate neighbor. At the close of the class one day, he introduced himself and invited me to his room. Before the next recitation he had helped me with several hours in French discourse. He also arranged for the Berlitz School of Modern Languages to give me week-end instruction and daily instruction during the Christmas vacation. He insisted on advancing the cost of this special instruction out of his own pocket until I could get the necessary funds.

At the first meeting of the class after the holiday vacation, the professor was astonished at the improvement in my efforts to speak French, and inquired: "Have you been to France during this vacation?" I replied, "No, professor, but a member of this class has taken a friendly interest in me during the last month and has helped me to overcome my handicap."

That friendly, neighborly student who helped me out did so with nothing to gain for himself, because, coming from the farm in Ohio, with little money and no acquaintances or friends at Harvard, I could be of no service to him in return for his great thoughtfulness and kindness to me in my hour of difficulty. Of course, I paid back the money he advanced for the special instruction arranged for me, but never can I fully repay him for the neighborly kindness he did for me in my hour of discouragement and need.

Thus, it was as the "good neighbor" that I first learned to know Franklin D. Roosevelt, who, seeing my difficulty, introduced himself, took me to his room, helped me with my French lessons, and, at his own expense, secured special instruction for me. So, even in his younger days as a student in Harvard, Franklin D. Roosevelt lived the philosophy of the "good neighbor", which he is now living as President of the United States, serving all of us as one of the most courageous, kindly, humanitarian Presidents who has ever occupied the White House.

THE PRESIDENT BECOMES MEMBER OF PYTHIAN ORDER FOUNDED UPON PHILOSOPHY OF THE "GOOD NEIGHBOR"

In my office that day on his way to the White House to participate in the impressive ceremonies initiating President Roosevelt into the Pythian Order, my lifelong friend, Harvey R. Snyder, recounted many similar Roosevelt acts of helpfulness and kindness toward his student neighbors. From these early incidents thoughtful observers might accurately have predicted that Roosevelt, the student, when he became Roosevelt, the statesman, would build his leadership and his service to humanity on the same principle—philosophy and policy of the "good neighbor"—which, I am glad to say, is the spirit in which most measures considered by this Congress have been conceived and enacted into the law of the land.

SELFISHNESS OF GREEDY MEN POISONS THE STREAM OF ECONOMIC LIFE FOR UNDERPRIVILEGED MILLIONS

As the indifference, selfishness, and unneighborly attitude of communities located along the inland streams and rivers endanger the happiness, homes, and health of their neighbors living miles below, so overprivileged, greedy, selfish men of wealth and power, controlling the natural resources of the country and exploiting the people of the Nation, have polluted the stream of economic life with disaster, unemployment, insecurity, and unhappiness for underprivileged millions of their less-fortunate fellow men to whom opportunity is denied.

It is this unneighborlike attitude of selfish individuals and selfish groups, lacking in social intelligence, which makes necessary legislation like this we are considering today and which will make necessary still other humanitarian legislation in the interest of social justice, democracy of opportunity, and financial security for the masses of Americans who will ever be grateful for having in the White House a sympathetic and helpful friend whose kindness and usefulness to his fellow men is that of the "good neighbor", devoting his life to the service of mankind.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity to support a measure that will help my friends in Michigan and my friends in New York more than it will the people of the State of Virginia. We have no great pollution problem in Virginia. We have 2,000 miles of good bass waters and 1,000 miles of trout streams. But I know what you are up against in the industrial centers. Dr. Wollman, of the National Resources Board, testified before us it would require \$4,000,000,000 to provide for adequate treatment plants for domestic sewage and industrial waste. The manner in which we have made open sewers of once beautiful streams is a national disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, there are 7,000,000 licensed fishermen in this Nation. They have been writing me about pollution of our streams. The health problem of our people is also involved. We are spending millions annually to kill the germs in our drinking water.

This bill will give an opportunity to study the matter scientifically. It will promote the passage of uniform State laws and develop cooperation between the various States and with the Federal Government. It will help to finance the installation of treatment plants.

It also provides a worth-while public-works program on a reasonable scale, to be spread over a number of years.

As I stated previously, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity of supporting a measure that will help the industrial centers of this Nation more than it will agricultural States, like Virginia. I hope this bill will pass.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER].

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new matter. Pollution of navigable streams has been a bugbear for many years. It not only causes disease throughout this land of ours, but also brings about destruction of aquatic life and everything pertaining thereto.

Let me cite just one instance. In my district there is a body of water known as Newtown Creek, approximately 5 miles long, on which commerce is carried to a greater extent than on the father of all rivers, the Mississippi. Connected with Newtown Creek there are 20 untreated domestic sewers emptying into this body of water, not counting the hundreds of other sewers that empty into the creek from industrial sources. This sewage is carried into the East River, which in turn empties into Long Island Sound, which borders the shores of the district represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts who is opposed to the bill. It also goes along the shores of New Jersey and Connecticut, and New Jersey today has a suit pending against the city of New York for stream pollution. This is a vital proposition and it is up to each and every one of us to do what we can to help pass this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the membership of the House that I do not yield to anyone insofar as the importance of clean streams is concerned or insofar as the health of the Nation is concerned, but I wonder whether you know what this bill calls for. If you will read carefully sections 5 and 6, and then read section 7, which authorizes the amount of money necessary to carry out sections 5 and 6, I question whether any of you know what the amount involved will be. It evidently will be quite expensive.

In section 7 you authorize the amount of \$700,000 annually for 10 years, which is a total of \$7,000,000 to make this survey.

If you will look at your statement of the Treasury Department, which all of you have received at your offices, you will see that this year you have spent \$4,687,000,000 more than you have received and that you are now in debt \$34,345,000,000. I wonder where in the world the limit of expenditures is going to be by this great spending Congress. None of you can tell us what the ultimate cost of this bill will be. I think you ought to provide a definite and specific sum to be set aside for this purpose and not leave the amount indefinite so that no one knows what the eventual cost may be. That is only business of inefficient men.

I think there is another question involved in connection with this survey that should be considered, and that is the fact that we have streams used largely for the sportsmen of this country. I am interested in the sportsmen of the country, and I want to help them have streams where they can take their families and enjoy the pleasures that one gets with a fishing line. We also have what may be termed manufacturing streams, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] just a moment ago stated that to clean up these manufacturing streams would cost \$4,000,000,000. Is there anybody in this House today who is willing to spend \$4,000,000,000 on streams, when we have the great national debt we have and our present conditions with respect to getting employment for the people on relief. You must get it from industry. Kill industry and you kill employment. I think we have got to give consideration to the manufacturers as well as the sportsmen; they are both essential, and I want to protect both, and this bill has been brought in here without any consideration of all these facts, and I am wondering whether we ought to pass it at this time or not. We have the health departments who look after the purity of the water in the States for the purpose of health. Then we have the Department of Fisheries who look after the fish, and in Pennsylvania our State commissioner of fisheries, O. M. Deibler, is a peer of fish commissioners in this country. He is doing a great work in getting streams cleaned for fish culture.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania inquires about the amount of money to be expended. I want to ask him, in all seriousness, what the expense in suffering and in sickness and in death would be of an epidemic that might come to any section of this country through a failure of government to meet its responsibilities.

Mr. RICH. I am going to answer that.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I may say to my friends in this House that this is one bill that is nonpartisan, non-political, and nonsectional.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has asked me a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL of Alabama). Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I decline to yield at this time, Mr. Speaker.

I repeat that this is one measure that is nonpartisan, non-political, and nonsectional. There ought not to be a single vote in this House against this bill.

The only thing I can see that has brought any opposition to this bill is erroneously mixing it with another bill in which the coercive powers of the Federal Government would be exerted against the industrial life of the country. There is no coercion in this bill. This bill proceeds upon the theory of cooperation—cooperation between the States and the Federal Government, cooperation between the public health departments of the States and the Public Health Service of the Federal Government. There is not an iota of coercion in this bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I yield to my good friend from Ohio, who knows the need of this legislation and who has rendered such valiant service in its consideration.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is not this the fact, that this bill cannot work at all unless the welfare of the States is considered from every angle?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Undoubtedly. Everything that is done under sections 5 and 6 has to be done under the supervision and with the approval of the States and their health departments before it is approved by the Federal Government.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that my good friend Mr. RICH, of Pennsylvania, said it would help the sporting element, whom he wants to protect. This would help humanity who use and bathe in the water from getting infections of the eye and ear and typhoid fever and dysentery and abscess of the liver and countless other diseases.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. And these diseases do not come with a great warning, they slip on one unawares. When Cincinnati alone deposits 450 tons of sewage per day in the Ohio River, it is time to stop, look, and listen. That is the reason that JOHN HOLLISTER, of Cincinnati, and HESS, of Cincinnati, BRENT SPENCE, of the Covington district, O'NEAL, of the Louisville district, CREAL, CARY, and GREGORY, of Kentucky, BOEHNE, CROWE, PARSONS, KELLER, and all other members on the lower Ohio are vitally interested in stream-pollution control and eradication. I trust, now that Members who know this bill does not have the coercive effect they thought it had in the beginning, that we may have a unanimous vote on the passage of the bill. I feel it is a most forward-looking piece of legislation in behalf of men, women, and children. It is very pleasing to see the membership, upon consideration of the measure, rallying to its support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL of Alabama). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fifteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules I submit the following privileged report, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 559

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 12455, entitled "A bill to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes", shall be considered as having been engrossed and read a third time, and the House shall immediately proceed to vote upon the passage of said bill without any intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Is it permissible under the rules, after a bill has been defeated on the Private Calendar and this very day defeated on a motion to suspend the rules, to then have the Committee on Rules come in with a resolution or order and bring it up with the idea of trying to pass it, virtually by Executive order, and shoving it through?

The SPEAKER. Is that a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RICH. I think it is. We want to know whether we are going to have this "logrolling" legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows nothing about "logrolling" legislation, but, according to all the rules of the House with which the Chair is familiar, it is within the power of the Rules Committee to bring in this rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I take the floor of the House to criticize anything that the Committee on Rules has done. I am about as good a friend of that committee as any Member on the floor, but I do feel that in bringing in this rule at this time the committee has gone beyond all limits. I have seen various rules, some that are called gag rules. I do not know that I would even call this a gag rule, but I do say that it is the acme of all tight rules that I have seen in 20 years' experience in this House.

Let me say to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee that if I had a piece of legislation which had been brought up this afternoon, and had over a three to one majority, and could not pass it under suspension, I would not consider it was a very popular piece of legislation and force the House to consider it at this time.

Furthermore, considering the fact that we have already passed an adjournment resolution and expect to adjourn within the next few hours, there is certainly no possible opportunity for passing this legislation in the other body before we adjourn.

I do not care to enter into a general discussion of this bill further than to say that this is the rankest operation of the Rules Committee I have ever known in the House of Representatives. I defy any man on the Democratic side, which is always talking about generosity and liberal rules, to find a similar example in history equal to the rule that has just been presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR.] [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, what the distinguished Minority Leader has said might at first blush carry some impression to the House, but the fact is that this bill has already been debated for 40 minutes. It was brought up under suspension where no amendment was permitted. All this rule does is to carry out that situation exactly, there having been debate on the bill, and this rule does not change the situation at all.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Did the gentleman ever see a rule presented in this House which provided that a bill should be considered as engrossed and read a third time?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not before it had been considered under suspension of the rules.

Mr. SNELL. I defy the gentleman to find a single example of that kind in history.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I never saw such a rule brought in the original instance, but this bill has already been debated.

Mr. SNELL. And you say you are liberal. Where are all these people who talked about liberal rules?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are the great liberal party.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; you are a great liberal party. You are progressing pretty fast in the wrong direction.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, let us see what we are doing here and consider this very extraordinary procedure without heat and without passion. The rules of the House provide for what is known as suspension of the rules; that is, on certain specified times the Speaker of the House is permitted to recognize a Member to make a motion to suspend all rules of the House and pass a bill. In the beginning it was intended that this procedure should be resorted to only on rare occasions and really as a matter of emergency. In

drafting this rule the Congress was very careful to provide that a two-thirds vote of those present and voting was necessary to pass the bill. When this method is adopted the proponents of the bill are given 20 minutes to present their case under the rule, and the opponents are allowed but 20 minutes of debate. Then the bill comes to a vote without any opportunity to amend. This rule is a regular gag rule, if there is any such thing in the regular rules of the House.

Of late passing bills under the suspension process has become very common. A number of days ago a resolution passed the House permitting the Rules Committee to bring in rules without notice, and immediate consideration is given to such rules. This is an innovation, because under the general rules of the House the Rules Committee must present a rule the day preceding its consideration, and in this way the House has an opportunity to have before it a copy of the rule before it is asked to vote.

A few minutes ago the House considered this parkway bill under suspension of the rules. Two-thirds failed to vote for the bill. While the bill deals with a project costing approximately \$50,000,000, yet the House was given but 40 minutes' debate. Because the bill failed of passage the Rules Committee was immediately convened and brings before us the rule which we are now asked to vote upon. I have been in Congress for many years, and I have no fear of successful contradiction when I say that a proceeding of this type has never heretofore been resorted to.

The Rules Committee has brought in a rule making a second consideration of this same bill in order within less than 1 hour's time. Do not forget that we voted on this same proposition under the rules of the House less than 1 hour ago and defeated the bill. There is but one copy of the rule which we are asked to vote upon in existence, and we heard that read from the Clerk's desk. It provides that the parkway bill "shall be considered as having been engrossed and read a third time" and that the House shall immediately proceed to vote upon the passage of said bill. In short, it changes the suspension rule from a two-thirds vote to a majority vote without even reading the bill.

Now, we have heard much about gag rules. My colleagues, this is the "gaggiest" gag rule ever presented to this body. In polite terms, we might call it a supergag rule. Think of the Congress being required to vote upon a proposition involving \$50,000,000 without any consideration other than as above indicated!

The splendid chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], knows the rules of the House. He is a good parliamentarian and understands the precedents. I served on the Rules Committee with him for several years and am convinced that he is too familiar with parliamentary procedure and has too much respect for fair leadership to bring in a rule like this unless somewhere there was an urge that induced the action.

Now, I am not going to discuss the merits of this bill. From what I have been able to learn, this parkway is a roadway, approximately 450 miles long, connecting two great national parks. This roadway is to be 800 feet wide, will be beautiful and scenic, and will be paid for out of the Treasury of the United States. This bill will give the Department of the Interior the control, which carries with it the maintenance of this parkway.

The improvement is not necessary at this time. In the beginning, it was not authorized by Congress. This is one of those projects where either under the P. W. A. or the W. P. A. \$6,000,000 of relief money was appropriated, the purpose of which was to eventually accomplish some local benefit. I live in Michigan, and when I think that this 800-foot driveway, which the Government is to construct and pay for, represents just about the distance from my home to Washington, then I wonder whether it might be well, if we are going to spend this \$50,000,000, to spend it through the regular channels whereby Federal-aid roads are built. We can do much better by building farm-to-market roads or improved post roads, rather than developing this splendid scenic driveway in two States of the Union.

Much has been said here about sectionalism. No one will accuse me of sectionalism. However, up in our part of the

country, some people are beginning to wonder if the administration is not bearing down just a little hard, when projects like the T. V. A. and these other great developments in certain localities are being connected up with scenic drive-ways, to be paid for by the taxpayers throughout the length and breadth of the land, who are not only overburdened with taxation, but who, in many cases, have almost impossible highways leading from their homes to their markets.

Remember that the passage of this rule, because that would eventually mean the passage of the bill, means that the Government is taking over this highway and becoming responsible for its maintenance for all time. If, perchance, the majority of those present should not vote to pass the bill on this, its second trial within an hour, I am wondering what unheard of, ruthless parliamentary procedure will next be resorted to. It seems that in these closing days there is no limit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anybody can take any particular pride in considering a bill in this manner, which has been before the House on three occasions, and has been defeated on each of those occasions. I do not, however, think we should spend too much time on that. If the gentleman sponsoring this bill feel this is the proper way to legislate, the responsibility is theirs. It is our responsibility, however, when we vote to do so upon the merits of the measure.

Let me call your attention to this fact that in these projects, of which this is one, there are involved \$48,000,000. Now, \$48,000,000 is almost one-half the amount we appropriate and allocate each year for highway purposes under the highway act to all of the 48 States. Forty-eight million dollars is eight times the amount allocated to the State of Michigan and several other States having comparable road mileage.

When you gentlemen adopt your platform and reiterate that you are in favor of relief, when you reiterate that you are in favor of balancing the Federal Budget, when you state that it will not be necessary any more to pass \$700,000,000 tax bills because you promise to reduce expenditures, remember that here today you voted to increase the burden of taxation on the people of this Nation \$48,000,000 for an unjustifiable, unwarranted, unsound proposition. You cannot go back to your constituents and say "We are in favor of economy, we are in favor of relief, we are in favor of balancing the Federal Budget, we are in favor of reducing the cost of government" and vote for this measure with consistency. The two things are incongruous, they are as far apart as the poles. You cannot be consistent with your platform and vote for this.

Gentlemen, as competent legislators, I want you to consider this in the light of the fact that this amount is one-tenth of the amount we appropriated to take care of every poor person in the United States for the fiscal year 1934; one-tenth of that amount, and for what purpose? To build a beautiful parkway across two States, and two States only are going to benefit by this. Remember, there are millions of people in these United States today going without proper nourishment, without proper clothing, and without a proper roof over their heads while we are down here legislating \$48,000,000 for the purpose of building a beautiful parkway through two States.

I entreat you gentlemen to use some common sense in the consideration of the merits of this bill and vote it down as you have on three different occasions. Let us not go home from this Congress without voting for at least one measure which is in the interest of the taxpayers, the merchants, the industrialists, and the agriculturists of this Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the question of road building on the part of the United States Government is a

comparatively new matter. It was only about 30 years ago, I think, that the Government first launched upon any program of road building. At that time the Government approached the subject with great timidity because the principal opposition came from those who were jealous of the rights of the States. They insisted that the Federal Government had no right to enter the field of the construction of roads, but gradually that feeling faded away with the coming of the automobile. Today we see Congressmen on this floor demanding great sums of money from the Government, whose predecessors would have opposed this program most strenuously. First, as I remember, the Government paid only about \$5,000 a mile as its contributory part, and that had to be matched by the States. In most cases the State's part was twice as much as that of the Government. I am not trying to give exact figures. But since that time it has been increased very much.

Many of you will remember, especially the Members from the South, the battle we had 2 years ago to allocate Federal contribution for public roads so as to provide that 25 percent of the appropriation should be used for the construction of country roads such as rural-mail routes and school-bus routes. Now, listen to me. The money you are going to vote here this afternoon for the construction of this one highway, \$48,000,000, as I understand it, is enough money to build a farm-to-market road or a school-bus road such as we provided for 2 or 3 years ago clear around the world. This much money would build such a road 24,000 miles in length.

I am calling upon the Members to be sensible about this matter. You are about to undertake the most gigantic step in connection with road building that anybody ever thought of. The Shenandoah Park is a beautiful place. I have been through it. The Smoky Mountains Park is a beautiful place. I have been through that, also. Now, they want to build a highway 477 miles long and 800 feet wide. Think of it, the parkway is to be 800 feet wide, with a minimum width of 200 feet to connect these two parks. Of course, this highway will have to be built over the mountains. This will be very expensive construction. You will have to go from this mountain section to the other mountain section. The expense of construction will be enormous. The maintenance will also be enormous. How can you who come from Ohio vote for this, where we have built the highways for all the automobiles of the world as they fly hither and yon through our great State. We have built our own roads in Ohio. We have matched dollar for dollar with the Government in connection with the construction of our main market roads and our thousands of miles of other State highways. We have paid every cent of the money for the construction of these fine State highways. In Michigan they have done the same thing. In California they have built thousands of miles of roads and paid for them. This is the case everywhere.

How can you on the Democratic side justify the building of this superhighway and make it one of the show-place highways of all the world and the Government pay every nickel of the expense? How can you do it in the face of the terrific outlay of money on every hand. Gentlemen, your conduct, if you pass this bill, will call down upon your heads the retribution that must come from an outraged public.

This is only the original expense. How much is it going to cost to maintain that parkway? No doubt many millions. So long as the Republic stands, our successors will be appropriating money to maintain this show place. Why do we need a parkway 800 feet wide between these two parks? Are not the parks themselves sufficient? The Smoky Mountains Park contains many thousands of acres; I am not sure how many, but I think enough to comprise several counties. I do not know the exact acreage, but it is tremendous. The same is true of the Shenandoah Park. I think the parkway through this park is about 40 miles long.

We can with as much propriety build a parkway from Niagara Falls, a show place in the East, to Yellowstone Park, a show place in the West.

Ladies and gentlemen, you should not submit yourselves under pressure in the last days of this session. I call on you to do your duty and protect the depleted Treasury. It is little short of criminal to waste the people's money in this fashion. I call upon the Democratic Members and the Members from the rural sections and the urban sections to stand together and do what is manifestly your duty. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the speeches made by the gentlemen on the opposition, and it seems like in the closing hours they are developing a case of jitters about something.

There is no money involved in this bill for the construction of the highway. That has already been provided. It is simply a question of the maintenance and management of the parkway in one Government department, whereas now two departments are administering this project. Everyone recognizes these national parks are within driving distance of millions of the population of the United States. This parkway is not located away off in some remote section. It is close to the big cities of this Nation. By Executive order proper authorization has already been made to build this highway, and this bill covers the maintenance and administration thereof. We are bringing in the bill at this time because an emergency exists relative to the administrative features of the bill.

Something has been said about this being a gag rule. The matter has already been debated for 40 minutes as an emergency measure, and has been sustained by a clear majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The Rules Committee above everything else is organized to serve this House, and when the House has spoken by a majority, why should anyone rise on the floor of this House and say this is a gag rule? This House may exercise its own will.

Mr. Speaker, I want to answer some of the extreme speeches that have been made by the opposition. The Rules Committee proposes to serve the House where a majority has demonstrated it is in favor of certain emergency legislation. That is what the Rules Committee is for, and the gentlemen on that side of the House have many times used the Rules Committee for similar purposes. That is the function of that committee.

This House can speak on this bill and if a majority is in favor of its passage, the bill will be in the same position as any other legislation favored by a majority of the House. That is all there is involved, and there is no use getting excited at the eleventh hour about it.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says this has been authorized by Congress?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The construction of the highway has been authorized, and it is being built now.

Mr. RICH. What authority has the gentleman for making that statement? Where is the law?

Mr. GREENWOOD. It has been authorized by the Congress. The Congress has appropriated millions of dollars which are being administered by the Chief Executive on all kinds of similar projects in the United States. This one is just the same.

Mr. RICH. It has been authorized by Executive order of the President of the United States only.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 146, nays 139, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]
YEAS—146

Barden	Dickstein	Lewis, Colo.	Ryan
Barry	Dingell	Lewis, Md.	Sabath
Beam	Doughton	Lucas	Sanders, Tex.
Bell	Doxey	McGehee	Scrugham
Bland	Driver	McLaughlin	Sirovich
Blanton	Duffy, N. Y.	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Boehne	Duncan	McReynolds	Smith, W. Va.
Boland	Dunn, Pa.	McSwain	Snyder, Pa.
Boykin	Eckert	Mansfield	Somers, N. Y.
Boylan	Edmiston	May	South
Brown, Ga.	Evans	Mead	Spence
Brown, Mich.	Farley	Merritt, N. Y.	Starnes
Buchanan	Flannagan	Miller	Steagall
Buck	Ford, Calif.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sutphin
Burch	Ford, Miss.	Murdock	Tarver
Cannon, Mo.	Frey	O'Connell	Taylor, Tenn.
Carmichael	Fuller	O'Connor	Terry
Castellow	Gasque	O'Day	Thom
Chandler	Gildea	O'Leary	Thomason
Chapman	Gingery	Oliver	Tonry
Clark, N. C.	Goldsborough	O'Malley	Turner
Colden	Greenwood	Owen	Umstead
Colmer	Greever	Patman	Utterback
Connery	Hancock, N. C.	Patton	Vinson, Ga.
Cooley	Hart	Pearson	Vinson, Ky.
Cooper, Tenn.	Harter	Peterson, Ga.	Wallgren
Cox	Hill, Ala.	Pfeifer	Walter
Crosby	Hill, Samuel B.	Ramsay	Warren
Cross, Tex.	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph	Werner
Crowe	Johnson, W. Va.	Rankin	West
Cullen	Jones	Rayburn	Whelchel
Curley	Keller	Reece	White
Daly	Kerr	Reilly	Whittington
Darden	Knutson	Richards	Williams
Delaney	Kramer	Robertson	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Kvale	Rogers, Okla.	
DeRouen	Lambeth	Romjue	

NAYS—139

Adair	Engel	Lemke	Polk
Amle	Fenerty	Lord	Powers
Andresen	Fletcher	Luckey	Quinn
Arends	Fulmer	Ludlow	Ramspeck
Ashbrook	Gavagan	Lundeen	Ransley
Beiter	Gearhart	McAndrews	Reed, Ill.
Biermann	Gehrmann	McCormack	Rich
Binderup	Gilchrist	McKough	Risk
Blackney	Gillette	McLean	Rogers, Mass.
Bolleau	Goodwin	Maas	Rogers, N. H.
Buckler, Minn.	Gray, Ind.	Mahon	Russell
Burdick	Gray, Pa.	Main	Schaefer
Burnham	Griswold	Mapes	Schulte
Carlson	Guyar	Marcantonio	Seger
Casey	Gwynne	Marshall	Shanley
Cavicchia	Halleck	Martin, Colo.	Shannon
Christianson	Hancock, N. Y.	Mason	Sisson
Church	Harlan	Massingale	Smith, Conn.
Coffee	Hartley	Meeks	Smith, Wash.
Cole, N. Y.	Hennings	Merritt, Conn.	Snell
Cooper, Ohio	Higgins, Conn.	Michener	Stefan
Costello	Hildebrandt	Millard	Stewart
Cravens	Hoffman	Mitchell, Ill.	Sweeney
Crawford	Holmes	Moritz	Taber
Crosser, Ohio	Houston	Mott	Thompson
Crowther	Huddleston	Norton	Thurston
Culkin	Hull	O'Brien	Tinkham
Darrow	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Neal	Treadway
Dietrich	Jenkins, Ohio	Palmisano	Turpin
Dirksen	Kahn	Parsons	Wearin
Dobbins	Kelly	Patterson	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Kenney	Pettengill	Wolcott
Eicher	Kinzer	Pierce	Wolverton
Ekwall	Kloeb	Pittenger	Woodruff
Ellenbogen	Kopplemann	Plumley	

NOT VOTING—138

Allen	Corning	Gassaway	Lambertson
Andrews	Creal	Gifford	Lamneck
Ayers	Cummings	Granfield	Lanham
Bacharach	Dear	Green	Larrabee
Bacon	Deen	Greenway	Lea, Calif.
Berlin	Dies	Gregory	Lee, Okla.
Bloom	Disney	Haines	Lehlbach
Bolton	Ditter	Hamlin	Lesinski
Brennan	Dockweiler	Healey	McClellan
Brewster	Dorsey	Hess	McFarlane
Brooks	Doutrich	Higgins, Mass.	McGrath
Buckley, N. Y.	Drewry	Hill, Knute	McGroarty
Bulwinkle	Driscoll	Hobbs	McLeod
Caldwell	Duffy, Ohio	Hoeppe	Maloney
Cannon, Wis.	Dunn, Miss.	Hollister	Martin, Mass.
Carpenter	Eagle	Hook	Maverick
Carter	Eaton	Hope	Monaghan
Cartwright	Englebright	Imhoff	Montague
Cary	Faddis	Jacobsen	Monte
Celler	Ferguson	Johnson, Okla.	Moran
Citron	Fernandez	Kee	Nelson
Claborne	Fiesinger	Kennedy, Md.	Nichols
Clark, Idaho	Fish	Kennedy, N. Y.	Parks
Cochran	Fitzpatrick	Kleberg	Peterson, Fla.
Cole, Md.	Focht	Kniffin	Peyser
Collins	Gambrill	Kocalkowski	Rabaut

Reed, N. Y.	Schuetz	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Pa.
Richardson	Scott	Taylor, S. C.	Withrow
Robinson, Utah	Sears	Tobey	Wolfenden
Robson, Ky.	Secrest	Tolan	Wood
Sadowski	Short	Wadsworth	Woodrum
Sanders, La.	Stack	Weaver	Young
Sandlin	Stubbs	Welch	Zioncheck
Sauthoff	Sullivan	Wilcox	
Schneider, Wis.	Sumners, Tex.	Wilson, La.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Drewry (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
Mr. Montague (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).
Mr. Weaver (for) with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. Monaghan (for) with Mr. Gifford (against).
Mr. Bulwinkle (for) with Mr. Eaton (against).
Mr. Woodrum (for) with Mr. Bacon (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Focht.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Short.
Mr. Maverick with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Green with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Dorsey with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Young.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Driscoll.
Mr. Richardson with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Carpenter.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Cary.
Mr. Kniffin with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Cole of Maryland.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Kennedy of New York.
Mr. Moran with Mr. Dockweiler.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Stubbs.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Sandlin.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Wilson of Louisiana.

Mr. O'BRIEN and Mr. KOPPLEMANN changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 145, nays 131, not voting 147, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]
YEAS—145

Barden	Doxey	Lewis, Md.	Shanley
Barry	Driver	Lucas	Shannon
Beam	Duffy, N. Y.	McGehee	Sirovich
Beiter	Dunn, Miss.	McLaughlin	Smith, Va.
Bell	Dunn, Pa.	McMillan	Smith, Wash.
Bland	Eckert	McReynolds	Smith, W. Va.
Blanton	Edmiston	Mansfield	Snyder, Pa.
Boehne	Evans	May	Somers, N. Y.
Boland	Farley	Mead	South
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	Miller	Spence
Brown, Mich.	Ford, Miss.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Starnes
Buck	Frey	Murdock	Steagall
Burch	Fuller	O'Connell	Sutphin
Cannon, Mo.	Gavagan	O'Connor	Tarver
Carmichael	Gildea	O'Day	Taylor, Tenn.
Castellow	Goldsborough	O'Leary	Terry
Chandler	Greenwood	Oliver	Thom
Clark, N. C.	Greever	O'Malley	Thomason
Cochran	Griswold	Owen	Tonry
Colden	Hancock, N. C.	Patman	Turner
Colmer	Hart	Patton	Umstead
Cooley	Harter	Pearson	Utterback
Cooper, Tenn.	Hennings	Peterson, Ga.	Vinson, Ky.
Cox	Hill, Ala.	Pfeifer	Wallgren
Crosby	Hill, Samuel B.	Rabaut	Walter
Cross, Tex.	Jenckes, Ind.	Ramsay	Warren
Crosser, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Randolph	Wearin
Crowe	Johnson, Tex.	Rankin	Werner
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	Rayburn	West
Curley	Keller	Reilly	Whelchel
Daly	Kerr	Richards	White
Darden	Knutson	Robertson	Whittington
Delaney	Kramer	Rogers, Okla.	Williams
Dempsey	Kvale	Romjue	Zimmerman
DeRouen	Lambeth	Ryan	
Dingell	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, Tex.	
Doughton	Lewis, Colo.	Scrugham	

NAYS—131

Adair	Ekwall	Lambertson	Pittenger
Andresen	Ellenbogen	Lemke	Plumley
Arends	Engel	Lord	Polk
Ashbrook	Fenerty	Luckey	Powers
Biermann	Fletcher	Ludlow	Ramspeck
Blinderup	Focht	Lundeen	Ransley
Blackney	Fulmer	McAndrews	Reed, Ill.
Bolleau	Gearhart	McCormack	Rich
Buckler, Minn.	Gehrman	McKeough	Risk
Burdick	Gilchrist	McLean	Rogers, Mass.
Burnham	Gillette	Maas	Rogers, N. H.
Carlson	Goodwin	Mahon	Russell
Carpenter	Gray, Ind.	Main	Schaefer
Casey	Guy	Mapes	Seeger
Cavicchia	Gwynne	Marcantonio	Short
Christianson	Halleck	Marshall	Sisson
Church	Hancock, N. Y.	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Conn.
Citron	Harlan	Mason	Snell
Coffee	Hartley	Massingale	Stefan
Cole, N. Y.	Higgins, Conn.	Meeks	Stewart
Connery	Higgins, Mass.	Merritt, Conn.	Sweeney
Cooper, Ohio	Hildebrandt	Michener	Taber
Costello	Hoffman	Millard	Thompson
Cravens	Holmes	Mitchell, Ill.	Thurston
Crawford	Houston	Moritz	Tinkham
Culkin	Huddleston	Mott	Treadway
Darrow	Hull	Norton	Turpin
Dickstein	Jenkins, Ohio	O'Brien	Wigglesworth
Dirksen	Kahn	O'Neal	Wolcott
Dobbins	Kelly	Parsons	Wolverton
Dondero	Kinzer	Patterson	Woodruff
Dorsey	Kloeb	Pettengill	Young
Eicher	Kopplemann	Pierce	

NOT VOTING—147

Allen	Ditter	Imhoff	Reece
Amle	Dockweller	Jacobsen	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews	Doutrich	Jones	Richardson
Ayers	Drewry	Kee	Robinson, Utah
Bacharach	Driscoll	Kennedy, Md.	Robison, Ky.
Bacon	Duffey, Ohio	Kennedy, N. Y.	Sabath
Berlin	Duncan	Kenney	Sadowski
Bloom	Eagle	Kleberg	Sanders, La.
Bolton	Eaton	Kniffin	Sandlin
Boykin	Englebright	Kocialkowski	Sauthoff
Boylan	Faddis	Lamneck	Schneider, Wis.
Brennan	Ferguson	Lanham	Schuetz
Brewster	Fernandez	Larrabee	Schulte
Brooks	Fiesinger	Lee, Okla.	Scott
Buchanan	Fish	Lehlbach	Sears
Buckley, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Secrest
Bulwinkle	Ford, Calif.	McClellan	Stack
Caldwell	Gambrill	McFarlane	Stubbs
Cannon, Wis.	Gasque	McGrath	Sullivan
Carter	Gassaway	McGroarty	Sumners, Tex.
Cartwright	Gifford	McLeod	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Gingery	McSwain	Taylor, S. C.
Celler	Granfield	Maloney	Tobey
Chapman	Gray, Pa.	Martin, Mass.	Tolan
Clalborne	Green	Maverick	Vinson, Ga.
Clark, Idaho	Greenway	Merritt, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Cole, Md.	Gregory	Monaghan	Weaver
Collins	Haines	Montague	Welch
Corning	Hamlin	Montet	Wilcox
Creal	Healey	Moran	Wilson, La.
Crowther	Hess	Nelson	Wilson, Pa.
Cummings	Hill, Knute	Nichols	Withrow
Dear	Hobbs	Palmisano	Wolfenden
Deen	Hoepfel	Parks	Wood
Dies	Hollister	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum
Dietrich	Hook	Peyster	Zioncheck
Disney	Hope	Quinn	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Drewry (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
Mr. Montague (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).
Mr. Weaver (for) with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts (against).
Mr. Monaghan (for) with Mr. Gifford (against).
Mr. Bulwinkle (for) with Mr. Eaton (against).
Mr. Woodrum (for) with Mr. Bacon (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Jones with Mr. Amle.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Gingery with Mr. Ford of California.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Palmisano.
Mr. Merritt of New York with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Kenney with Mr. Duncan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PORTRAIT OF THE LATE MR. RAINEY

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on the Library met and, finally, selected the portrait of Henry T. Rainey painted by Howard Chandler Christy. The committee was in session at the time my good friend from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] spoke here this morning criticizing the delay, and I accept in perfectly good faith his sincerity in the matter.

I had called in four of the noted artists and critics of our country who agreed unanimously upon this portrait as the best of the 16 submitted.

Every opportunity was given to the painters of the country to enter this contest. It was the hope of the committee that this contest might bring out a portrait as individual, as great, and as outstanding in portraiture as is the wonderful head of Abe Lincoln in the rotunda of the Capitol. Such was not our good fortune because Mr. Rainey had neglected to have his marvelous head painted from life at a time when he still retained his physical powers in full. All the portraits except one were painted from photographs. Nevertheless a number of excellent portraits were offered. This made it most difficult for the committee to make its decision. It could not be hoped to make a selection acceptable to all. There was very wide divergence of opinion. It was for this reason that I thought it wise to call in men of such distinction in the art world to advise us. In view of all this I feel it incumbent upon me to appeal to the men who approach greatness to have the painters portray them while at their best, so that when a Speaker passes there will be portraits that express him at his best. That is the hope I have, so that in the future men will not be compelled to guess at what is the best expression of our great men to be passed on to posterity.

ELECTION CASE—LANZETTA V. MARCANTONIO

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Committee on Elections No. 1 in the contested-election case of Lanzetta against Marcantonio and ask for the immediate consideration of the accompanying resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 560

Resolved, That James J. Lanzetta is not entitled to a seat in the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fourth Congress from the Twentieth Congressional District of the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved, That Vito Marcantonio is entitled to a seat in the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fourth Congress from the Twentieth Congressional District of the State of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

CLAIMS OF OWNERS OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4773) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims against the United States on the part of owners of certain vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any lapse of time or any statutes of limitations, to hear, examine, and adjudicate claims against the United States on the part of owners of certain Finnish sailing vessels, to wit: *Glenard, Kensington, Vidylia, Parchim, Woodburn, Port Patrick, Grace Harwar, Professor Koch, Prompt, Albyn, Rowena, Fahrwohl, and Pampa*, for damages said to have been sustained as a result of the alleged refusal of representatives of the United States to permit said vessels to sail from United States ports during the period between March 18, 1918, and November 26, 1918: *Provided*, That such suit or suits shall be brought within 3 months after the date of the approval of this act.

Sec. 2. In determining the said claims, the Court of Claims shall pass solely on the following questions:

1. Were the 13 Finnish sailing vessels named herein, or any one or more of them, detained by the United States?
2. If the preceding question is answered in the affirmative, was such detention unlawful?
3. If the second question is answered in the affirmative, is the United States obligated to indemnify the owner or owners, or

their successors in interest, of the vessel or vessels found to have been unlawfully detained?

4. If the third question is answered in the affirmative, what indemnity should be paid by the United States with respect to each vessel found to have been unlawfully detained?

SEC. 3. The claims shall be prosecuted in the name of the owner or owners or managing owner or owners of the said several ships. If the Court of Claims, or the Supreme Court on appeal, decides that the United States is obligated to indemnify the owner or owners, or their successors in interest, the amount of the indemnity shall be paid by the United States to the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland then resident in the United States, for the use and benefit of the owner, owners, or their successors.

SEC. 4. In determining the aforesaid claims, the Court of Claims shall receive and consider the evidence and arguments contained in (a) the record mentioned in the note of the Minister of Finland to the Secretary of State, dated February 1, 1935; (b) the answer mentioned in the note of the Secretary of State to the Minister of Finland, dated March 4, 1935; and (c) the reply and additional material mentioned in the note of the Minister of Finland to the Secretary of State, dated April 12, 1935, relating to said claims.

Neither party shall be entitled as of right to present as evidence documents other than those specified herein, except copies of other correspondence pertinent to the case exchanged between the Department of State and the Legation of Finland: *Provided*, That the court shall be authorized to require the production of such additional evidence as the court deems material.

SEC. 5. A copy of the petition or petitions of the owner or owners of each of the said sailing vessels shall be served upon the Attorney General of the United States, and he, or some attorney or attorneys designated by him, shall appear and defend the interests of the United States in such case or cases. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Supreme Court to grant a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims on the petition of any party to any of the aforesaid cases, to review any determination that may be rendered by the Court of Claims under the terms of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a brief statement by the War Department.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE CANAL ZONE CODE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6719) to amend the Canal Zone Code, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, if I may make a statement about the measure, the Senate struck out one of the sections in the bill which covered a number of different bills and that one section was the only one that was in dispute. The bill passed here all right, but there was some controversy over there, because it was claimed by laborers and some of the union organizations in the Canal Zone that if the bill passed it would do away with their 30-hour week. There are other beneficial matters in the bill pertaining to retirement and things of that kind and it was thought better to strike out the amendment and let the bill go through.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it increase the tolls in any way?

Mr. BLAND. Not at all; there is nothing in the measure about tolls.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 3 to 24, inclusive.
Page 3, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "2."
Page 4, line 1, strike out "4" and insert "3."
Page 5, line 3, strike out "5" and insert "4."
Page 5, line 24, strike out "6" and insert "5."
Page 6, line 14, strike out "7" and insert "6."
Page 6, line 22, strike out "8" and insert "7."
Page 7, line 22, strike out "9" and insert "8."
Page 9, line 1, strike out "10" and insert "9."
Page 9, line 13, strike out "11" and insert "10."
Page 9, line 15, strike out "12" and insert "11."
Page 10, line 15, strike out "13" and insert "12."
Page 11, line 9, strike out "14" and insert "13."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

SAFETY AT SEA

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4648, to promote safety at sea in the neighborhood of ice and derelicts, and for other purposes, and consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON ICE PATROL AND DERELICT DESTRUCTION

SECTION 1. The President is authorized to conclude agreements with interested maritime nations (a) to maintain in the north Atlantic Ocean a service of ice patrol, of study and observation of ice and current conditions, and of assistance to vessels and their crews requiring aid within the limits of the patrol; (b) to maintain a service of study and observation of ice and current conditions in such waters as may affect the set and drift of ice in the north Atlantic Ocean; and (c) to undertake all practicable steps to insure the destruction or removal of derelicts in the northern part of the Atlantic Ocean, east of the line drawn from Cape Sable to a point in latitude 34° north, longitude 70° west, if this destruction or removal is necessary. The President is further authorized to include in such agreements a provision for payment to the United States by the countries concerned, of their proportionate share of the expense for maintenance of the services named, or for the United States to contribute proportionate share should it be agreed that another country was to maintain the patrol.

PATROL SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) Unless the agreements made in accordance with section 1 provide otherwise, an ice patrol shall be maintained during the whole of the ice season in guarding the southeastern, southern, and southwestern limits of the region of icebergs in the vicinity of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and the patrol shall inform trans-Atlantic and other passing vessels by radio and such other means as are available of the ice conditions and the extent of the dangerous region. A service of study of ice and current conditions, a service of affording assistance to vessels and crews requiring aid, and a service of removing and destroying derelicts shall be maintained during the ice season and any or all such services may be maintained during the remainder of the year as may be advisable.

(b) The ice-patrol vessels shall warn vessels known to be approaching a dangerous area and recommend safe routes.

(c) The ice patrol vessels shall record the name, together with all the facts in the case, of any ship which is observed or known to be on other than a regular recognized or advertised ship route crossing the North Atlantic Ocean, or to have crossed the fishing banks of Newfoundland north of latitude 43° north during the fishing season, or, when proceeding to and from ports of North America to have passed through regions known or believed to be endangered by ice. The name of any such ship and all pertinent information relating to the incident shall be reported to the government of the country to which the ship belongs, if the government of that country so requests.

(d) The Commandant of the Coast Guard, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall administer the services provided for in this section and shall assign thereto such vessels, material, and personnel of the Coast Guard as may be necessary. Any executive department or agency may upon the request of the Secretary of the Treasury detail personnel, loan or contribute material or equipment, or otherwise assist in the carrying out of the services named.

(e) The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall publish each year a report of the activities of the services provided for in this section, a copy of which shall be furnished to each interested foreign government and to each agency assisting in the work.

NORTH ATLANTIC ROUTES

SEC. 3. (a) The owner, or operating agent, of any passenger vessel of the United States crossing the North Atlantic Ocean shall give public notice, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the regular routes which he proposes such vessel will follow and of any changes made in a route, and shall require the vessel to follow the published route as far as circumstances will permit. Any passenger vessel of the United States crossing the North Atlantic Ocean shall follow, as far as circumstances will permit, the recognized ship routes; it shall avoid, as far as practicable, the fishing banks of Newfoundland, north of latitude 43° north during the fishing season; and shall, as far as circumstances will permit, pass outside of the regions reported or known to be endangered by ice.

(b) If the owner, or operating agent, of any such passenger vessel fails to comply with this section, he shall for each offense be liable to a fine not exceeding \$100.

SEC. 4. (a) The master of every vessel of the United States, when ice is reported on or near his course, shall proceed at a moderate speed or alter his course so as to go well clear of the danger zone.

(b) If the master of any such ship fails to comply with this section, he shall for each offense be liable to a fine not exceeding \$500.

PUBLICATION

SEC. 5. All rules and regulations, except such as have no general applicability and legal effect or are effective only against Federal agencies or persons in their capacity as officers, agents,

or employees thereof, issued, prescribed, or promulgated pursuant to authority contained herein, shall be forwarded forthwith to the Division of the Federal Register in The National Archives for filing and publishing in the Federal Register.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is simply to give legislative sanction to the ice patrol now being carried on for the United States and other governments. It is provided for in the treaty of 1929, the Convention of Safety of Life at Sea. It is felt that this legislation is necessary in order that certain restrictions and requirements contained in the 1929 convention may be applied in the same manner to American vessels as to other vessels.

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

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Has a similar bill been passed in the House?

Mr. BLAND. A similar bill in the House has been reported and it is now on the calendar.

Mr. SNELL. It comes unanimously from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any difference in the bills?

Mr. BLAND. No; it is identically the same bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY, TRI-STATE TERRITORY

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8107) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the opening of the tri-State territory of east Texas, north Louisiana, and south Arkansas by Capt. Henry Miller Shreve, to be held in Shreveport, La., and surrounding territory, in 1935 and 1936, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Shreveport, La., and of the opening to navigation of the Red River of the West by the United States Government, resulting in the development of the tri-State territory of north Louisiana, east Texas, and southwest Arkansas, there shall be struck at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint 25,000 commemorative medals of a special appropriate single design, size, weight, and composition to be fixed by the Director of the Mint with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"Sec. 2. Such commemorative medals shall be delivered to the duly authorized officers of the Shreveport Centennial, Inc., upon payment to the Director of the Mint of an amount to be fixed by the Director of the Mint not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

"Sec. 3. Whoever shall falsely make, forge, or counterfeit or cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited or shall aid in falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting any medal issued under the provisions of this act, or whoever shall sell or bring into the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof from any foreign place, or have in his possession any such false, forged, or counterfeited medal, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Shreveport, La., and the opening of the Red River of the West to navigation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY, YORK COUNTY, MAINE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4608) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in com-

memoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine, and consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, S. 4608, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine, there shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 30,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition and of special appropriate single design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

Sec. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1936, irrespective of the year in which they are minted or issued, shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the Committee for the Commemoration of the Founding of York County upon payment by it of the par value of such coins, but not less than 25,000 such coins shall be issued to it at any one time and no such coins shall be issued after the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by such committee, and the net proceeds shall be used by it in defraying the expenses incidental and appropriate to the commemoration of such event.

Sec. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purposes, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. It is my understanding that the important housing and slum-clearance bill, which many of us favor and which should by all means be enacted into law before the adjournment of this Congress, is being held in committee, and, instead of considering an important bill like that for the welfare of the people, we are asked to pass a bill of the nature now under consideration, and I object.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Oh, I wish the gentleman would withhold his objection. The gentleman ought not to hold that against me. I have nothing to do with the bill to which the gentleman refers. Possibly if it came before my committee I would give it consideration.

Mr. YOUNG. This is the important housing bill to which I refer.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I sympathize entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. It is of immense importance not only to the city dwellers but to the people of rural America.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I sympathize entirely with the gentleman and would support that policy.

Mr. YOUNG. It should be enacted into law.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I think the gentleman is right.

The regular order was directed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is going to object to that after we have let a lot of other bills go through, I give notice that there will be a lot of other things objected to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF BEACHES ALONG THE SHORES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3505) for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States, and consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for present consideration the bill S. 3505, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to assist in the construction, but not the maintenance, of works for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States, and to prevent erosion due to the action of waves, tides, and currents, with the purpose of preventing damage to property along the shores of the United States, and promoting and encouraging the healthful recreation of the people. As used in this act, the word "beaches" includes all those situated on the coasts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, and the shores of the Great Lakes, and all estuaries and bays directly connected therewith.

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War, through the Beach Erosion Board, organized under the provisions of section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved July 3, 1930, to make investigations with a view to determining the most suitable methods of beach protection and restoration of beaches in different localities; to advise the States, counties, municipalities, or individuals of the appropriate locations for recreational facilities; and to publish from time to time such useful data and information concerning the protection of beaches as the Board may deem to be of value to the people of the United States.

(b) All provisions of existing law relating to examinations and surveys and to works of improvement of rivers and harbors shall apply, insofar as practicable, to examinations and surveys and to works of improvement relating to shore protection; except that all projects having to do with shore protection shall be referred for consideration and recommendation to the Beach Erosion Board instead of to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

Sec. 3. The Beach Erosion Board, in making its report on any work or project relating to shore protection shall, in addition to any other matters upon which it may be required to report, state its opinion as to (a) the advisability of adopting the project, (b) what Federal interest, if any, is involved in the proposed improvement, and (c) what share of the expense, if any, should be borne by the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, page 1, after the word "construction" insert "where Federal interests are involved"; page 2, line 14, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert the following: "Provided, That not more than 75 percent of the cost of any specific investigation shall be borne by the United States"; page 3, add a new section, reading as follows:

"Sec. 4. Any expenses incident to the United States in the undertaking of the investigations and studies authorized herein may be paid from funds hitherto or hereafter appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies for rivers and harbors."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SELECTION OF LANDS OF STATE PARK SYSTEM IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4633) to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to valid rights existing on the date of this act, the State of California may, within 5 years, select for State park purposes by legal subdivisions all or any portion of the public land not reserved for public purposes in the following townships:

Township 13 south, range 4 east, San Bernardino meridian, sections 25, 26, 35, and 36; township 13 south, range 5 east; township 13 south, range 6 east; township 13 south, range 7 east; township 13 south, range 8 east; township 13 south, range 9 east.

Township 14 south, range 4 east, sections 1 and 12; township 14 south, range 5 east, sections 1 to 26, inclusive, 35, and 36; township 14 south, range 6 east; township 14 south, range 7 east; township 14 south, range 8 east; township 14 south, range 9 east.

Township 15 south, range 6 east, sections 1 to 18, inclusive; township 15 south, range 6 east, sections 21 to 27, inclusive; township 15 south, range 6 east, sections 34, 35, and 36; township 15 south, range 7 east; township 15 south, range 8 east; township 15 south, range 9 east; township 15 south, range 10 east, sections 29, 30, 31, and 32.

Township 16 south, range 6 east, sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16; township 16 south, range 7 east; township 16 south, range 8 east; township 16 south, range 9 east, sections 1 to 12, inclusive; township 16 south, range 10 east, sections 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Township 17 south, range 8 east, San Bernardino meridian: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may set aside lands of approximately 42,000 acres of the above-described area, and may in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, transfer complete title to all or any part of the same to the State of California on the basis of acre for acre in

consideration of the transfer by the State of California to the United States of the complete title to lands owned by said State within the area withdrawn by Executive Order No. 6361 of October 25, 1933, and the provisions of section 2 of this act shall not apply thereto.

Sec. 2. Upon the submission of satisfactory proof that the land selected contains characteristic desert growth and scenic or other natural features which it is desirable to preserve as a part of the California State park system, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause patents to issue therefor: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all coal, oil, gas, or other mineral contained in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same at such times and under such conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That any patent so issued shall contain a provision for reversion of title to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that for a period of more than 1 year the land has not been used by the State for park purposes: *And provided further*, That in order to consolidate park areas or to eliminate private holdings therefrom, lands patented hereunder may be exchanged with the approval of and under rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for privately owned lands in the area hereinbefore described of approximately equal value containing the natural features sought to be preserved hereby. The lands so acquired to be subject to all the conditions and reservations prescribed by this act, including the reversionary clause hereinbefore set out.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASSAIC VALLEY SEWERAGE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3143) for the relief of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$109,088.03 to the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners, a body politic and corporate, created by and under the laws of the State of New Jersey, and by said laws vested with the title to the Passaic Valley sewer, for damage done to the outlet of said sewer at or near Robbins Reef in the harbor of New York by the steamship *Leviathan*, a passenger vessel owned by the Government of the United States and operated under the direction and control of the United States Shipping Board and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, on the 21st day of December 1923: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOSSES SUSTAINED BY COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 38) for the adjustment and settlement of losses sustained by the cooperative marketing associations.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of adjustment and settlement of losses sustained by the cooperative marketing associations dealing in grain during the stabilization operations of the Federal Farm Board in the years 1929 and 1930 when such cooperative marketing associations were induced and requested by the Federal Farm Board to withhold grain from the market and to make advances to their members in order to stabilize prices, the Federal Farm Credit Administration is hereby authorized and directed to make such adjustments and settlements in accordance with the understanding that such cooperative marketing associations had with the Federal Farm Board, and on the basis of a price or a sum equal to the amount directly loaned or advanced to such associations plus carrying charges and operation costs in connection with such grain from the date of the loans or advances to the date that such grain was finally taken over by the Federal Farm Board or delivered pursuant to its instructions.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, down to and including line 10 on page 2, and insert the following: "That the Court of Claims, in accordance with such rules as it may adopt, shall investigate losses sustained during the stabilization operations of the Federal Farm Board in 1929 and 1930,

by cooperative associations to which loans were made, either directly or indirectly, by the Federal Farm Board, through withholding grain from the market and making advances to their members in order to stabilize prices, for the purpose of determining—

"(1) The amount of loss, if any, in the case of each such association and the facts and circumstances relating to such loss; and

"(2) Whether, because of any agreement or understanding between such associations, or any of them, and the Federal Farm Board (or any member, officer, or employee thereof) or because of any other facts or circumstances, there is any legal, equitable, or moral obligation on the part of the United States to reimburse such associations, or any of them, for the whole or any part of any such loss.

"The court shall report to Congress, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation and determinations, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "Joint resolution to provide for an inquiry by the Court of Claims with respect to losses sustained by cooperative marketing associations in connection with stabilization activities in grain."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 551.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation to determine (1) the fair and proper basis of compensation for postmasters of the fourth class, and (2) the fair and proper basis of compensation for carrying mail on star routes. The Post Office Department shall make available to the committee such material and such information as it has in its possession with respect to the subjects under investigation by the committee.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places within or outside the District of Columbia, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done as it deems necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, to ask a question. As I understand, the gentleman simply proposes to do some work with his own committee, at no expense whatever to the Government? It is simply to prepare the committee for legislation at the next session?

Mr. MEAD. Further than that, our committee has requested the Post Office Department to conduct these two investigations, and we merely call upon them to turn over their findings to us for review. During the interim, and until Congress convenes, without any expense to the Government, we intend to use that material for the purpose of legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—these hearings are to be in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; except such hearings as the Post Office Department itself conducts. As far as the committee or subcommittee is concerned, there will be no hearings outside of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. None at all?

Mr. MEAD. None at all.

Mr. BLANTON. And there will be no expense whatever?

Mr. MEAD. None whatever.

Mr. BLANTON. The Post Office Department can conduct this investigation through their own investigators in different places?

Mr. MEAD. We have requested them to do so and they have agreed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Reserving the right to object, is this study being made with the objective of increasing salaries?

Mr. MEAD. None whatever. The idea is to improve the service. As a result of the evolution in transportation we find about 40,000 communities which were formerly served by railway service are now without such service. We feel that these two investigations, conducted at our request by the Department, will result in the improvement of the service, and no additional expense, as far as we are concerned.

Mr. FLETCHER. Do you propose to lower the population requirement of the towns in relation to the carrier service?

Mr. MEAD. No. We have no intention whatever of doing anything like that. It may be necessary to augment existing service with star-route service or rural service or motor-truck service, if it will be beneficial where the railroad or bus service has been withdrawn.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no additional cost to the Government?

Mr. MEAD. None whatever, except for new service required from time to time.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no contemplation of increasing salaries?

Mr. MEAD. None whatever. We may suggest changes in the present system.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, one further question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to get the gentleman's attitude on this matter. There has been a disposition on the part of certain inspectors in order to get a record for economy to recommend the abolition of certain little post offices and put those communities on rural routes.

This is detrimental to the interests of the people living in the communities. It means everything to people living out in the country to have a post office. They want to get money orders; they want to use the parcel post; they want this, that, and the other from the post office; and they are entitled to have a post office. These inspectors ought to be instructed that there is something besides economy in furnishing postal service to the country people of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. I hope the gentleman from Texas will come before our committee on that subject.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall do so, without doubt, and give the committee the benefit of some specific evidence I have in my office files.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BAUSCH & LOMB OPTICAL CO.

Mr. DUFFY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2268) for the relief of Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that in the final hours of this session of Congress, after we have been here since January, we could do much better than spend our time on private bills for the relief of some individuals or corporations. If we would consider an important measure such as the Wagner housing and slum-clearance bill and enact it into law, we would render real and needful service to the people of rural America and to the underprivileged people living in insanitary and overcrowded dwellings in the cities throughout this Nation. It seems to me it is a disgraceful performance that this important measure is held pigeonholed in the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Seventy-fourth Congress will evade a major responsibility if it adjourns without enacting this important measure into law.

I know nothing about the particular bill under consideration, of course, and do not object to it; but I feel that we should be spending our time upon more important matters. What could be more important than to provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, by way of answer to the gentleman's statement in reference to the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill, I may say that the parliamentary situation is such that the gentleman may get the consent of the Speaker to be recognized to suspend the

rules and pass the bill, and we shall be pleased to meet the issue.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish we could suspend the rules and pass it. Recognition would not be accorded to me for the purpose of making such a motion. Also, I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., a corporation, of Rochester, N. Y., the sum of \$33,487.34, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States on account of expenditures made by said Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., pursuant to an arrangement between said Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. and representatives of the War and Navy Departments of the United States, in the maintenance of special guards for the protection of its plant and property against violence and espionage of enemy aliens from December 4, 1917, through December 7, 1918: *Provided,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any portion of the funds appropriated in this act on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any persons violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the extension for which I secured permission a few minutes ago printed in the permanent RECORD immediately after my remarks of May 22, 1936.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with my bill to create the Wisconsin Valley Authority and to include therein some tables of comparative electrical rates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SALE OF PUBLIC DOMAIN IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4241) to provide for the sale of a certain isolated tract of the public domain in the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law or any Executive order, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized upon application filed within 6 months from the date of this act to order into the market and sell at public auction for not less than the appraised value, lot 5, section 21, township 2 south, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, subject to the provisions and reservations of section 24 of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended by the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 846): *Provided,* That any money paid in connection with such sale shall be deposited in the Oregon and California land-grant fund in the United States Treasury.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUERTO RICO IS HELD FREE BY UNITED STATES

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on bills involving Puerto Rico and to also include a resolution from the legislature of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction to a large majority of the people of Puerto Rico and to all of us

that at the close of this session certain bills of Senator TYDINGS, which were passed by the Senate without having hearings to give those representatives of the island most interested a chance to express their views against independence, and the other bill, which proposed to legislate regarding local election laws of Puerto Rico, were not considered by the House in any way following the advices and petitions of the insular legislature and its leadership.

Sentiment for independence has been propagated by a group in the island, but never has it reached the importance on the scale that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands have given to it for the past 37 years. Although Puerto Rico came under the rule of the United States under the same circumstances as the Philippines, its people generally have not favored separation but a closer and more permanent union with the people of the United States. The people have been in favor of the largest measure of self-government within the American Union.

THE ELECTION LAW

The action of Senator TYDINGS in introducing his election bill for Puerto Rico and sponsoring its passage in the Senate was a tremendous mistake. Senator TYDINGS should have known better.

Vice President of the Insular Legislature Bolivar Pagan explains the fundamentals of the election law passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico in a very clear and enlightening way. It shows how our legislators are thinking, despite what their enemies may have thought of them.

This statement represents fundamentally the opinion of the great majority of the people and all parties of the island, because—

One of the measures most fundamental and important for the regime of democratic people is the election law. It constitutes the basis of democracy. Without an election law fair to all political parties and to all citizens who exercise the lofty prerogative of suffrage, democracy would be a farce. Discussions of election laws have always provoked heated controversies in popular parliaments. The men who love democracy honestly believe that, among the different forms of government which the human mind has conceived in the course of history, the best is that formula which guarantees government by majorities. By respecting these principles, every citizen of sincere sentiments and democratic convictions should always strive to prevent the machinery created by the election law from becoming an instrument of coercion or of oppression, and he should sincerely aspire to have such election machinery an honest vehicle for the free and unsullied expression of popular suffrage. A victory at the polls, under the protection of an election law without guaranty to all the sectors and the citizens who take part in elections, is the victory which does not honor or give prestige to any democratic people.

With the said ideas in mind, we have tried to make an election law that would be a guaranty of democracy and would give prestige to our country. The election law (S. B. 9) modified several sections of the election law in force and adds others, improving the law which, with amendments, has been in force in Puerto Rico since the year 1919, approved immediately after the organic act in force was implanted in Puerto Rico.

THE UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

This new law has special importance, because under it will be put in force the act recently passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico consecrating for the first time in our history and to a greater extent than in any other democratic country of the world the grand principle of universal suffrage for men and women without distinction of any kind, establishing the just equality of all citizens at the polls.

THE RIGHT OF COALITIONS

The most important aspects of the new law which we are explaining are several. The principle of the coalition of parties is considered. The principle of the coalition of parties has been the subject of discussions in these latter decades in all countries of the world where the vote of the people determines the governments which are to rule the peoples. In the historical beginnings of democratic practices the nuclei of opinion have generally been divided into two great opposing sectors. Later, in the evolution of ideas and the liberty of thought, numerous parties have arisen in each democratic country in regard to the various public problems set before the consciousness of the people, and for that reason it has been indispensable, in order to secure order and to establish government, to allow coalitions of those parties that may constitute a majority and organize governments as well as to prevent the confusion and the chaos of numerous groups, none of them sufficiently strong to form governments. In the most civilized countries of the world—among them England, France, Spain, Germany, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland—coalitions have been formed for the said purposes. Only in those countries under military dictatorships or dictatorial leaders has it been possible, by various hateful means, to coerce public opinion, to establish one single party, and, finally, to prohibit coalitions.

In Puerto Rico it was not until the year 1924 that coalitions of parties were permitted for the first time. The party that was in power from the year 1904, for reasons which we do not now wish to comment upon, always prohibited in the election law the coalition of parties, especially when public opinion in Puerto Rico was divided into two great historical parties, both already extinct in the evolution of our local politics. When the Socialist Party entered the public arena as the hope of the laboring and rural multitudes, with its redeeming program that embodied the aspirations of the laboring masses and of a great part of all the people, then began the idea of a coalition of the Puerto Rican Republican Party and the Socialist Party. In order to prevent this the party which for so many years had been in power caused the prohibition against such coalitions of parties to be made more effective. It was in 1924, in view of the need and convenience of the historical parties, that a law was enacted so that the common candidates could appear on both tickets. The Socialist Party, outside of the combination for powerful reasons of principles, could not, under that law, form a coalition on the electoral ballot with the Constitutional-Historical Party (pure Republican) because the act did not recognize the rights of the powerful nucleus of Puerto Ricans who were to form the Constitutional-Historical Party. It was necessary for the Socialist Party to support in its column of the ballot the candidates of the Constitutional-Historical Party by placing together the emblems of these parties, practically forming a new party, to which political organization the Socialist Party gave the given name and the Constitutional-Historical Party gave it the surname, this new party being called Socialist-Constitutional.

CONSTITUTIONAL

That which seemed fair in order to facilitate coalitions of the historical parties in 1924 has been maintained in this new election law which we are explaining, coalitions being allowed and at the same time being made more easy, liberal, and just, so that the new law would not maintain the injustice of the law of 1924 which prevented a powerful nucleus of opinion from being able to register its own ticket with candidates common to the ticket of another party. Now, under the new law, all parties, either great or small, with privileges to none, may form a coalition by making their common candidates appear on the same ticket. Another important aspect of the new election law is the representation of the parties in the electoral bodies. In the past, from the formation of parties at the beginning of the American civil regime in Puerto Rico, the total representation was divided in equal parts between the historical parties, Union de Puerto Rico and Republicano Puertorriqueno, from the birth of these two parties. The Socialist Party, a giant that arose before public consciousness and claimed its position in the political arena, had to strive titanically and heroically in order to secure fair representation on the electoral bodies. It was somewhat later that the Socialist Party succeeded in having representation equal to the other parties, and only after it had gained with votes at the polls the position of the party second in electoral strength and after this right had been recognized by the judicial voice of our Supreme Court.

THE ALLIANCE

In 1924, when the alliance of the aforesaid historical parties, Union de Puerto Rico and Republicano Puertorriqueno, was formed, these two parties monopolized the representation in the electoral bodies under the election law then in force, thus providing that a single party, the Alianza Puertorriquena, enjoyed two representatives on the insular board of elections, enjoyed the total representation of the three representatives on local election boards, and enjoyed all four representatives on poll boards. The powerful Socialist Party, in spite of the fact that it was joined in the opposition by the newborn and vigorous Puer Republican Party, had to go to the polls in 1924 with no effective representation in the electoral bodies. The election law merely granted the Socialist-Constitutional Party a so-called observers faced the walls and not the ballot box, as was their right.

Due to the disappearance of the Puerto Rican Republican Party as a principal party, by mandate of the ballot box, its place having been won by the Socialist Party, the Socialist Party in 1928 had for the first time effective representation in the electoral bodies. When the first combination of parties was made for voting for common candidates in 1924, the historical parties that combined at that time monopolized the whole representation, and these allied principal parties did not divide their representation into half votes against the opposition party at the polls. It was in 1932, after the victory won by the popular front made up of the Socialist Party and the Union-Republican Party, that electoral representation in Puerto Rico began to develop democratically and fairly. In 1934 this Union-Republican and Socialist coalition that won the election passed an election law providing for the first time in our electoral history that in case two parties formed a coalition the two parties thus combined would each have only half a vote and the opposing party a whole vote. The legislature of 1934, looking toward the future with lofty ideals in mind, inspired by a sense of justice, and considering all human possibilities, also provided that if the three principal parties formed a coalition, each would then have but one-third of a vote, so that always, under any circumstance, the opposing parties would have the same representation. This is a glory that no one will dispute with the present parliamentary majority of Puerto Rico.

TO AVOID FRAUDS

The other principal aspect which the new law which we are explaining considers, is the process of voting. The aforesaid election law approved in 1919, as well as other previous election laws, provided a manner of voting which was the same that has been in

force from the establishment of the American civil regime in Puerto Rico to the 1933 election. Under the provisions establishing said manner of voting, a political party was in public power in Puerto Rico for 25 years, without any objection ever having been raised against said manner of voting. Under the same provisions relative to the manner of voting, the election of 1932 was held and resulted in a victory for the present legislative majority. This 1932 election, in accordance with official statement of the Governor of Puerto Rico, Hon. James R. Beverely, and of the Secretary of War of the United States, Hon. George H. Dern, was the most peaceful, lawful, and fair election ever held in Puerto Rico. These statements appear in official documents of the White House and of the Congress of the United States.

Nevertheless, in answer to a powerful public clamor, all the parties represented in the present legislature deemed it advisable and proper that, to hold the 1936 and subsequent elections, the voting should be carried on in a new way, that is, by enclosing the voters in quarters to prevent, as far as possible, the fraudulent repeating vote of the same voter in different polling places or precincts, and to insure, as far as possible, that the voters who vote are legitimate voters having the right to vote under our laws. This new law which we are explaining modifies this process and improves it. In view of the physical impossibility of obtaining adequate quarters in numerous precincts of the island, and in order to insure an orderly and lawful election, the new law grants powers to the election bodies in which all parties are equally represented, so that they may choose and decide, when said closed quarters cannot be obtained, that the voters be placed in front of the polling places, in closed files, the same procedure for voting to be followed as in the closed quarters.

The other amendments that the new bill makes to the election law are details of no great importance, and are to make more effective the aspects on which we have commented.

Finally, we wish to state that we have voted in favor of the new bill because we believe that it is just, that no reasonable opposition can be made to it, and because it is a statute which gives prestige to Puerto Rico and guarantees democracy and the fairness of the vote.

LEGISLATION FOR PUERTO RICO

Over 30 bills have been introduced during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses dealing with the economic, political, industrial, and agricultural life of Puerto Rico, as well as other bills of a private nature. Six of these bills became law. One measure proposed to liberalize our organic act granting the people of the island the right to elect their own Governor and to permit the Governor to appoint the heads of the various departments with the advice and consent of the insular senate. It also contained other progressive clauses, but did not pass.

Another bill of great importance was the one to enable the people of Puerto Rico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States. It also failed to pass.

The provisions of over 60 bills which became law of a national scope have been extended to Puerto Rico, intended to help in the services of education, relief, reconstruction, building of roads, sanitation, and other activities which are greatly needed in the island.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES DENIED

In conferences which I have had with high Government officials it has been plainly stated that while the administration is willing to give assistance to the island, it does not desire to favor any special party or individual who claims to have obtained any personal advantage, political or otherwise, for the prosecution of their particular or political preferences. If such declaration is carried out with sincerity, it will do good to the island.

In considering our social and economic problems which confront us we have to admit that the situation is not all satisfactory—the standard of living and education among the working classes, especially among those in the agricultural fields, although constantly improving, yet are not so high as we should like to see them. There is dire need of further improvement.

But regardless of whatever mistakes might have been made the liberalization of our organic act in a broad way is necessary to prevent not only serious disturbances in our economic, social, and political set-up but harmful effects of an impairment to our present structure, with the result that future reforms may be established in an easy and happy way.

THE LANDING OF AMERICANS

When General Miles landed in Puerto Rico in 1898 he met a hearty welcome from the entire population of the island, who for a long time had felt the highest regard for the United States. The change of sovereignty was considered by all a

most fortunate event in the history of the island, and when later on, in the year 1917, President Wilson signed the law which made Puerto Ricans citizens of the United States, the honor was accepted without reservations and with full recognition of the responsibilities, duties, and rights which it bestowed upon us. The loyalty and sincerity of purpose of the people of Puerto Rico are far above any possible question. We have done our duty and played our part in the sorrows and happiness of the Nation.

Puerto Rico has a population of over 1,700,000 people, according to the special census taken in 1936, or almost 500 inhabitants to the square mile. The population of Puerto Rico in 1930 exceeded the combined population of Nevada, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, and Vermont, judging from the latest figures released by the Census Bureau.

The Resident Commissioner, not having a vote in Congress, cannot exercise the great influence which is exercised by the representatives of the several States of the Union.

The influence of the people of the United States in the destiny of Puerto Rico has been, is, and will ever be, uplifting, and the extension of the Constitution to the island represented a positive guarantee to the individual citizen of all national economic and social legislation and of all the political liberties convenient and favorable to the enjoyment of the people's rights.

PERMANENT UNION

We consider any formula of inferiority in government disgraceful and not compatible with the civil dignity of our Nation, and, therefore, we proclaim the permanent union of the people of Puerto Rico on an equal footing with the people of the United States to maintain and consecrate economically, socially, politically, and industrially a democratic community with the same rights and duties as any State of our Nation. "We want, and are willing, to be recognized as an integral part of the States, and lead our future in that line."

Congress, as contemplated in the treaty of peace, granted American citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico, and, under the Jones Act, created a political body and a civil government, composed of American citizens in Puerto Rico, owing allegiance and entitled to the protections of the United States. The island has over 1,700,000 American citizens, and for two generations our men, women, and children and the children of our children have been born under the American flag and have been taught the American ideals of Government in the forum in our courts, in our schools, in our entire civil life.

OUR PROGRESS

I want to express some thought regarding the progress made by the Americanization of Puerto Rico from a general economic, political, and administrative point of view. During the autonomous regime granted Puerto Rico by Spain in 1897, the island had an income for itself derived from royal tariffs, taxes on personal cedulas, disembarkment of voyagers, ecclesiastic bills, payments of periodicals, cedulas on privileges, and taxes on raffles and lotteries. The different classes of general taxes and others which were paid to the insular and municipal treasuries reached 29 divisions and numerous subdivisions.

The total budget of income during the Spanish autonomous regime reached the sum of \$3,536,342.19. This total income of the insular treasury was spent in a great part for soldiers and marines, clergy, construction and repair of churches and pensions up to the sum of \$2,174,879.13. The other expenditures of the Government, such as public education, public works, sanitation, and justice, were assigned \$1,361,963.06.

In these days we spent on public education from funds of the State \$30,000, and the municipalities spent in education through the Paulist Fathers, Jesuits, and Sisters of the Sacred Heart, \$99,255. There were only 22,265 children in the schools throughout the island. The benefit of superior studies was granted to only 55 students every year. Under our present American regime there are more than 240,000 children in the schools, and they are not restricted from reaching superior grades. More than \$4,000,000 from a

budget of over \$11,000,000 are assigned for schools and teachers.

Under the first year of our American regime the construction of the first buildings for public schools was ordered. We have already organized an army of 5,000 teachers, who teach English and Spanish, and we use at present more than 2,000 buildings, constructed for graded and high schools, which are the property of the insular government.

When the old regime was changed for the American regime there were 157.12 miles of constructed roads. From June 30, 1900, to June 30, 1935, 2,000 kilometers of insular roads have been constructed, and also numerous bridges and buildings, at a great cost.

The sanitation, agricultural, and labor departments were organized for the first time in the island during the present regime, and the installation of a modern system of public-health service has been inaugurated and also great services have been dedicated to agriculture and labor.

The insular government is composed at present of the following employees in public service, including the Governor, the legislature, and the departments, who receive the following compensation: Six thousand and eleven Puerto Rican-American employees \$6,579,748, and 233 continental Americans \$489,585.75. Of this total employees, over 4,000 are school teachers and over 800 comprise the police force.

The judiciary of Puerto Rico has only three continental Americans serving as judges. The continental Americans in the executive government are three, including the Governor. The other continental Americans are mostly teachers and professors and other scientific men from the Federal departments.

PUERTO RICO IS A TERRITORY

In a series of decisions known as the insular cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has clarified the present status of Puerto Rico as an organized Territory, though not an incorporated one.

We hope that at the earliest opportunity, in considering the political and economic reforms of Puerto Rico, Congress will liberalize our organic law as has been proposed by H. R. 1393, and then we could hope that the ultimate political status of the island would be to organize the people of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union. Having defined this objective, Congress should give Puerto Rico its cooperation by extending to the island all national measures with ample possibility of action to work out a practical program and reach the goal by the efforts of its own people. The words of hope and action of the President should always embrace Puerto Rico as an integral part of our Nation, and, I believe, he has demonstrated that he has this thought in mind.

COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Puerto Rico stands today as the first best buyer of United States goods in all Latin America and the eighth of all the European nations. The fact that Puerto Rico has bought, and is continuing to buy, millions upon millions of dollars' worth of goods from continental United States is vitally interesting. It is estimated that Puerto Rico has purchased over \$2,000,000,000 worth of commodities from the mainland during the last 36 years.

In accordance with the last report of the Governor of Puerto Rico for the fiscal year 1934-35, the following enlightening statement was made with regard to its commerce:

Statistically the island had a good trade year with an external commerce of approximately \$150,000,000, an increase of \$19,500,000 over the previous year, while the apparent favorable balance of trade was \$22,000,000. Of total exports to the United States valued at \$83,000,000, sugar shipments accounted for \$54,267,000 while approximately 20 percent of the sugar crop remained in the island. Island imports from the United States increased \$8,600,000 over the previous year and totaled \$57,500,000. During the year 2,834 ships entered island ports.

In view of the fact that agriculture is Puerto Rico's most important industry, the report on this subject has special interest. While there has been considerable recovery from the destructive hurricane of 1932, the Governor finds that other forces have held back agricultural progress, except in sugar and tobacco. Sugar production increased almost 275,000 tons over the previous year, while the tobacco crop of 25,000,000 pounds showed a gain of approximately 7,000,000 pounds over the curtailed crop of 1933.

Puerto Rico is not a burden to the United States.

Two-thirds of the profits in commercial exportations and importations derived from the 1,700,000 Puerto Rican consumers flows right back and remains in the hands of continental businessmen. So the relief and cooperation given to Puerto Rico through Federal agencies represents a natural compensation to the people of the island.

LABOR IN AMERICA

In a statement made by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, he contends:

Public policies should not be decided abruptly, but with reference to historic development. Since 1898 Puerto Rico has been under the flag of the United States, and since 1917 its residents have been citizens of the United States. We took them under our flag to put an end to political persecution and bloodshed and assumed the obligation of helping them to develop the institutions and habits of democracy. During the years of our responsibility there has been progress in Puerto Rico. With that progress new needs have become urgent and new demands have been urged. There are manifestations of a growing vision of the possibilities of life and of a higher level of thinking.

Economically Puerto Rico has been an advantage. It is one of our largest customers, and in turn supplies us with things we need. Strategically, in international relations that do not assure years of peace, it is important that the United States control significant outposts. The withdrawal of the United States Government from Puerto Rico would not mean Puerto Rican independence any more than withdrawal from the Philippines has meant self-control in those islands. A small and specially privileged group in Puerto Rico has been asking independence, but the majority of its citizens, including the labor movement of Puerto Rico, desire statehood under our Republic.

It was only under the flag of the United States that the workers of Puerto Rico were free to organize a labor movement for the purpose of bettering their conditions of life and work. The American Federation of Labor gave them support and counsel in formulating their policies and methods. The labor movement in Puerto Rico includes agricultural as well as industrial workers. The effective functioning of the labor movement at the present time, when the reconstruction program is in progress in Puerto Rico, is indispensable to desirable and lasting results from that program. It is the masses of the people who suffer from the existing economic exploitation.

Under independence the possibility is for reversion to old institutions and practice, which would imply repression for labor unions and the masses of the people.

The desire for independence is confined to a small group of people, while the majority have felt that the protection of the United States Government afforded the best opportunity for development and progress. They feel that as an independent government the island would not be powerful enough to control the corporations which exploit the people and the land and drain off revenues to be spent in foreign markets. Puerto Rico has made real progress under the leadership of the United States and is anxious to continue without change in political relationships. We cannot lightly relinquish an obligation we assumed.

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein extracts from a statement by Dr. John Bryan on the labor situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include excerpts from an address by the Right Reverend John A. Ryan, of Catholic University, at a regional meeting of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems in San Francisco on June 9, 1936:

The Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno was published in May 1931. It was addressed to the world. Therefore it could not have said anything specific concerning the depression in the United States or the return of prosperity. It does, however, contain several general statements which are very pertinent to both the industrial depression and industrial recovery. The statements which are particularly applicable are those concerning the bad distribution of wealth and income, the just wage, cooperation between labor and capital, and the profits of capital.

Concerning distribution, Pope Pius says: "The immense number of propertyless wage earners, on the one hand, and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few, on the other, is an unanswerable argument that the earthly goods so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism are far from rightly distributed and equitably shared among the various classes of men. Every effort, therefore, must be made that, at least in the future, a just share only of the fruits of production be permitted to accumulate in the hands of the wealthy and that an ample sufficiency be supplied to the workingmen."

The unjust distribution to which the Pope calls attention is particularly striking in the United States.

This was the main cause of the depression. For at least a quarter of a century before the year 1929 too much of the national product had been distributed in the form of profits and interest and too

little in the form of wages to labor and prices to farmers. As a consequence, too much of the national income was invested in new capital goods. Too much was saved and too little spent. The product could not all be sold because labor and the farmers had not been receiving enough income to buy as much as they wanted to buy. The receivers of large profits and interest would not buy more because they did not want to buy more.

Such are the main deplorable effects of the unjust distribution condemned by the Pope. Not only does it deprive the majority of our people of the means of decent living but it compels our industries to be operated at far below their full capacity.

The Pope demands that the bad distribution be rectified by giving to the wealthy only a "just share" and to the workingmen "ample sufficiency." This brings us to the second of his statements that we are to consider. He defines "ample sufficiency" in the following terms: The laborer's wages must be "sufficient for the support of himself and of his family"; "sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs"; sufficient to enable him "to bear the family burden with greater ease and security"; sufficient to free him from "hand-to-mouth uncertainty"; sufficient to "support life's changing fortunes"; sufficient to make "some little provision for those who remain after him"; sufficient "to acquire a certain moderate ownership."

These specifications show that Pope Pius had in mind something more than a bare living wage, something more than the minimum means of a day-to-day livelihood. To comply with these specifications would probably require more than the \$2,000 income which, at 1929 prices, the Brookings Institution estimates as "sufficient to supply only basic necessities." Yet in 1929, 60 percent of the total number of American families were below this standard.

If all families had been provided with the equivalent of \$2,000 a year at 1929 prices, our industries could have been kept in operation at full capacity. This fact is a very striking illustration of the principle that in the long run and for the community as a whole, good ethics is in harmony with good business.

The third statement of Quadragesimo Anno which is pertinent to our subject has to do with situations in which the employer is unable to pay a just wage. If this inability is due to bad management, want of enterprise, or out-of-date methods, says the Pope, it "is not a just reason for reducing the workingman's wages." If, however, the inability is due to causes beyond the control of the employer, the Holy Father would have "employers and employed join in their plans and efforts to overcome all difficulties and obstacles, and let them be aided in this wholesome endeavor by the wise measures of public authority. In the last extreme, counsel must be taken whether the business can continue or whether some other provision should be made for the workers." The last sentence is a clear confirmation of the view that businessmen or business concerns that are unable to pay decent wages cannot reasonably claim a right to continue in business.

The most fundamental and far-reaching part of this declaration is that labor, employers, and the public should cooperate to abolish the evil of insufficient wages. Precisely this kind of cooperation was in force under the National Recovery Administration. Unfortunately it was ended by the Supreme Court. A few months ago a new attempt was made to explore the possibilities of cooperation between capital, labor, and the Government in the conferences held under the chairmanship of Maj. George L. Berry at the direction of the President of the United States. Greatly to be lamented is the fact that almost all of the most important directors of industry who were invited to join in this cooperative effort refused to go on with it after the first conference. Apparently the great majority of our most powerful industrial concerns do not desire the kind of cooperation recommended by the Holy Father.

The outlook for cooperation between industry, labor, and the Government is discouraging, because the dominant and dominating elements of business still believe in the old order and are still opposed to intervention by the Government for social justice. Last December the National Association of Manufacturers, at convention in New York, adopted this brazen proposition: "Control of the individual by Government is limited to the minimum essential for the protection of individual rights and the safety of the Nation." At its annual meeting in Washington the latter part of April the United States Chamber of Commerce passed the following resolution:

"The true function of Government is to maintain equality of opportunity for all, to preserve the sanctity of contracts, and to assume those collective activities which society must conduct as a whole. When Government attempts by legislative means or Executive fiat to impose upon business rules of conduct pertaining to such matters as wages, hours, conditions, and terms of employment, or other restrictive measures interfering with the free play of economic forces, it retards both the material and spiritual progress of the Nation."

These statements by the two most powerful business associations in our country enable us to see why very little of a helpful character is to be expected from organized business in the struggle for social justice and a better economic order. The voices of great and enlightened industrialists, such as E. A. Filene and Henry Dennison, as well as the opinions of thousands of smaller businessmen, are overwhelmed or overawed by the dominating reactionaries. Humane and helpful business opinion is, for the most part, silent and ineffectual.

Probably the most decisive indication of the benefits of the N. R. A. to labor is what has happened since the collapse of that organization. In private concerns having contracts with the Government, N. R. A. wage rates were reduced in about 40 percent of the cases, while work hours were lengthened in something over 30 percent. In the retail industries wages have been cut in more than 60 percent of the establishments and hours lengthened in about the same proportion of establishments.

The fourth and last statement in the encyclical that we have to consider is that which asserts that both capital and labor should have a share of the product. The Holy Father declares: "Each class then must receive its due share, and the distribution of created goods must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good and social justice." While this statement has a bearing upon the just reward of labor as well as the just return to capital, I cite it mainly in the latter connection. The rate of interest or profit should not be greater than is consistent with the common good. If 2 percent is sufficient to provide all the capital that the community needs, then 2 percent is all that the capitalist has a right to claim.

The statements from the Pope's encyclical are at once a comprehensive description of our economic malady and an indication of the way to complete business recovery. We must have a better distribution of the product, ample living wages for all workers, adequate cooperation between business, labor, and government, and a smaller return to capital. Unfortunately, the great majority of our businessmen do not realize that this is the situation. They still talk vaguely and expansively about the necessity of restoring business confidence, reviving the capital-goods industries, and stimulating investment.

All the facts of the present situation indicate that even if our business level were back to that which existed in 1929 there would still be between five and eight million persons out of work. Many members of our comfortable classes seem to look upon this horrible prospect with a certain amount of equanimity. They calmly visualize millions of their fellow citizens existing year after year on the dole. It is difficult to imagine how any really humane person, any intelligent lover of his country or his kind can take this attitude. All Americans who are genuinely concerned about the safety of our institutions will demand and work for legislation to end as speedily as possible this menace of vast unemployment, and to bring about genuine and well-balanced prosperity. The principle and the indispensable legislative enactments are a revived N. R. A. and a 30-hour workweek. Anyone who disputes this proposition should be required to propose an alternative measure which will go to the root of the matter. Pollyanna talk about restoring business confidence, expanding investments, making new inventions to provide new luxuries for the wealthy minority of the population is not only futile but a mockery of human needs and human hopes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the Appropriations Committee may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include printed tables and figures referring to the fiscal affairs of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A PLEDGE FULFILLED—EAST BOSTON RECEIVED NEW POST-OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short letter written by the Post Office to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for over 25 years the people of East Boston have sought a new Federal building in that section of Boston to replace the privately leased, inadequate, and unsanitary quarters that housed the local post office. My predecessors in Congress, in all sincerity, pledged that they would bring to East Boston that much-needed improvement, but notwithstanding their sincerity of purpose and tireless efforts, no progress was made until the present Congressman presented East Boston's case to a kind, gracious, and able Assistant Postmaster General in the person of Smith W. Purdum. Within a month after my arrival in Washington in January 1935, I presented an exhaustive brief to General Purdum, setting forth facts that I believed would appeal to the sense of justice of both General Purdum and his associate, Admiral Peoples, members of the interdepartmental committee. Statistics on population, valuation of property in East Boston, data on the volume of business in that section, a review of the postal receipts and postal savings over a period of years, data proving the inadequacy and unsanitary surroundings of the present location, hundreds of letters from citizens and business firms giving evidence of the desire of the people of East Boston for a new building, together with other information, were collected by me and presented to the committee to support the popular opinion that East Boston, upon merit, was entitled to a new Federal building. Months passed and I appeared personally before the committee on two different occasions to present

the case, and finally, with the passage of the recent deficiency bill in Congress, I was advised by General Purdum that East Boston had been awarded a new Federal post-office building, and that work would commence on its construction within the next few months.

In my contest for election to Congress I made this a matter of campaign pledge, and I am happy to have fulfilled that pledge and thus contribute in an humble way toward permitting the people of East Boston to realize their dream of a quarter of a century to have a new Federal post-office building in their midst.

The success in securing the post-office building was attributable in a large measure to my good fortune to meet during this my first term in Congress a kindly man, the Honorable Smith W. Purdum, Assistant Postmaster General. I have met many men of prominence in Government affairs, but none have impressed me more than this man for genuine sincerity, unquestioned ability, devotion to duty, and a humanness which radiates friendship toward his fellow man and his problems.

It is commonly said that General Purdum is the best-informed official in the Post Office Service. His varied and extensive duties as Assistant Postmaster General, which include supervision of the entire motor-vehicle service of the Department, membership in the Interdepartmental Committee, designated by the Postmaster General, which allocates funds for every public building erected under the supervision of the Treasury and Post Office Departments, complete supervision of the making and enforcing of thousands of leases for post offices and other Federal buildings, charge of the administration, maintenance, and upkeep of our 1,500 Federal buildings throughout the country, testify to his executive ability and the unusual knowledge which he has of postal affairs. Smith W. Purdum is a career man with a record of almost 40 years of faithful service to the Department, yet notwithstanding the great honor of being Assistant Postmaster General which has been conferred upon him, he has never lost the kind and gracious mannerisms that have endeared him to the heart of every man who is privileged to know him.

Some days ago, when I was advised that a new building was awarded to East Boston, I tried in my humble way to express by letter my appreciation on behalf of the people of the district to General Purdum for his tolerance of my many visits to his office on this matter and his favorable consideration of my application for this much-needed improvement. I submit herewith his reply to my letter of thanks.

HON. JOHN P. HIGGINS,

Member of Congress, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. HIGGINS: This is to refer to your very kind letter of recent date with reference to the allotment of funds for a Federal building project at East Boston.

Please be assured of my appreciation of the kind expressions contained therein.

Our own surveys and your thorough and intelligent presentation of the situation at East Boston indicated that this was a deserving project, and I am glad that it was possible for the Post Office and Treasury Departments to allot funds for it under the current building program.

I know that this decisive step, looking to the consummation of the building project for East Boston, must be gratifying to you, in view of the continued personal interest which you have manifested in the matter. You may be sure that your sincere and cooperative attitude in this matter is appreciated, and that the Post Office and Treasury Departments will endeavor to expedite the project with a view to having actual construction started at the earliest possible date.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

S. W. PURDUM,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

In conclusion may I say to General Purdum, on behalf of the people of East Boston, that they are everlastingly grateful for his interest in this most vital community need. Personally I am privileged to call this kindly and sincere gentleman and able executive my friend.

AMENDING THE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10094) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and

soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the first sentence of section 1 of the act entitled, 'An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes', approved June 28, 1934, is amended by striking out the words 'eighty million' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'one hundred and forty-two million.'

"Sec. 2. Section 7 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to examine and classify any lands withdrawn or reserved by Executive order of November 26, 1934 (no. 6910), and amendments thereto, and Executive order of February 5, 1935 (no. 6964), or within a grazing district, which are more valuable or suitable for the production of agricultural crops than for the production of native grasses and forage plants, or more valuable or suitable for any other use than for the use provided for under this act, or proper for acquisition in satisfaction of any outstanding lieu, exchange or script rights or land grant, and to open such lands to entry, selection, or location for disposal in accordance with such classification under applicable public-land laws, except that homestead entries shall not be allowed for tracts exceeding 320 acres in area. Such lands shall not be subject to disposition, settlement, or occupation until after the same have been classified and opened to entry: *Provided*, That locations and entries under the mining laws, including the act of February 25, 1920, as amended, may be made upon such withdrawn and reserved areas without regard to classification and without restrictions or limitation by any provision of this act. Where such lands are located within grazing districts reasonable notice shall be given by the Secretary of the Interior to any grazing permittee of such lands. The applicant, after his entry, selection, or location is allowed, shall be entitled to the possession and use of such lands: *Provided*, That upon the application of any applicant qualified to make entry, selection, or location, under the public-land laws, filed in the land office of the proper district, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause any tract to be classified, and such application, if allowed by the Secretary of the Interior, shall entitle the applicant to a preference right to enter, select, or locate such lands if opened to entry as herein provided."

"Sec. 3. Section 8 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) That where such action will promote the purposes of the district or facilitate its administration, the Secretary is authorized, for the purpose of this act only, to accept on behalf of the United States any lands within the exterior boundaries of a grazing district as a gift.

"(b) When public interests will be benefited thereby the Secretary is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to any privately owned lands within or without the boundaries of a grazing district, and in exchange therefor to issue patent for not to exceed an equal value of surveyed grazing district land or of unreserved surveyed public land in the same State or within a distance of not more than 50 miles within the adjoining State nearest the base lands.

"(c) Upon application of any State to exchange lands within or without the boundaries of a grazing district the Secretary of the Interior shall, and is hereby, directed to proceed with such exchange at the earliest practicable date and to cooperate fully with the State to that end, but no State shall be permitted to select lieu lands in another State. The Secretary of the Interior shall accept on behalf of the United States title to any State-owned lands within or without the boundaries of a grazing district, and in exchange therefor issue patent to surveyed grazing district land not otherwise reserved or appropriated or unappropriated and unreserved surveyed public land; and in making such exchange the Secretary is authorized to patent to such State, land either of equal value or of equal acreage: *Provided*, That no State shall select public lands in a grazing district in furtherance of any exchange unless the lands offered by the State in such exchange lie within such grazing district and the selected lands lie in a reasonably compact body which is so located as not to interfere with the administration or value of the remaining land in such district for grazing purposes as set forth in this act.

"When an exchange is based on lands of equal acreage and the selected lands are mineral in character, the patent thereto shall contain a reservation of all minerals to the United States; and in making exchanges of equal acreage the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept title to offered lands which are mineral in character, with a mineral reservation to the State.

"For the purpose of effecting exchanges based on lands of equal acreage the identification and area of unsurveyed school sections may be determined by protraction or otherwise. The selection by the State of lands in lieu of any such protracted school sections shall be a waiver of all of its right to such sections.

"(d) Before any such exchange under this section shall be effected, notice of the contemplated exchange, describing the lands

involved, shall be published by the Secretary of the Interior once each week for 4 successive weeks in some newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which may be situated the lands to be accepted, and in the same manner in some like newspaper published in any county in which may be situated any lands to be given in such exchange; lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become public lands, and if located within the exterior boundaries of a grazing district they shall become a part of the district within the boundaries of which they are located: *Provided*, That either party to an exchange based upon equal value under this section may make reservations of minerals, easements, or rights of use. Where reservations are made in lands conveyed either to or by the United States the right to enjoy them shall be subject to such reasonable conditions respecting ingress and egress and the use of the surface of the land as may be deemed necessary. Where mineral reservations are made by the grantor in lands conveyed by the United States, it shall be so stipulated in the patent, and any person who prospects for or acquires the right to mine and remove the reserved mineral deposits may enter and occupy so much of the surface as may be required for all purposes incident to the prospecting for, mining and removal of the minerals therefrom, and may mine and remove such minerals, upon payment to the owner of the surface for damages caused to the land and improvements thereon. No fee shall be charged for any exchange of land made under this act except one-half of the cost of publishing notice of a proposed exchange as herein provided."

"Sec. 4. Section 10 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. That, except as provided in sections 9 and 11 hereof, all moneys received under the authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, but 25 percent of all moneys received under this act during any fiscal year is hereby made available, when appropriated by the Congress, for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior for the construction, purchase, or maintenance of range improvements, and 50 percent of the money received under this act during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which the grazing districts or the lands producing such moneys are situated, to be expended as the State legislature of such State may prescribe for the benefit of the county or counties in which the grazing districts or the lands producing such moneys are situated: *Provided*, That if any grazing district or any leased tract is in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said district or leased tract shall be proportional to its area in said district or leased tract."

"Sec. 5. Section 15 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized, in his discretion, where vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved lands of the public domain are so situated as not to justify their inclusion in any grazing district to be established pursuant to this act, to lease any such lands for grazing purposes, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That preference shall be given to owners, homesteaders, lessees, or other lawful occupants of contiguous lands to the extent necessary to permit proper use of such contiguous lands, except, that when such isolated or disconnected tracts embrace 760 acres or less, the owners, homesteaders, lessees, or other lawful occupants of lands contiguous thereto or cornering thereon shall have a preference right to lease the whole of such tract, during a period of 90 days after such tract is offered for lease, upon the terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary."

"Sec. 6. Such act is further amended by adding the following new section:

"Sec. 17. The President shall have power, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to select a Director of Grazing. The Secretary of the Interior may appoint such Assistant Directors and such other employees as shall be necessary to administer this act. The Civil Service Commission shall give consideration to the practical range experience in public-land States of the persons found eligible for appointment by the Secretary as Assistant Directors or graziers. No Director of Grazing, Assistant Director, or grazer shall be appointed who at the time of appointment or selection has not been for 1 year a bona-fide citizen or resident of the State or of one of the States in which such Director, Assistant Director, or grazer is to serve."

"TITLE II—BADLANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

"SECTION 1. The boundaries of the Badlands National Monument, as established by the act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1553), shall be and are hereby, extended to include such lands adjacent or contiguous thereto, in the State of South Dakota, including, but not being restricted to, lands designated as submarginal by the Resettlement Administration, as may be determined by the President, by proclamation, within 5 years following the approval of this act, to be necessary for the proper rounding out of the boundaries of said monument or the administration thereof, providing the entire area of such monument shall not exceed 250,000 acres.

"Sec. 2. That the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled 'An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes', as amended, are hereby made applicable to and extended over such lands as may be added to the monument under the authority of the foregoing section."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly

use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the calendar does not indicate this bill has ever passed the Senate.

Mr. DEROUEN. The bill has passed the Senate, with an amendment, and I am asking unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS OF ADMINISTRATION ARE MORE BENEFICIAL FOR AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND LABOR THAN RETALIATORY MEASURES—REPUBLICANS ARE IN A DILEMMA

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of reciprocal-tariff agreements and include therein certain tables made up by the Department of Commerce and the State Department. I have submitted these tables to the Public Printer, who has already reported to me their extent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 of this year I took occasion in the House to review some things which Republican politicians had said regarding tariff reciprocity. At that time it was freely predicted even in the Republican press and by members of that party that they had learned their tariff lesson and would likely endorse the Democratic policy of reciprocity rather than go back to the reactionary Republican policy of retaliation in matters of foreign trade. In view of what took place at Cleveland in the so-called tariff platform, in which the Republicans seem to say, "We propose to expand foreign trade by placing prohibitory tariffs on additional imported products", I wish to make some further comments relative to reciprocity and trade agreements.

PAGE COL. FRANK KNOX

On March 24, 1934, the now Republican nominee for Vice President, Col. Frank Knox, is reported by the press to have suggested for the Republican platform—

To recognize that intelligent national self-interest demands that we cooperate with other nations to stabilize currencies and remove as far as possible artificial barriers that now encumber the flow of goods and services between nations, without which there can be neither prosperity nor peace. * * * A scientifically lowered tariff will greatly benefit both agriculture and industry and supply a much-needed prime to recovery.

Such tariff heresy from a Republican "white hope" brought from the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Republican self-appointed tariff spokesman [Mr. TREADWAY], public apologies for Colonel Knox's lack of information on such matters. On the floor of the House on March 30, 1936, Mr. TREADWAY said:

Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised at reading in the press the other day certain extracts from the speech by a very prominent Republican before the Economic Club in New York City, wherein he seems to have accepted without question the oft-stated but thoroughly misleading doctrine (a) that we are a creditor Nation, and (b) that to regain our foreign export market we must accept more imports.

The gentleman evidently has been misinformed regarding our international position, and is unfamiliar with our experience in the last 2 years as regards the attempt to increase exports by increasing imports. I feel sure that he would not have embraced this false doctrine if he had been aware of the true facts.

In his Peekian-Crowther-Treadway method the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] set about to right the mind of the now Vice-Presidential nominee of the

Republican Party regarding all phases of international trade, commerce, and finance. We had read the same explanations at various times by Samuel Crowther and by Mr. Peek in the Saturday Evening Post. Who is doing the ghosting in this piece, anyway? These gentlemen, by the use of spurious calculation, in spite of an excess of commodity exports over imports in 1934 of \$478,000,000 and in 1935 of \$234,000,000, still attempt to show that the balance was unfavorable to American commerce. They attempt to make their case by the trick method of subtracting the so-called favorable commodity balance from the imports of gold and silver, which when brought into this country, are usually considered assets. In the philosophy, economics, or logic of the trio, Peek, Crowther, and Treadway, the precious metals become apparently a national liability of the American Government. Apparently these gentlemen do not realize that a large part of this gold and silver has been brought into the United States by the flight of capital from unstable governments and on account of the confidence which the world has in the Roosevelt administration. This gold and silver, although at the present time not apparently serving any important purpose in our economy, may be used at any time the Government so desires. As regards such assets, in the days of the Republican "new-era economics", the gentleman's party frequently pointed with pride to the soundness of our economic system as indicated by the quantity of gold within this country. This was a matter of pride during the administration of "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton."

However, since evil days have set upon the Republican Party, erstwhile Republican virtues now seem to become Democratic vices in the mind of the gentleman from Massachusetts. It seems, from his observation, that it is wholly bad to take any payment whatever in gold, silver, or goods for our exported products, or to receive imports of any nature in exchange for our own wealth sent abroad.

THE SORROWS OF MR. TREADWAY

On the floor of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] did not mention the name of the "very prominent Republican", but, on being questioned by Mr. BANKHEAD, he admitted that he had in mind Colonel Knox and further observed, "This gentleman enunciated views directly opposed to those which I hold and directly opposed to views that other men hold as well."

It would be interesting to ascertain whether or not the so-called tariff platform of the Republican Party more nearly conforms to the ideas expressed by Colonel Knox before the convention or whether it represents the views of the gentleman from Massachusetts, or whether or not it expresses anyone's point of view. The hodgepodge inconsistencies and the contradictions make the tariff plank meaningless. Every other sentence is a straddle.

Mr. Landon has expressed himself as being in favor of expanded foreign markets. He cannot do it by following his party platform. This much is clear, however, that there are Republicans who are unwilling to follow the Cleveland tariff platform but prefer the clear-cut program now being carried out by the Democratic Party. For example, Charles S. Haight, admiralty lawyer of New York and a Republican, stated, in defense of Mr. Hull's trade-agreements program, as follows in the Washington Post of June 18, 1936:

There are many persons in the Republican Party besides myself whose swords are drawn and, regardless of New Deal policies, will defend the movement to the utmost.

BENEFITS OF RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS—THE TABLES PROVE THE CASE

The opposition, however, continues to make desultory attacks against the reciprocal trade agreements program. Every industry which thinks that it has been or may be injured sends up wall after wall that it is being "sold down the river." Far too little has been said and shown regarding the benefits received from the program. I have had made an official tabulation showing the concessions obtained from foreign countries in the 14 trade agreements thus far concluded. A glance at these tables will show that every State and every industry of the country has obtained better markets as a result of these agreements.

AMERICAN EXPORT PRODUCTS BENEFITING FROM RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS SIGNED THUS FAR

[Revised to June 15, 1936]

BY IMPROVEMENT OR STABILIZATION OF PREVIOUS MARKET POSITION IN PARTICULAR COUNTRY, WHETHER IN MATTER OF DUTIES, TAXES, QUOTAS, OR OTHER MEASURES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Commodity groups (based upon United States classification of exports):	Pages
A. GRAINS AND GRAIN PRODUCTS (INCLUDING FEEDS).....	10628, 10629
B. MEATS, FISH, AND OTHER ANIMAL PRODUCTS.....	10630, 10631
C. FRUITS, NUTS, AND VEGETABLES.....	10632, 10633
D. COTTON, TOBACCO, AND OTHER VEGETABLE PRODUCTS.....	10634, 10635
E. LEATHER, FUR, RUBBER, AND PRODUCTS.....	10634, 10635
F. TEXTILE PRODUCTS.....	10636, 10637
G. LUMBER, PAPER, AND PRODUCTS.....	10638, 10639
H. NON-METALLIC MINERALS AND PRODUCTS.....	10640, 10641
I. METALS AND MANUFACTURES.....	10642, 10643
J. MACHINERY AND ELECTRICAL APPARATUS.....	10644, 10645
K. AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER VEHICLES.....	10646, 10647
L. CHEMICALS AND RELATED PRODUCTS.....	10648, 10649
M. SPECIALTY AND MISCELLANEOUS MANUFACTURES.....	10650, 10651

EXPLANATION OF TERMS INDICATING, FOR EACH AGREEMENT COUNTRY, NATURE OF BENEFIT SECURED FOR PARTICULAR UNITED STATES PRODUCTS

Reduced=duty or other charges on imports reduced and bound.

Reduced MFFN or reduced MFN=duty or other charges on imports reduced under general extension of most-favored-foreign-nation treatment, but not bound as to amount. (The resulting reductions of this character, applying to a broad range of products, include in their scope some commodities of limited trade possibilities for the U. S.)

Bound=present duty or charges assured against increase.

Bound free=assurance against imposition of duty.

Quota removed=quantitative limitation entirely eliminated.

Quota increased=increase in quantity previously allotted to United States.

Quota assured=definite quantity assured admission from United States.

Embargo lifted=product previously prohibited importation now admitted.

Purchase agreement=undertaking to purchase specified amount or share from United States.

Special notation for Cuba

Preferential increased=rate to United States unchanged, but percentage of preferential margin below rate to other countries increased (whether rate is bound or not).

Reduced*=rate reduced but not bound, and preference increased.

Special notation for France

Import turn-over tax=in addition to the benefits indicated, numerous semifinished and finished manufactures (whether here listed or not) benefit by reductions in the French import turn-over tax from 4 percent and 6 percent, respectively, to 2 percent of the duty-paid value.

GENERAL NOTE.—This study does not attempt to list all products covered by each of the agreements, nor can it show in this brief compass the precise measure of improvement in a given situation or the level of the taxes, duties, or quotas on particular products resulting from each agreement. Full details and analyses of all the agreements concluded are available at each district office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, to whom inquiries may be addressed, as well as to Washington.

Prepared in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

American export products benefiting

A. GRAINS AND GRAIN

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Wheat.....	152,145						Reduced MFN.....
Wheat flour.....	78,502	Reduced ¹					do.....
Corn.....	19,537	Bound.....					{Bound free ¹
Corn meal.....	1,611	Reduced (also flour).....					{Reduced.....
Cornstarch.....	7,165	Reduced.....	{Duty bound.....		Bound.....		{Reduced MFN.....
Barley.....	24,383	{Bound (flour, grain).....	{Quota increased.....}				Reduced MFN.....
Malt.....	3,074	{Reduced (meal).....}					Reduced MFN (in-
		Reduced.....					cluding sirup and
							extracts).
Rye.....	14,637	{Bound (flour, grain).....					{Reduced MFN (grain
		{Reduced (meal).....}					and flour).
Rice.....	10,753	Reduced *.....	Bound free.....		Bound (milled).....		Reduced MFN.....
Oats.....	4,066	Reduced.....					do.....
Oat flour.....		do.....				Reduced.....	Reduced.....
Oatmeal.....	4,277	do.....	Reduced.....			do.....	do.....
Crackers and biscuits.....	1,974	Bound or reduced.....					{Reduced MFN (un-
							{sweetened).....
Breakfast foods, prepared.....	884				{Reduced (swelled or		Reduced MFN.....
Macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles.....	791				{toasted).....}		do.....
Hay.....	256	Reduced.....					do.....
Cottonseed cake.....	7,513	Reduced (and meal).....			Bound free.....		
Linseed cake.....	12,465	do.....	{Bound free.....		do.....		
			{License tax re-				
			{duced.....}				
Other selected feeds.....		Reduced or bound.....	{Quota removed.....}		Bound free (copra and		
					other oil cake).		

Secondary or limited benefits:

- (A) Cuba: Flours of unspecified grains—Bound.
- (B) Cuba: Meals of unspecified grains—Reduced.
- (C) Cuba: Wheat semolina—Reduced.
- (D) Canada: Wheat semolina—Reduced MFN.
- (E) Canada: Soybeans—Reduced.
- (F) Canada: Buckwheat, grain, meal and flour—Reduced MFN.

from reciprocal-trade agreements signed thus far
 PRODUCTS (INCLUDING FEEDS)

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
A: Purchase agreement. do	Quota assured			Bound				Wheat.
		Bound		do		Bound		Wheat flour.
			Reduced	Bound	Reduced MFN		Bound	Corn.
					Reduced MFN (and flour)			Corn meal.
			Reduced (extracts).		Reduced MFN			Cornstarch.
					Reduced MFN (and flour)			Barley.
					Reduced MFN (whole milled)			Malt.
A: Bound free in bulk. A: Bound (packaged) Quota assured	Bound Quota assured				Reduced MFN			Rye.
					do			Rice.
A: Bound free ¹ A: Bound ² B: Bound		Reduced	Bound	Reduced				Oats.
		Reduced (unsweetened). Bound (if sweet).	Reduced (soda crackers).		Reduced MFN			Oat flour
								Oatmeal.
A: Bound free in bulk. B: Bound ³		Bound	Reduced					Crackers and biscuits.
					Reduced MFN			Breakfast foods, prepared.
								Macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles.
								Hay.
								Cottonseed cake
								Linseed cake.
A: Quota assured (soybean cake).								Other selected feeds.

¹ Preferential increased, but limited to flour milled entirely from American-produced wheat; under Garber Act of United States, flour milled in United States with foreign wheat obtains no net advantage over foreign-milled wheat when exported to Cuba.
² Corn for manufacture of starch—Bound free; other corn (except for distillation purposes)—Reduced.
³ Rolled oats in bulk—Bound free. Ratio of monopoly fee to fee on oats Bound resulting in reduced monopoly fee on rolled oats.
⁴ Rolled oats and grits in packages—Bound. Ratio of monopoly fee to fee on oats Bound resulting in reduced monopoly fee on rolled oats.
⁵ Corn, wheat, and rice flakes, and grits.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

B. MEATS, FISH, AND

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Pork:							
Fresh and frozen	2,336			Reduced			Reduced MFN
Hams	28,478	Reduced	Quota assured				do
Bacon	21,269	do	do				do
Salted and pickled	4,860	do	do	Bound	Bound (salted)		do
Canned	3,313	do.*	Reduced (tongues)				do
Lard	98,331	do. ¹	{Bound free Quota assured}	Reduced* (conditional)}			{Reduced MFN (including lard oil)}
Beef:							
Fresh and frozen	503			Reduced			Reduced MFN
Salted and pickled	1,591			Bound			Reduced
Canned	838	Reduced*					Reduced MFN
Horse meat, salted (1931)	563						Reduced
Sausage casings	6,578		Bound free				Reduced MFN
Oleo oil, stock, and stearin	10,231	{Reduced (oleo oil) ¹ Bound (stearin) ¹ }					{Reduced (oleo oil) Reduced MFN (others)}
Tallow	507	Bound ¹					Reduced MFN
Fish:							
Fresh	2,061	Bound (oysters)					{do Reduced*}
Salted	1,445	Reduced (mackerel)				{Reduced (salmon and trout)}	{Reduced MFN Reduced (halibut)}
Canned:							
Salmon	7,003	Reduced				Reduced	Reduced MFN
Sardines	7,205	do	Reduced (pilchards)			Bound	do
Shellfish	857	do					{Reduced (shrimps and lobsters) Reduced MFN (oysters)}
Prepared milk	13,980			Reduced		{Reduced (powdered)}	
Infants' food (malted milk, etc.)	677			do			
Butter	1,877			do			Reduced MFN
Cheese	836			do			do
Eggs	6,215						
Poultry and game (including live, \$302,000)	1,317						Reduced MFN
Honey	765		Reduced				do

Secondary or limited benefits:

- Cuba: Other canned fish—Reduced.
- Colombia: Miscellaneous, fresh, salted, and canned meat and fish—Reduced.
- Canada: Live animals (except for improvement of stock)—Reduced MFN.
- Canada: Beeswax—Reduced MFN.
- Canada: Fish oils, cod-liver oil—Reduced MFN.
- Honduras: Canned or smoked sausages—Reduced.
- Guatemala: Sausages of all kinds—Bound.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

OTHER ANIMAL PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
		Reduced	Reduced	Reduced				Pork: Fresh and frozen. Hams. Bacon. Salted and pickled. Canned.
		do	do	Bound	Reduced MFN			
		do	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced MFN (certain cuts)			
A: Bound free ¹	Reduced Embargo lifted (Quota assured)	do	do	do		Reduced	Reduced (for limited quantity)	Lard.
			do	Reduced				Beef: Fresh and frozen. Salted and pickled. Canned.
A: Bound			do	do				
A: Quota assured			do	Bound				Horse meat, salted.
A: Bound ²	Bound			Reduced				Sausage casings.
A: Bound free ⁴								Oleo oil, stock, and stearin.
								Tallow.
			Reduced		Bound (salmon)			Fish: Fresh.
			do		Reduced MFN (other)			Salted.
					Reduced MFN (including smoked)			Canned: Salmon. Sardines.
B: Bound	Reduced	Reduced	do	Reduced	Quota assured, duty reduced			
	do	do	do	do	Reduced MFN (for limited quantity) (pilchards).			Shellfish.
	Reduced (shrimps)		do	do	Quota assured, duty reduced			
		Reduced or bound	do	Red. (dried or powdered). Bound (evap. or cond.)	Reduced MFN (condensed)	Reduced		Prepared milk.
			do	do	Reduced MFN			Infants' food (malted milk, etc.).
		Reduced		Bound				Butter.
				do	Reduced MFN			Cheese.
				Bound (canned)	do			Eggs.
								Poultry and game (including live, \$302,000).
								Honey.

¹ If duty or tax is reduced on any edible fats and oils, impure corn, soybean, cottonseed oil, or edible tallow, oleo stearin, and nonspecified vegetable oils, a compensatory reduction is to be made on the oils and fats in the above categories.

² Pure lard and steam lard.

³ Oleo stearin and grease stearin for manufacture of margarine, technical production, or reexport.

⁴ Oleo oil, plus stearin, other than that fluid at 15° C.

⁵ Lobsters, scallops, halibut, oysters shelled in bulk.

⁶ 1 of the 3 products on which reduction does not become effective until Haitian budget for a given fiscal year is promulgated at 40,000,000 gourdes or more.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

C. FRUITS, NUTS,

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Fruits, fresh:							
Apples.....	29,826	Bound.....	Bound.....	Reduced.....	{ Reduced Bound ¹ } { Reduced ² } { Bound }	Bound free.....	Reduced.....
Pears.....	4,515	do.....	Reduced.....	do.....		do.....	do.....
Oranges.....	14,135					do.....	do.....
Grapefruit.....	3,060		Reduced.....		Reduced.....	do.....	do.....
Grapes.....	2,121	Bound.....		Reduced.....		Bound free.....	do.....
Other fresh fruits.....		Bound or reduced.....				{ Bound free (except citrous). }	{ do. ³ } { Reduced MFN ⁴ } { Bound free ⁵ }
Fruits, dried:							
Prunes.....	13,575		Reduced.....	Reduced.....	Bound free.....		
Raisins.....	10,170			do.....	Reduced.....		
Apples.....	3,563	Reduced.....	{ Reduced (peeled). }		Bound free.....		Reduced MFN.....
Apricots.....	3,345		{ Bound (other)..... }				
Other dried fruits.....			{ Reduced (peaches, pears). }		{ Bound free (peaches, pears, and salad fruit). }		do. ⁶
			{ Bound (other)..... }				
Fruits, canned:							
Peaches.....	7,040	do.....		{ Reduced..... }	Reduced.....		
Pears.....	6,195	do.....		do.....	do.....		
Pineapples.....	4,049			do.....	do.....		
Apricots.....	2,682	Reduced.....	Reduced.....	{ Reduced..... }	do.....	Reduced.....	Reduced ¹⁰
Grapefruit (1934).....	1,578			{ Reduced..... }	do.....		
Fruits for salad.....	4,620	Reduced.....		do.....	do.....		
Other canned fruits.....		do.....		do.....	do.....		
Nuts.....	1,453	do.....					{ do..... } { Reduced MFN ¹¹ }
Vegetables, fresh or dried:							
Potatoes, white.....	2,956	{ Bound Nov. 1-June 30..... }		{ Reduced (seed potatoes). }			
		{ Reduced July 1-Oct. 31..... }					
Onions.....	744	{ Bound Nov. 15-June 15..... }					Reduced.....
		{ Reduced June 16-Nov. 14..... }					
Peas and beans, dried.....	1,981	{ Reduced (peas and beans). }					do.....
		{ Bound (white beans)..... }					
Other fresh and dried vegetables.....		Bound.....					do.....
Vegetables, canned:	7,820						
Asparagus.....	2,533	Reduced.....				Reduced.....	do.....
Baked beans.....	979	Bound.....			Reduced.....	do.....	do.....
Peas.....	566	Reduced.....				do.....	do.....
Corn.....	484	do.....				do.....	do.....
Tomatoes.....	363	Bound.....					do.....
Soups.....	2,316	Reduced.....			Reduced.....	{ Reduced (not containing meat). }	Reduced MFN.....
Other canned vegetables.....		Bound.....				Reduced.....	{ Reduced..... } { Reduced MFN (canned mushrooms). }

¹ Reduced Jan. 1-Apr. 30; bound May 1-Dec. 31.

² Duty bound, monopoly fee seasonally reduced (limited).

³ Reduced Dec. 31-Apr. 30; bound May 1-Nov. 30.

⁴ Duty bound, monopoly fee reduced.

⁵ Apricots, cherries, cranberries, peaches, plums and prunes, strawberries, cantaloupes, muskmelons, avocados, olives in brine.

⁶ Olives and cherries not bottled.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued
AND VEGETABLES

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
{ A: Reduced ¹ } { B: Bound } A: Reduced ²	Quota assured do	Bound do			{ Quota increased } do		{ Reduced (Dec. 15-June 15). } Bound	Fruits, fresh: Apples. Pears. Oranges. Grapefruit. Grapes.
A: Reduced ⁴ B: Bound		Bound do	Reduced	Bound	{ Quota assured } Reduced		Reduced Bound (plums)	Other fresh fruits.
{ A: Reduced ⁴ } { B: Bound } { A: Reduced ⁴ } { B: Bound } do	{ Quota assured (apricots). } do				{ Reduced } do		{ Reduced } do	Fruits, dried: Prunes. Raisins.
{ A: Reduced ⁴ } { B: Bound } do	{ Quota in-creased. } { Duty bound or reduced. } Bound	Reduced	do	do	Bound		Reduced	Apples. Apricots.
{ A: Reduced ⁴ } { B: Bound } do	{ Quota in-creased. } Duty reduced. { Quota in-creased. }				Bound (peaches and pears)	Reduced	Reduced (pears, peaches, and salad fruit).	Other dried fruits.
A and B: Bound	Reduced	do	do	do	{ Reduced (unsweetened) } do	do	{ Reduced } do	Fruits, canned: Peaches. Pears. Pineapples. Apricots. Grapefruit. Fruits for salad. Other canned fruits.
			do		{ Reduced (certain unsweetened) }		do	Nuts.
			do					Vegetables, fresh or dried: Potatoes, white.
					Reduced MFN	{ Bound (beans). }		Onions.
			{ Reduced (tubers). }					{ Peas and beans, dried. }
A and B: Bound		Reduced			Reduced		Reduced	{ Other fresh and dried vegetables. }
B: Bound		Reduced						Vegetables, canned: Asparagus. Baked beans. Peas.
do	Bound (asparagus only). Quota in-creased (all except tomatoes).	do						Corn.
do		do	Reduced	{ Bound (not including soups). }	Reduced MFN (low solid content)	Reduced	Reduced (juice only).	Tomatoes. Soups.
B: Bound								{ Other canned vegetables. }

¹ Lemons.

² Apricot kernels only.

³ Including peaches and pears.

⁴ Candied fruits, peels, and maraschino cherries, and fruit pulp canned or frozen—Reduced MFFN.

⁵ Shelled almonds, peanuts, and walnuts—Reduced MFFN; all others—Reduced.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

D. COTTON, TOBACCO, AND

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Raw cotton, including linters.	765,674	Bound			Bound free		Bound free
Leaf tobacco	144,115	Reduced*	Bound				
Cottonseed oil, edible	1,313	do. ¹					
Soybean oil, edible	562	do. ¹					Reduced
Compound lard	1,643	do. ¹					Reduced MFFN
Cottonseed oil, crude	2,581	do. ¹					Reduced MFFN ¹
Other vegetable oils		do. ¹					Reduced ²
Syrups and molasses	5,629						Reduced MFFN
Confectionery	2,521	Reduced				Reduced (chewing gum).	Reduced MFFN (candied sweets).
Jams and jellies	390	do.				Reduced	Reduced MFFN
Cocoa and preparations	579	do.					do.
Spices	261						do. ⁴
Sauces, seasonings, flavorings		Reduced					do.
Yeast	644						do.
Seeds, field and garden	3,488						Reduced ⁵
Trees, plants, and flowers	676						Reduced MFFN
Other vegetable products		{Bound Reduced ⁷ }		Reduced ⁸	{Bound (coffee substitutes).		Reduced ⁶ Reduced MFFN ⁹ Reduced (maple sugar)

Secondary or Limited Benefits:

Cuba: Puerto Rican coffee—Reduced, conditional upon Cuban crop being insufficient for Cuban consumption.

¹ If duty or tax is reduced on any edible fats and oils, impure corn, soybean, and cottonseed oil, or edible tallow, oleo stearin, and nonspecified vegetable oils, a compensatory reduction is to be made on the oils and fats in the above categories.

² Linseed oil and olive oil—Reduced MFFN; vegetable oils, not specifically named in Canadian tariff—Reduced.

³ Chocolate and milk mixtures, powdered.

E. LEATHER, FUR,

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Raw hides and skins	9,022						Bound free
Upper leather	29,740	Reduced or bound	Quota assured ¹	Reduced (goat and kid, tanned and curried).		Reduced (colored or greased except reptile).	Reduced MFFN
Patent upper leather	10,392	Reduced	{Bound Quota assured	Reduced (kid and sheep).	Bound	Reduced	
Other selected leathers		Reduced (in general)					Reduced MFFN ²
Leather footwear	11,492	Bound (in general)					do.
Selected leather manufactures		{Reduced* ³ Reduced (baggage)}					do. ⁴
Furs:							
Undressed	25,819						Bound free
Dressed	3,644						Reduced MFFN (including apparel).
Rubber tires	30,092	{Reduced (pneumatic) Bound (solid)}		Reduced ⁵	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced MFFN
Inner tubes for tires	3,232	Reduced		do. ⁶		do.	do.
Rubberized piece goods	1,606	{Reduced (cotton) Bound (silk or wool)}					do.
Rubber boots and shoes, and canvas rubber-soled shoes	8,629	Reduced (canvas footwear with rubber soles).					do.
Rubber heels and soles	1,496	Reduced			Bound		do.
Rubber belting and belts	2,675	Bound (belting)	Reduced (belting)		do. ¹⁰	Reduced (for machinery).	do.
Rubber hose and tubing	2,678	Bound	Reduced			Reduced (certain weights).	do.
Other rubber manufactures		{Bound (packing) Reduced* (in general)}					Reduced MFFN (all)

¹ Painted, dyed, or morocced leather, except goat, kid, sheep, and other small skins.

² Lining and chamois leather included.

³ For manufacture of gloves and clothing and other leathers not further manufactured than tanned.

⁴ Chamois, morocco, pig, and other small-animal skins.

⁵ Fabric footwear (except of silk and artificial silk, plush, etc.) with soles of leather, rubber, etc.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

OTHER VEGETABLE PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
A: Bound free	Bound						Bound free	Raw cotton, including lint.
A and B: Bound			Reduced	Bound	Monopoly purchase assurance			Leaf tobacco.
				Reduced				Cottonseed oil, edible.
								Soybean oil, edible.
								Compound lard.
								Cottonseed oil, crude.
								Other vegetable oils.
								Syrups and molasses.
								Confectionery.
	Reduced (chewing gum).		Bound (chewing gum).					Jams and jellies.
	Reduced (fruit).		Reduced ¹					Cocoa and preparations.
			Reduced					Spices.
			Bound					Sauces, seasonings, flavorings.
								Yeast.
								Seeds, field and garden.
					Reduced MFN (subject to quarantine regulations).			Trees, plants, and flowers.
					Reduced MFN (refined sugar and alcoholic beverages).			Other vegetable products.

¹ Nutmegs, mace, pepper, and mustard.
² Timothy seed, broomcorn seed, parsley and lettuce seed.
³ Nut trees for grafting stock—Reduced; other, except cut flowers—Reduced MFN.
⁴ Cottonseed oil residues.
⁵ Inexpensive red and white wines.
⁶ Wines, and certain other alcoholic beverages; peanut butter.

AND RUBBER PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627.]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
A: Quota assured ¹	Bound (goat and kid chrometanned).	Bound free	Reduced	Bound	Quota increased (certain types)	Bound	Bound	Raw hides and skins.
B: Bound								do
do			do	do	Quota increased (certain carried hides).	do	Bound	Patent upper leather.
			do ⁴	Bound (except sole, chamois, and parchment).	Reduced MFN (sole and most rough tanned).	Bound (engraved, figured, etc.).		Other selected leathers.
A: Quota assured			do ⁵	Bound (transmission belts).	Reduced MFN			Leather footwear.
					Reduced MFN (clothing, saddlery, belts, straps).			Selected leather manufactures.
								Furs: Undressed. Dressed.
A and B: Bound ⁶	Bound Quota increased.	Bound free	Bound	Reduced	Reduced MFN	Bound (except solid).	Reduced	Rubber tires.
do								Bound Quota increased.
								Rubberized piece goods.
A: Quota assured			Reduced ⁷					Rubber boots and shoes, and canvas rubber-soled shoes.
			Bound		Reduced MFN	Reduced (heels).		Rubber heels and soles.
			do		do		Bound	Rubber belting and belts.
			do		do			Rubber hose and tubing.
			do		Quota increased (miscellaneous rubber manufactures).			Other rubber manufactures.
					Reduced MFN (clothing, elastic fabrics, packing, hard-rubber products, and selected drug-gists' sundries).			

¹ Certain manufactures of saddlery, harness and shoe-making trades.
² Belting; harness and saddlery; leather board, whips.
³ 1 of the 3 products on which reduction does not become effective until Haitian budget for a given fiscal year is promulgated at 40,000,000 gourdes or more.
⁴ Reservation has been made concerning quotas on this product in Netherland India.
⁵ Transmission and conveyor belts.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

F. TEXTILES

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1928-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Cotton yarn.....	13,488	Preference increased.....					Reduced MFFN.....
Selected cotton fabrics.....		Reduced or bound ¹					do.....
Cotton and rayon mixtures.....	4,209	Reduced (knit fabrics).....					do.....
Cotton hosiery.....	6,519	Reduced.....					do.....
Cotton shirts.....	1,978	do. ²				Reduced (of woven fabric).....	do.....
Other cotton wearing apparel.....		do. ²	Quota increased (collars, cuffs, etc., and women's clothing).....				do.....
Selected cotton products.....	12,942	[Reduced (toweling)..... Reduced* (blankets)..... Bound (cotton cordage).....]					[Reduced MFFN (laces and embroideries)..... Reduced MFFN.....]
Broad silk fabrics.....	3,529	Reduced.....					do.....
Silk hosiery.....	8,531	Reduced.....	Quota increased.....				do.....
Silk dresses, etc.....	1,627	Reduced (knit).....	Quota increased (women's).....				do.....
Other silk wearing apparel.....		Reduced (knit wear).....	do.....				do.....
Rayon fabrics, woven and knit (1928-30).....	2,152	Reduced ⁴					do.....
Rayon hosiery.....	3,418	do.....					do.....
Rayon wearing apparel.....		Reduced (underwear, knit) ³					do.....
Wool apparel.....	2,209	Reduced.....	Quota increased (women's).....				do.....
Jute bags.....	3,428	Reduced.....					do.....
Linoleum and felt-base floor covering.....	2,351	Reduced.....	Reduced (felt base).....			Reduced or bound.....	Reduced.....
Oilcloth.....	2,214	Reduced or bound.....	Reduced.....			Reduced.....	do.....
Waterproof fabrics and garments, excluding rubber.....	1,655	do.....					Reduced MFFN.....
Artificial leather.....	2,964	Reduced or bound ¹	Reduced.....		Bound ⁴		Reduced.....
Corsets and related products.....	1,845	do.....					Reduced MFFN.....
Felt hats.....	2,222	Reduced* (men's and boys').....					do.....
Absorbent cotton, gauze, and bandages.....	2,278	do.....				Reduced.....	[Reduced ¹ Reduced MFFN..... Reduced ³]
Textile small wares.....		Reduced ³					do.....
Selected textile articles.....		Reduced or bound ³			Bound ⁴		Reduced MFFN ⁴

Secondary or limited benefits:

Cuba: Rayon yarn—Preference increased; rayon gloves—Reduced.

¹ In general "Reduction" applies to the finer-woven cotton fabrics; no action on colored fabrics except dyed pique, on which duty is reduced; the rate on all cotton crepe is reduced; knit cotton fabrics in the piece—Bound.

² Certain unbleached fabrics—Bound; certain unbleached white and colored canvas—Reduced.

³ These products when of knit fabric—Reduced; of woven fabric—Reduced or Bound; if fabric of which composed is reduced or bound.

⁴ Except woven outerwear.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 1, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
			Bound (more than 3 strands)	Bound	Reduced MFN (in general)			Cotton yarn.
A: Quota assured		Reduced (denim)	Bound	do	do			Selected cotton fabrics.
do		Bound	Bound		Reduced MFN			Cotton and rayon mixtures.
do		Reduced	Bound	Bound	do	Bound		Cotton hosiery.
			Reduced or bound (selected)		Reduced MFN (if woven)			Cotton shirts.
					do			Other cotton wearing apparel.
		Bound (free bags)	Bound (blankets)		Reduced MFN (certain minor products)			Selected cotton products.
A: Quota assured	Bound (Quota assured)		Reduced	Bound	Reduced MFN (certain types)			Broad silk fabrics.
do			Reduced (if knit)		Quota increased			Silk hosiery.
A: Quota assured (outer and under clothing)			Reduced		Reduced MFN (if woven)			Silk dresses, etc.
A: Quota assured					do			Other silk wearing apparel.
	Quota assured		Reduced (excluding outerwear)		Reduced MFN (certain woven fabrics)			Rayon fabrics, woven and knit.
A: Quota assured					Reduced MFN (if woven)			Rayon hosiery.
					do			Rayon wearing apparel.
		Bound free						Wool apparel.
			Bound		Reduced MFN (inlaid linoleum)		Bound free (used)	Jute bags.
A: Quota assured			do		Reduced MFN (certain types)			Linoleum and felt-base floor covering.
					do			Oilcloth.
			Reduced		Reduced MFN (certain types)			Waterproof fabrics and garments, excluding rubber.
								Artificial leather.
								Corsets and related products.
								Felt hats.
A: Quota assured (ribbons, tape, elastic bands, etc.)			Bound		Reduced MFN (pharmaceutical cotton)			Absorbent cotton, gauze and bandages.
A: Quota assured (wool fabrics and mixtures)			Reduced ¹⁰					Textile small wares.
								Selected textile articles.

¹ Unbleached woven rayon fabrics; rayon velvet and plush; knit fabrics and tulle; rayon open-work fabric and upholstering fabric.

² Articles for manufacture or assembly of automobiles.

³ Absorbent cotton, gauze, and surgical dressings—Reduced; cotton bandages—Reduced MFN.

⁴ Badges, belts, regalia, etc.

⁵ Batts, wadding, etc.; woven fabrics of jute; felt; blankets; gloves; webbing; rugs and carpets; woven fabrics of wool or hair; rovings of vegetable fibers, silk, or rayon.

¹⁰ Certain apparel of linen, hemp, ramie and similar materials—Reduced if woven—Bound if knit.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal
G. LUMBER, PAPER,

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Unmanufactured timber	12,841	{ Reduced (gumwood) } { Bound ¹ }					Bound free
Sawed timber:							
Softwoods	17,296	do. ¹	Reduced or bound				do.
Hardwoods	103		do.				do.
Boards, planks, etc.:							
Softwoods	54,703	Bound ¹					{ Reduced ¹ } { Bound free }
Hardwoods	27,467						{ Reduced ¹ } { Bound free }
Cooperage and cooper- age stock	9,373	Bound (assembled)					{ Reduced } { Bound free }
Box shooks	3,744	Bound					Reduced MFN
Veneers and plywood	3,287	Bound (plywoods)					Reduced
Doors	3,411	{ Bound (of ordinary } wood) }					Reduced MFN ²
Furniture of wood	3,581	{ Bound ³ } { Reduced }					do.
Tool handles	2,157	{ Bound (of ordinary } wood) }			Bound		Reduced
Selected manufactures of wood		{ Reduced ⁴ } { Bound }	Bound ⁵				Reduced MFN ⁶
Book paper, uncoated	1,936	do.					Reduced
Wrapping paper	2,559	{ "Cellophane" (prefer- } ence increased) }					{ do. ⁷ } { Reduced MFN }
Surface coated paper	1,019	{ Reduced ⁸ } { Bound }					do.
Tissue and crepe paper	1,050	Reduced ¹¹					Reduced
Toilet paper	720	do.					do.
Boxboard (of paper and strawboard)	1,426	Reduced or bound					Reduced MFN
Fiber insulating board and wallboard	3,049						do.
Writing paper	2,478	{ Reduced } { Bound ¹² }					Reduced
Paper bags	940	do.					Reduced MFN
Boxes and cartons	1,645	Reduced ¹⁴					{ Reduced ¹³ } { Reduced MFN }
Other selected forest products		{ Bound ¹⁶ } { Reduced }					{ Reduced ¹⁷ } { Reduced MFN }

¹ Ordinary woods except pine and Douglas fir—Bound.
² Planed or dressed on one or both sides and edges are jointed, tongued and grooved—Reduced; when not manufactured to that state—Bound free.
³ Plywood not further manufactured than glued and veneers of single ply under 5/16 in.
⁴ Not less than 6 by 2 feet—Reduced MFN; other—Reduced.
⁵ Plain wood furniture—Bound; folding chairs and venetian blinds—Reduced.
⁶ Packing cases of ordinary wood containing imports—Reduced; unspecified manufactures of wood—Bound.
⁷ Carpentry work, other than wheel hubs, spokes, and rims.
⁸ Corks, cork slab, and manufactures of corkwood; moldings of wood; churns, brooms, washboards; certain athletic equipment; picture frames; coffins and caskets; show cases.
⁹ Oiled, coated, or embossed—Reduced; uncoated wrapping paper and "cellophane"—Reduced MFN.
¹⁰ Coated, sensitized, waterproofed, etc.—Reduced; metal covered—Bound.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

AND PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Filand, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
					Quota increased (certain species)			(Unmanufactured timber. Sawed timber: Softwoods.
A: Bound free (fir and pine).	Quota increased duty bound (Douglas fir).	Bound	Bound (planed only).		do			Hardwoods.
		Bound (except cabinet wood)	do		do			Boards, planks, etc.: Softwoods.
		Bound	do		{Quota increased (certain species) (unplaned).}			Hardwoods.
		{Bound (except cabinet wood).	do		do			(Cooperage and cooperage stock.
					Reduced MFN (certain types)			Box shooks.
					do			Veneers and plywood.
					Reduced MFN			Doors.
					{Reduced MFN (including sash, flooring, and certain mill work).}			Furniture of wood.
					Reduced MFN (chairs and seats)			Tool handles.
					{Reduced MFN (implement handles).}			{Selected manufactures of wood.
A: Quota assured					{Reduced MFN (cork and products).}			Book paper, uncoated.
do								Wrapping paper.
A: Quota assured					Reduced MFN			Surface coated paper.
A: Quota assured ¹¹			Bound		Reduced MFN			Tissue and crepe paper.
do	{Quota increased. Duty reduced.}				do			Toilet paper.
do					do			Boxboard (of paper and straw board).
do					do			{Fiber insulating board and wallboard.
do					Reduced MFN (plain)			Writing paper.
do					do			Paper bags.
do					Reduced MFN			Boxes and cartons.
do ¹²					{Reduced MFN (wall paper and vulcanized paper) ¹³ }			{Other selected forest products

¹¹ Towels, handkerchiefs and napkins—Reduced.

¹² Corrugated board, packing board.

¹³ Writing paper not containing linen—Reduced; envelopes, bond paper, and letterheads—Bound.

¹⁴ Only on those containing imported goods.

¹⁵ Boxes of paper—Reduced; containers of fiberboard or paperboard—Reduced MFFN.

¹⁶ Playing cards—Bound; newsprint, bottle caps, and filter paper—Reduced.

¹⁷ Includes cigarette papers, stencil paper, paper shoe patterns, milk bottle caps, collar cloth of paper, sand paper and emery paper; pulpboard for wrapping; paper matting; vulcanized fiber sheets, etc.; newsprint; wood pulp—Reduced MFFN; wall paper and nonspecified manufactures of paper—Reduced.

¹⁸ Parchment paper and various articles not specified.

¹⁹ Certain machine made paper and rough cardboard—Quota increased; certain cut paper and cardboard, vulcanized fiber, uncut—Bound.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

H. NONMETALLIC MIN

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1929-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Gasoline.....	244,577				Bound.....		Reduced MFN (including naphtha). Reduced MFFN ¹
Kerosene.....	84,049						do.....
Lubricating oil.....	91,733						do.....
Lubricating greases.....	5,523						do.....
Fuel oil.....	42,278						do.....
Paraffin wax.....	15,077		Bound free (crude and refined).				Reduced MFFN.....
Special petroleum preparations.							Reduced MFFN (vaseline and similar preparations). Reduced.....
Marble, granite, or other rough stone.	910						do.....
Cement.....	2,854	Reduced (white) Bound (other)				Reduced (white). Bound (Portland, Roman, etc.).	do.....
Glass, sheet or plate.....	1,146	Reduced (not ground, beveled, etc.).		Bound (plain, unmounted and plate and cylinder).			do.....
Glass containers.....	3,252	Reduced (ordinary)					Reduced MFFN.....
Table glassware.....	1,578	Reduced (all)					do.....
Electrical porcelain.....	1,473			Bound.....			do.....
Earthenware plumbing fixtures.	1,354	Reduced.....					Reduced MFFN (drain tiles and pipes).
Tile and brick (including refractory brick).....	4,273	Bound (refractory only and cement roofing tiles.)					Reduced ² Bound free ³ Reduced MFFN ¹
Artificial abrasives.....	6,615	Reduced (cloths and paper).			Bound ⁴		do.....
Asbestos brake lining.....	1,147	Bound.....					do.....
Electrodes (for electric furnaces).	1,980				Bound..... Bound free ⁴		do.....
Sulphur.....	14,850				do.....		do.....
Salt.....	1,104	Reduced.....					Reduced MFFN.....
Phosphate, raw.....	4,927				Bound free.....		do.....

Secondary or limited benefits:

Canada: Reduced—Articles of glass, not plate or sheet, designed to be cut or mounted.

Reduced MFFN—Plaster of paris, grindstones, building stone, sawn more than 2 sides; manufactures of marble and granite; roofing slate and manufactures of slate; plumbago ground and manufactures of; spectacles and other manufactures of glass; insulator cores for manufacture of spark plugs; lamp bulbs.

¹ Also illuminating oils over 30 cents per gallon.

² Paraffin and ceresin, pure, unmanufactured.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

TERMS AND PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands and Indies (A) and (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10799)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
	Quota increased.						Bound	Gasoline.
{A: Bound free (in bulk).	do.							Kerosene.
	Bound		Bound					Lubricating oil
	Quota assured							Lubricating greases.
	Bound							Fuel oil.
	Quota increased.				Reduced MFN			Paraffin wax.
	Bound ¹		Reduced (industrial use).					
	Bound (petrolatum).				Reduced MFN (petrolatum)			Special petroleum preparations.
{A: Quota assured (Portland).								Marble, granite, or other rough stone.
								Cement.
					Reduced MFN (certain types)			Glass, sheet or plate.
					Reduced MFN			Glass containers.
								Table glassware.
			{ Bound (un-mounted) Reduced (mounted). Bound (sanitary water closets and requisites).		Reduced MFN (certain types)			Electrical porcelain.
					do			Earthenware plumbing fixtures.
					do			{ Tile and brick (including refractory brick)
		Bound			Quota increased (carborundum, powdered). ⁷			Artificial abrasives.
		Bound	Reduced					Asbestos brake lining.
A: Bound free (in bulk).								Electrodes (for electric furnaces).
								Sulphur.
								Salt.
								Phosphate, raw.

¹ Firebrick of a class or kind not made in Canada; and building and paving brick—Reduced; firebrick of magnesite, silica, etc.—Bound free; other tile and brick—Reduced MFN.

² Abrasive paper and polishing cloth, and synthetic grindstones.

³ Electrodes, graphited—Bound; all other—Bound free.

⁴ Electric light and arc carbons.

⁷ Natural abrasives on cloth, wood, or paper, Quota increased.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

I. METALS AND

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Iron and steel bars and rods.	11,019	Preference increased					{Reduced MFN (including ferro-alloys).
Iron and steel plates and sheets.	42,630	{Reduced* (plain)----- Reduced (others)-----}					Reduced MFN
Tin plate	27,388						{Reduced ¹ Reduced MFN
Structural shapes	12,545	{Reduced (not cut to measure).-----}					{Bound ⁴ Reduced MFN
Rails (including railway track material).	9,121	Reduced* (except rails)					do
Pipes and fittings	28,822	{Reduced* (except boiler tubes).-----}		Bound			do
Iron and steel wire and manufactures (including nails).	13,687	{Reduced* (wire, etc.)----- Reduced (nails)-----}					{Reduced ¹ Reduced MFN ⁴
Nuts and bolts, etc.	2,476	Reduced					do
Castings and forgings	6,611	{Reduced* (unspecified articles of cast iron).-----}					{Reduced ⁷ Reduced MFN
Cutlery (razor blades, etc.)	9,687	{Reduced* (in general, except scissors).----- Reduced (razor blades)-----}					do
Hollow ware	1,905	Reduced*					{Reduced ⁸ Reduced MFN
Metal furniture	7,282	Reduced (except beds)				Reduced	do
Cooking and heating equipment, nonelectric.	5,412	{Reduced* or----- Reduced-----}					Reduced
Tools	17,907	do. ⁹			{Bound (hacksaw blades).-----}	Reduced (steel files).	{Reduced MFN ¹⁰
Hardware	8,454	{Reduced (numerous items).-----}					{Reduced ¹¹ Reduced MFN (hinges, butts and screws).----- Reduced ¹⁴ Reduced MFN
Chains	2,543	Reduced*					do
Automatic scales (excluding coin operated).	942	Reduced				Bound	do
Refined copper	123,015	Reduced (bars)			{Bound free (unwrought).-----}		
Copper rods and wire	12,988	{Reduced ¹⁵ ----- Reduced* ¹⁵ ----- Preference increased ¹⁵ -----}					{Reduced Reduced MFN ¹⁶
Selected copper manufactures.		Reduced or bound ¹⁷					Reduced MFN (all)
Selected brass and bronze manufactures.	15,862						{Reduced MFN Reduced ¹⁸ Reduced MFN ²⁰
Lead and products	10,305	Reduced* ¹⁹					{Reduced ²¹ Reduced MFN ²²
Nickel manufactures (and electroplated ware).	1,806	{Reduced* (unspecified products).-----}					{Bound free ²³ Reduced MFN
Zinc and manufactures	6,564	Reduced* ¹⁹					do. ²⁴
Other metal products		{Reduced----- Reduced* ²⁴ -----}					

¹ Manufactures of tin plate—Reduced; containers of tin plate—Reduced MFN.
² For containers.
³ For other uses.
⁴ Weighing over 35 pounds per linear yard—Bound; other structural shapes—Reduced MFN.
⁵ Including wire coated with other metals—Reduced.
⁶ Woven or welded wire fencing; wire cloth or netting, of iron or steel, coated or not (according to size); pins of wire—Reduced MFN.
⁷ Axles and axle bars for vehicles other than railway—Reduced.
⁸ Hollow ware coated with vitreous enamel—Reduced; other hollow ware—Reduced MFN.
⁹ Fine tools, and most others, except shears, pincers, and agricultural.
¹⁰ Shovels and spades; axes; and certain precision tools.
¹¹ Builders', cabinet makers', upholsterers', and carriage hardware.
¹² Builders' hardware of brass or copper.
¹³ Rivets, nuts, bolts, screws, nails, etc., of iron or steel.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

METAL MANUFACTURES

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
					Reduced MFN			Iron and steel bars and rods.
			Reduced		do			Iron and steel plates and sheets.
			{ Bound ¹ Reduced ² }		do			Tin plate.
			Bound		do			Structural shapes.
					do	{ Bound free. }		Rails (including railway track material).
			Bound		do			Pipes and fittings.
A: Quota assured			do		Reduced MFN (excluding nails)			Iron and steel wire and manufactures (including nails).
			do		Reduced MFN			Nuts and bolts, etc.
					Reduced MFN (certain castings)			Castings and forgings.
			{ Reduced (clippers and razor blades). }		Reduced MFN (certain types)			Cutlery (razor blades, etc.).
			Reduced	Reduced			{ Reduced (office desks and chairs). }	Hollow ware.
	{ Reduced Quota increased (oil burners and parts). }		{ Bound (except large plants). }		{ Reduced MFN (certain stoves and furnaces). }			Metal furniture.
		{ Bound (hand tools). }	Bound		{ Quota increased (saws, files, drills, and most other tools). }			Cooking and heating equipment, nonelectric.
A: Quota assured (locks and parts)			{ Reduced ¹¹ Bound ¹² }					Tools.
			do		Reduced MFN			Hardware.
			do		Reduced MFN (heavy industrial)			Chains.
A: Bound free (pigs, bars, and ingots)								Automatic scales (excluding coin operated).
			{ Bound (wire only). Reduced (tubes and pipes). }		{ Reduced MFN (pipe and hollow ware). }		{ Bound (selected copper rods). }	Refined copper.
					do			Copper rods and wire.
					Reduced MFN			Selected copper manufactures.
					Reduced MFN (certain products)			Selected brass and bronze manufactures.
A: Quota assured (sheet zinc)					do			Lead and products.
					{ Quota increased (certain aluminum products). Reduced MFN (most aluminum products). }			Nickel manufactures (and electroplated ware).
								Zinc and manufactures.
								Other metal products.

¹⁴ Roller chain—Reduced MFFN; other chains of iron or steel—Reduced.

¹⁵ Copper and alloy bars—Reduced; copper wire—Reduced*, Reduced, or Preference increased; copper wire gauze—Reduced.

¹⁶ Copper wire twisted—Reduced MFFN; others—Reduced.

¹⁷ Plates and sheets, nails, tacks, and certain unspecified manufactures—Reduced; pipe, bearings, notions, sanitary articles—Bound.

¹⁸ Wire of brass insulated or not—Reduced; others—Reduced MFFN.

¹⁹ Bars, plates, wire, and unspecified products—Reduced.*

²⁰ Except tea lead and lead in pigs and blocks.

²¹ Nickel plated and electroplated ware—Reduced.

²² Nickel household hollow ware and manufactures of nickel and German silver not plated—Reduced MFFN.

²³ Zinc strip, tubing, and dust, etc.—Bound free; manufactures of zinc—Reduced MFFN.

²⁴ Nickel bars, plates, powder, wire—Reduced; tin bars, plates, wire—Reduced*; tin pipes and containers—Reduced.

²⁵ Including water pumps for domestic use, buckles, needles, metal signs, pulleys, lighting fixtures, gas meters, lamp shades and holders, bathtubs, sinks; phosphor tin and bronze; steel balls; steel wool; skates; window-shade rollers.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal
J. MACHINERY AND ELECTRICAL

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Cultivating implements.	25,433	{ Reduced Preference increased }			{ Bound (plows and harrows). Bound }	Bound free do	Reduced do
Harvesting machinery.	25,744	{ Reduced Preference increased }					
Tractors and parts.	58,724	Bound				do	Bound free Reduced (including engines and parts).
Power-generating machinery (excluding electric and automotive).	25,239	{ Reduced (including windmills). Preference increased }					{ Reduced ² Reduced MFFN }
Construction and conveying machinery.	22,188	{ Reduced (in general). Bound (cane loaders) }					{ Reduced ³ Reduced MFFN }
Mining, well, and pumping machinery.	43,778	Reduced				Reduced (pumps).	Reduced or Reduced MFFN
Metal-working machinery.	30,383	do					Reduced
Textile machinery.	11,408	Reduced or bound					do
Sewing machines.	6,270	do		Reduced		Bound	Reduced MFFN
Printing and bookbinding machinery.	16,097	Reduced			Bound free (typesetting).	Bound (typesetting).	{ Reduced Bound free ⁴ }
Other industrial machinery.		do ⁵			Bound ⁶	Bound ⁷	{ Reduced ⁸ Reduced MFFN ⁹ }
Power-plant equipment.	19,727	do		Bound			{ Reduced or Reduced MFFN }
Batteries.	8,944	do		do		Reduced (dry)	do
Motors, starters, controllers.	14,647	do		do			{ Reduced ¹¹ Reduced MFFN }
Incandescent light bulbs.	4,712	Preference increased		do			
Household appliances.	8,870	Reduced				Bound (washing machinery).	Reduced ¹²
Electric household refrigerators.	7,084	do		Bound		Bound (also larger units).	Reduced (including commercial).
Radio apparatus.	15,259	Reduced (including tubes and accessories).	Reduced (including tubes).	Reduced ¹⁴ (conditional).		Reduced or bound (including tubes).	Reduced
Telephone and telegraph apparatus.	6,138	Reduced		Bound		Reduced or bound.	do
Other electrical apparatus and equipment.	17,330	Reduced (in general)		do ¹⁴			Reduced MFFN ¹⁵
Accounting and calculating machines.	12,021	Reduced	Reduced or bound ¹⁷			Bound	Reduced
Cash registers.	8,069	do	Reduced			do	Reduced MFFN
Typewriters.	20,962	do	do			do	
Dictating machines (including cylinders).			do				Reduced MFFN

¹ Including engines, chassis, chassis frames, and other under frames.

² Windmills and portable engines, diesel engines—Reduced; internal-combustion engines, steam engines, boilers, magnetos and parts—Reduced MFFN.

³ Concrete mixers, traction ditching machines; cranes and derricks; steam shovels—Reduced; concrete paving machines; ditching machines—Reduced MFFN.

⁴ Typesetting and typesetting machines—Bound free; other printing machinery and bookbinding machinery—Reduced.

⁵ Including meters, gages, etc., for machinery; machinery for manufacture or refining of sugar or alcohol—Reduced.

⁶ Cylinders, slide boxes, and other miscellaneous machine parts—Bound.

⁷ Includes small machinery as used in homes and stores such as knife and tool sharpeners, for cutting meat, paper, cloth, bread, cork, grinding corn, washing glasses, bottles, dishes, ironing and wringing clothes, chopping and shredding foods and tobacco—Bound.

⁸ Logging machinery, fire engines, fish-preparing machinery, street-cleaning machinery, machinery for converting "cellophane", veneer drying machinery, bakery machinery, milk clarifiers, wire stitchers, ball and roller bearings—Reduced.

⁹ Pasteurizers, machinery for sawing lumber, cylinder stove saws, machinery for making fish nets, clothes wringers, leather tanning machinery, certain dairy machinery, lawn mowers—Reduced MFFN.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

APPARATUS (USUALLY INCLUDING PARTS)

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
			Bound		Quota increased			Cultivating implements.
			do		do			Harvesting machinery.
A: Bound ¹			do		do	Bound free		Tractors and parts.
			do		Quota increased (stationary and marine steam engines). Reduced MFN (light steam engines).	do		Power generating machinery (excluding electric and automotive).
			do		Reduced MFN (heavy cranes, hoists, excavators, road machinery, concrete mixers).	do		Construction and conveying machinery.
			do		Reduced MFN (certain heavy mining and drilling machinery).	do		Mining, well, and pumping machinery.
			do		Quota increased (pneumatic tools and hammers).	do		Metal-working machinery.
			do		Reduced MFN (in general)			Textile machinery.
			do		Reduced (sewing-machine heads)			Sewing machines.
A: Bound (copy and letter presses).	Bound (typesetting and bookbinding).		Bound (except presses and blocks).		Quota increased (presses) Reduced MFN (typesetting)			Printing and book-binding machinery.
			Bound (all).		Quota increased (certain refrigerating apparatus). Reduced MFN ¹⁷	Bound free ¹⁰	Bound (refrigerating machines).	Other industrial machinery.
			Bound		Reduced MFN (certain generators and transformers).	do		Power-plant equipment.
			do		Reduced MFN (most dry batteries).	Bound		Batteries.
			do		Reduced MFN (motors, certain weights).	Bound free		Motors, starters, controllers.
			do		Reduced MFN (certain types)			Incandescent light bulbs.
			do					Household appliances.
A and B: Bound	Bound ¹⁵ Quota increased.				Quota increased		Bound	Electric household refrigerators.
	do		Bound (including tubes).	Reduced (receiving sets).	Quota increased (radios, tubes, and parts).	Bound		Radio apparatus.
			Bound					Telephone and telegraph apparatus.
					Reduced MFN (certain heavy apparatus). Quota assured (circuit breakers) Quota increased (certain measuring instruments).			Other electrical apparatus and equipment.
A and B: Bound	Bound Reduced ¹⁸		Reduced	Bound			Bound (calculating). Bound	Accounting and calculating machines. Cash registers.
A and B: Bound	do		do	Bound	Reduced (certain weights; and parts). Quota increased	Bound	Bound (including duplicating machines).	Typewriters.
								Dictating machines (including cylinders).

¹⁰ Ice-making, refrigerating, woodworking machinery and sawmills, and machinery for manufacture of sugar, cigarettes, chocolate, shoes, hats.

¹¹ Electric motors—Reduced; other motors, etc.—Reduced MFN.

¹² Vacuum cleaners and washing machines; cooking and heating apparatus (electric only).

¹³ Includes other electric refrigerators and refrigerator cabinets of all kinds and parts of refrigerators, etc.

¹⁴ Includes receiving apparatus only (1 of the 3 products on which reduction does not become effective until Haitian budget for a given fiscal year is promulgated at 40,000,000 gourdes or more)—Reduced; rate on transmitting apparatus is bound and is not affected by the conditional limitation.

¹⁵ Includes transformers, switchboards, switches, arc lights, fans, buzzers, meters, insulators and insulation materials.

¹⁶ Fuses, lightning arresters, meters, sockets, ignition apparatus, switches, sadrons, dental engines.

¹⁷ Refrigerating, air-conditioning, heavy petroleum-refining machinery, chemical-plant equipment, and certain other heavy industrial machinery.

¹⁸ Accounting machines—Reduced; calculating machines—Reduced or bound according to weight.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

K. AUTOMOBILES AND

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Motortrucks, busses, and chassis.	75,190	Reduced		Bound	Bound (chassis only)	Reduced	Reduced MFN
Passenger cars and chassis.	197,649	do	Reduced	do	Bound	{Reduced (cars only)}	do
Automobile engines	10,456	do	do	do	do. ¹		do
Automobile parts for assembly.	62,237	do	{Reduced (selected)}	do	do	Reduced	Reduced MFN (most)
Automobile parts for replacement.	52,187	do	do	do	Bound (in general)	do	do
Automobile accessories	8,277	do		do	Bound ²	do. ³	Reduced MFN
Automobile service appliances.	6,927	Reduced (selected)				{Reduced (gasoline pumps)}	{Reduced or Reduced MFN}
Engines, parts, and accessories for aircraft.	2,264	Reduced					do
Aircraft	2,643	Bound					do
Motorcycles and parts	5,279	Reduced				Bound (cycles)	Reduced
Motorboats and engines (except diesel).	3,370	Bound ¹					Reduced MFN ⁴
Locomotives		Reduced					do
Railway cars and parts	12,396	{Bound (mine cars) Reduced (other)}					do
Other vehicles and accessories.		{Reduced (velocipedes, bicycles, etc.)}					{Reduced ⁷ Reduced MFN ⁸ }

¹ Surtax on passenger cars or chassis with list prices over \$1,000 (United States currency) eliminated.

² If for the manufacture or assembly of automobiles.

³ Instruments, mirrors, horns, etc.

⁴ Motors, batteries, instruments, etc.—Bound.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

OTHER VEHICLES

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
A and B: Bound.....	Quota increased.	B o u n d free.	Reduced (with pneumatic tires only).	Bound.....			Bound.....	Motortrucks, busses, and chassis.
do.....	{Bound..... Quota increased.	do.....	Reduced.....	Reduced ¹	{Quota increased (cars, bodies, chassis). Duty reduced (chassis, limited quantity).		{Bound (except light).	Passenger cars and chassis.
do.....			{Bound (if separate).		Quota increase (certain parts and accessories). Reduced (spark plugs and parts). Bound (certain other parts including shock absorbers, gears, transmissions steering app., axles, brakes).			Automobile engines.
B: Bound.....			Reduced.....				Bound (certain parts and accessories).	Automobile parts for assembly.
do.....			do.....					Automobile parts for replacement.
do.....								Automobile accessories.
		{B o u n d (certain hand tools).	{B o u n d (selected).					{Automotive service appliances.
{B: Bound (engines and parts).			{Bound ⁴ Reduced (parts in general).		Reduced MFN (certain parts)			{Engines, parts, and accessories for aircraft.
			Reduced (cycles).		Reduced MFN (dutiable as parts). Reduced MFN (certain parts)			Aircraft.
B: Bound (engines and parts).			B o u n d (engines if separate).		Reduced MFN (boats)			Motorcycles and parts.
B: Bound free (engines for rail traction).							B o u n d free (including tenders).	Motorboats and engines (except diesel).
					Reduced MFN (freight cars)			Locomotives.
			{Reduced (parts).		{Reduced MFN (wagons and trailers).			Railway cars and parts.
								{Other vehicles and accessories.

¹ Less than 200 tons; includes dredges, scows, etc.

² Engines for use in fishing boats only.

³ Farming and logging wagons and sleds—Reduced.

⁴ Buggies, children's carriages and sleds, carts and wheel barrows, road scrapers, bicycles—Reduced MFN.

American export products benefiting from reciprocal

L. CHEMICALS AND

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Benzol.....	7,049						Reduced MFFN.....
Colors.....	6,300	Bound.....	Bound free (aniline dyes).				
Other coal-tar products.....			Bound free (coal tar).				
Biologics.....	2,036	Bound.....					Reduced MFFN (selected)
Tablets, pills, powders, etc.	17,657	{ Reduced†.....		{ Reduced (not over 14 percent alcohol).†			Reduced MFFN.....
Proprietary medicinal preparations.		{ (†).....					do.....
Other medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.		{ Bound† (pharmaceutical specialties).		Reduced†.....			Reduced MFFN (most)
Industrial alcohols.....	913	Reduced* (wood alcohol).					
Borax.....	2,625	Reduced.....					
Caustic soda.....	3,363	Bound.....					
Other industrial chemicals.		{ Reduced* and.....	Bound (acetone).				{ Reduced ⁴
Carbon black.....	5,815	Reduced ³					Bound free.....
Ready-mixed paints and enamels.	7,961	Reduced* (vegetable for sugar refining).			Bound.....	Reduced.....	Reduced MFFN.....
Varnishes and lacquers.....	2,585	Bound.....	Reduced (with alcohol).			Reduced (cellulose base).	do.....
Other pigments, paints, and varnishes.		{ Bound or.....					do.....
Fertilizers and materials.	17,917	{ Reduced.....			{ Bound free (raw phosphate).		{ Reduced ⁶
Explosives, fuses, etc.....		4,072	Reduced (in general)				
Soap.....	8,118	Bound or reduced ⁸			Reduced (shaving soap and cream).	Reduced (scouring and common).	do. ¹⁰
Dentifrices.....	3,109	Reduced.....			Reduced.....		
Cosmetics.....	2,078	do.....					
Other soap and toilet preparations.		Reduced (in general)					
Insecticides, disinfectants, and deodorants.	4,776	Reduced*.....					{ Reduced MFFN (insect powder).
Synthetic plastics and manufactures.		3,240	do.....				
Baking powder.....	1,705	do.*.....			Reduced.....		do.....
Inks.....	1,912	do.* ¹¹					{ Reduced ¹³
Polishes (metal, wood, and auto).	2,069	Bound.....					do.....
Rosin.....	20,008		Bound free.....		Bound free (gum and wood).	Reduced.....	
Turpentine.....	8,851					do.....	
Other naval stores.....			Bound free (gums, except white).				

†GENERAL NOTE.—Assurance has been given that American exporters of medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations will not be required to comply with formalities impossible of fulfillment in the United States because of the lack of a duly authorized Federal agency.

¹ Coal-tar derivatives for manufacture of aniline dyes.

² Except medicinal wines and injections other than quinine and biologicals.

³ Liquid carbonic acid—Reduced*; acetic acid—Reduced*; salts of ammonia, except sulphate, chlorides of potassium and calcium, sulphates of potash, soda, iron, magnesium, barium, salts of copper, alum, oxide and carbonate of magnesium, and hyposulphites—Reduced; sulphated oils and fats—Reduced; bleaching powders—Reduced; albumen, fibrin, gelatin, etc., and industrial glue—Reduced; mucilage, paste, etc.—Reduced. (No preference increase on carbonic and acetic acids.)

⁴ Sodium compounds, acetic acid, compounds of tetraethyl lead—Reduced.

⁵ Calcium molybdate, potassium chlorate, acetic acid crude, stearic acid, nitric acid, sulphuric and muriatic acids, hydrogen peroxide—Reduced MFFN.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

RELATED PRODUCTS

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627.]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936. (For turn-over tax, see p. 10627)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
			Bound (unprepared mineral colors only).		Reduced MFN (in general)			Benzol. Colors.
	Bound ¹					Bound (pharmaceutical only). Bound		Other coal-tar products.
			Reduced		Reduced MFN			Biologics.
		{Bound or reduced.†	do.†	(†)	{Reduced MFN (in retail packages).	Reduced†		{Tablets, pills, powders, etc.
		do.†	do.†	(†)	do	do.†		{Proprietary medicinal preparations.
		do.†	{Reduced ^{2†} Bound (quinine)	(†)	do	do.†		{Other medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.
A: Bound free (in bulk).					Quota increased (butyl alcohol and acetate). Reduced MFN (limited quantity).			Industrial alcohols.
			{Bound (non-specified).		Reduced MFN (Quota assured (hydraulic lime). Reduced MFN (certain acids and nicotine ¹¹).			Borax.
			Reduced	Bound (excluding enamels). Reduced		Reduced		Caustic soda.
			do		Quota increased (certain varnishes).	do		{Other industrial chemicals.
			{Bound (unprepared chemical colors).	{Bound (paste paint). Reduced (enamel).	Quota increased (certain paint products). Reduced MFN (certain pigments).			Carbon black.
A: Quota assured ⁴ . B: Quota assured								Ready-mixed paints and enamels. Varnishes and lacquers.
			Bound (black hunting powder and powder for mines). Reduced (shaving cream in tubes and shampoos only). Reduced		Reduced MFN (dynamite and detonators).			{Other pigments, paints, and varnishes.
		Reduced (bath and toilet).						{Fertilizers and materials. Explosives, fuses, etc.
			do		Reduced MFN (if containing alcohol). do do			Soap.
			Reduced (perfumery and toilet water).					Dentifrices.
		{Bound or Reduced (proprietary).	Bound					Cosmetics. Other soap and toilet preparations.
					Reduced MFN (certain types)			{Insecticides, disinfectants, and deodorants.
			Bound (black hunting powder and powder for mines). Reduced (shaving cream in tubes and shampoos only). Reduced		do			Synthetic plastics and manufactures. Baking powder.
			do					Inks.
			Bound (printing and lithographing only). Bound		{Reduced MFN (certain writing inks).			Polishes (metal, wood, and auto). Rosin.
A: Bound free (in bulk). A: Bound free (vegetable).			do		Reduced MFN (spirits)			Turpentine.
			do		Reduced MFN (certain gums)			Other naval stores.

¹ Manufactured fertilizers, superphosphate and phosphate of lime, sodium nitrate—Reduced.
² Dried blood, potash—Reduced MFN.
³ Nitrate, Chilean, including synthetic.
⁴ Common bar washing soap—Bound; medicinal soap—Bound; other soaps—Reduced.
⁵ Harness soap, liquid soap, toilet soap, and powdered soap.
⁶ Chromates and bichromates of soda and potassium—Reduced MFN up to fixed annual quantities only.
⁷ Writing, drawing, printing, and lithographic inks included, but on first two there is no preference increase.
⁸ Printing ink—Reduced.

American export products benefiting from reciproca
M. SPECIALTY AND MISCEL

[Countries listed in order of effective dates of agreements, indicated under each; if

Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)	Total value of average annual United States exports 1926-30 (thousands of dollars)	Cuba, Sept. 3, 1934	Belgium, May 1, 1935	Haiti, June 3, 1935	Sweden, Aug. 5, 1935	Brazil, Jan. 1, 1936	Canada, Jan. 1, 1936
Motion-picture projectors (including sound equipment).	8,467	{ Reduced (sound)..... Preference increased (silent).					Reduced.....
Photographic films.....	4,272	Reduced.....					do.....
Motion-picture films.....	8,942	Bound (sensitized and exposed).			Bound (developed).....	Bound.....	Reduced MFN.....
Optical goods.....	2,763	Reduced (optical frames).					do.....
Dental instruments and supplies.	2,832						do.....
Selected scientific instruments and apparatus.		Reduced.....					Reduced MFN (including surgical instruments).
Pianos and player pianos.	3,251	Bound.....					Reduced MFN.....
Phonographs and records.	8,563	Bound (records).....					do.....
Cigarettes.....	16,137	Reduced.....	Bound.....	Bound.....			
Smoking and chewing tobacco.	1,501	{ do. ¹ do. ²					
Pencils and pens.....	3,778	{ Reduced ³ Bound.....					Reduced MFN.....
Selected office supplies.....		Reduced (carbon paper).					{ Reduced MFN (carbon paper). Reduced.....
Toys.....	2,594	Reduced.....					Reduced MFN ⁴
Athletic goods and equipment.	2,318	do.....					do.....
Firearms and ammunition.	5,509	Reduced (empty cartridges).					{ Reduced MFN (books). Reduced ⁴ Bound free.....
Books and pamphlets.....							Reduced MFN ¹
Magazines.....							
Advertising matter.....	24,295						Reduced MFN ¹
Other selected printed matter.		Reduced (playing cards).					{ Reduced ⁴ Reduced MFN..... Bound free.....
Clocks, watches, and jewelry.	3,251	{ Reduced (clocks and parts).					Reduced ¹⁰
Composition roofing.....	1,901						Reduced MFN.....
Chemical fire extinguishers.	341	Reduced.....					do.....
Brushes.....	1,624	Reduced (including tooth brushes).					Reduced MFN (brushes) (bristles bound free).

Secondary or limited benefits:

Cuba: Photographic paper—Reduced.

Netherlands: Matches (folder)—Quota assured.

Canada: Fancy cases, purses, etc.; window shades on rollers; stereotypes, electrotypes for newspaper advertisements, etc.; engravers' plates, etc.; frames for manufacture of purses; candles; ornaments, fans, statues; coverings on imported goods; cameras and parts; other musical instruments, all Reduced MFN except brass band instruments of a class or kind not made in Canada which are Reduced.

¹ Exposed, negatives; and positives under 1¼ inches in width.

² Smoking tobacco and cigars—Reduced without binding and preference increase; chewing tobacco—Reduced.

³ Steel pens, lead and colored pencils—Reduced; copper pens—Bound.

trade agreements signed thus far—Continued

LANEIOUS MANUFACTURES

effective date not yet set, in order of signature. For explanation of terms used, see p. 10627]

Netherlands (A) and Indies (B), Feb. 1, 1936	Switzerland, Feb. 15, 1936	Honduras, Mar. 2, 1936	Colombia, May 20, 1936	Guatemala, June 15, 1936	France, June 15, 1936 (For turn-over tax, see p. 10762)	Nicaragua, signed Mar. 11, 1936	Finland, signed May 18, 1936	Classes of products involved (Not necessarily including all products in every class)
			Reduced (including magic lanterns).					Motion-picture projectors (including sound equipment).
			Bound (X-ray film).					
			Reduced (other).					Photographic films.
			Reduced.		Duty bound, present exhibition status assured for American films.		Bound (developed films).	Motion-picture films.
			Bound (selected).		Reduced MFN (eyeglasses).			Optical goods.
			Bound.		Quota increased and duty reduced (artificial teeth).			Dental instruments and supplies.
			Bound (most).		Reduced MFN (certain types).			Selected scientific instruments and apparatus.
								Pianos and player pianos.
			Reduced (paper disks, bound).					Phonographs and records.
			Reduced.					Cigarettes.
			Reduced (cut only).					Smoking and chewing tobacco.
			Bound (pencils).		Reduced (fountain pens, automatic pencils, pens and pencil holders and parts).			Pencils and pens.
A: Quota assured (office books).			Reduced ⁴ .					Selected office supplies.
			Bound.					Toys.
					Reduced MFN (gymnasium apparatus).			Athletic goods and equipment.
					Reduced MFN (certain types).			Firearms and ammunition.
A: Quota assured.					Reduced MFN (leather bound).			Books and pamphlets.
					Reduced MFN (if containing over two-thirds advertising matter).			Magazines.
A: Quota assured.			Bound free (catalogs).		Reduced MFN (in general).			Advertising matter.
			Reduced (other).					Other selected printed matter.
			Bound (prints, etc).		do.			
do. ⁵			Reduced (other pamphlets).		Reduced MFN (clocks and watches).			Clocks, watches, and jewelry.
					Reduced MFN (certain types).			Composition roofing.
			Bound free.		do.			Chemical fire extinguishers.
			Reduced (tooth brushes).					Brushes.

⁴ Typewriter ribbon—Reduced; carbon paper and pencil sharpeners—bound.

⁵ Wood golf club shafts, rough; 10-pin blocks, rough; billiard tables; cricket equipment; fishing rods and tackle, racquets, balls, bats, canes, guns.

⁶ Magazines for educational, scientific, religious purposes, etc.—Bound free; other magazines regardless of advertising content—Reduced.

⁷ If imported by mail duty is Bound at 2 cents for each package of 1 ounce or less.

⁸ Periodical publications, tourist literature, picture postcards, newspapers supplements—Reduced; newspapers, unbound—Bound free; time tables, rate books, labels tags, tickets, pictures, maps, decalcomania transfers, bank notes, commercial blanks, sheet music, newspapers—Reduced MFFN.

⁹ Wrapping paper, cardboard, parchment paper, envelopes, bags, etc., if printed; sheet music, printed matter.

¹⁰ Watch cases, and parts—Reduced; all other—Reduced MFFN.

A POLISH TRIBUTE

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a brief article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent accorded me, and in order to express my appreciation to a great newspaper for a very laudatory article concerning me, I include in my remarks the following from the Philadelphia Polish Star (Gwiazda) of June 7, 1936:

[From the Polish Star of June 7, 1936]

CLARE GERALD FENERTY, A GREAT FRIEND OF ALL THE POLISH PEOPLE—CONGRESSMAN SEEKS TO HAVE PULASKI DAY DECLARED PERMANENT HOLIDAY—APPOINTS POLISH BOYS TO WEST POINT AND ANNAPOLIS

The love for the Polish people by Americans and the respect and admiration accorded them through their various achievements are no better exemplified than in the interest shown by Congressman CLARE GERALD FENERTY.

Always kindly disposed toward the Poles and their well-being, Congressman FENERTY has shown on numerous occasions that he has the interest of the Polish people at heart, for which the Poles owe him a great deal of gratitude.

Only 3 months ago Mr. FENERTY succeeded in appointing a Port Richmond Polish boy to Annapolis. At the same time he appointed another Polish boy to West Point. In doing this he becomes the first Philadelphia Congressman to ever appoint Polish boys to the Naval Academy and the Army.

Last year CLARE FENERTY waged a bitter battle urging Congress to make Pulaski Day, October 11, a permanent memorial holiday. "Just as his memory is greater than all the ages", said the noted Congressman in his address about General Pulaski, "so the observance of his achievements should be equally enduring and perpetual."

CLARE GERALD FENERTY was born in Philadelphia, at 2618 East Thompson Street, where he now lives. He is a graduate of St. Joseph's College, with the degree of bachelor of arts; graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, with the degree of Bachelor of Laws; Hahnemann Medical College, with the honorary degree of doctor of laws, 1935; St. Joseph's College, honorary degree of doctor of jurisprudence, 1936; veteran of the World War, serving with the United States Navy in France, 1917-18; now a senior lieutenant in United States Naval Reserve; member of law faculty of the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, for 5 years; appointed by court as member of Philadelphia Board of Law Examiners, 1928 to present; assistant district attorney, 1928-35; elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress on November 6, 1934, having a substantial majority over the combined vote of the Democratic candidate and the candidate of the Industrial Recovery Party, the former Republican Member of Congress from this district.

While at St. Joseph's College and high school and the University of Pennsylvania Law School, he took the highest honors of his class, and represented St. Joseph's College in winning the oratorical championship of American colleges.

In 1934 he married Miss Miriam Elizabeth Loughran, of Hazleton, Pa.

This coming Monday, Mr. FENERTY will receive the degree of doctor of laws from Loyola College, Baltimore.

With all his innumerable activities, Mr. FENERTY nevertheless manages to find time to spend with his many Polish friends. Last Friday night, he delivered an address on Marshal Pilsudski, at memorial exercises at St. Laurentius Hall. He attends many Polish gatherings and is a member of numerous Polish societies.

In his fight for having Pulaski Day made a permanent holiday, Congressman FENERTY introduced a resolution which not only directed the President to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day but also authorized the Postmaster General to issue a special series of postage stamps in honor of the beloved Polish patriot. "In honoring the courage and fidelity of Pulaski", Mr. FENERTY said, "we are paying tribute to the brave land that gave him birth and gladly yielded him to us in our effort to liberate America from British rule. As long as America lives, American hearts will thrill to the name and the fame of Poland's immortal son."

Mr. FENERTY's bill passed both the Senate and the House, but was vetoed by President Roosevelt.

In addition to the Pulaski holiday bill, Congressman FENERTY introduced a bill to have \$3,000,000 allotted for the opening of Cramps' Shipyard, a bill which the Democrats are now trying to kill. The reopening of Cramps' and its effect on the numerous now unemployed Polish and American workers in the northeast can readily be realized. With his characteristic zeal, Mr. FENERTY is introducing bills also for paying the soldiers' bonus, for the prevention of war, for the prevention of religious persecution in Mexico, to withdraw recognition of Soviet Russia.

Numerous other bills to aid labor and industry in northeast Philadelphia are likewise receiving his endorsement.

Mr. FENERTY has the support of all labor groups, and, barring unforeseen and most unusual circumstances, he should be re-elected by a majority twice as large as that of 2 years ago.

CLARE GERALD FENERTY has proven himself a true friend of the Polish people. It is now their duty to reciprocate his genuine and heartfelt altruism.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I withhold it for unanimous-consent requests, but I reserve my right to press the point.

PARTICIPATION OF POLISH FORCES IN THE ALLIED ARMIES DURING THE WORLD WAR

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, at my request, Mr. H. A. McBride assistant to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, has prepared the attached memorandum of the participation of Polish forces in the allied armies during the World War. Mr. McBride had an unusual opportunity at first hand to become familiar with the facts set forth on account of his service in Europe during the war and in the demobilization period which followed. So far as I know, this is the first time this information has been assembled. It is of such value as a historical document that it ought to be preserved where it can be widely read, and for that reason I am incorporating it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

American readers will be particularly interested in the account of the participation of Polish-Americans, which began even before the United States declared war, again proving that intense patriotism for which the Poles are honored throughout the world.

I wish to express the appreciation of myself and the many persons who will read this article for Mr. McBride's scholarly paper. Limitations of space require me to omit certain facts, such as detailed statement of the various units which participated, their officers and military equipment, bibliography, and so forth. I have, however, retained this in my files, where it is available to anyone interested. I hope the publication of this paper by Mr. McBride will prompt someone to write a still better history of these Polish-Americans and their service.

The article is as follows:

PARTICIPATION OF POLISH FORCES IN THE ALLIED ARMIES DURING THE WORLD WAR—GEN. JOSEPH HALLER—THE ORGANIZATION, ACTIVITIES, AND SUBSEQUENT REPATRIATION TO THE UNITED STATES OF THE SO-CALLED HALLER ARMY

DEVELOPMENTS LEADING TO THE FORMATION OF THE ARMY

The World War, which brought about such enormous changes in the political status of European countries, gave birth to plans and hopes for restoration of the Polish State. From the beginning of the war both the Central Powers as well as the Allies gave consideration to the idea of organizing Polish armed forces for their own use. The Central Powers were the first to make use of this conception by rendering aid to the Polish legions under Pilsudski for fighting against the Russians. Similar intentions, though on a much smaller scale, were also sponsored by Russia. Use of organized Polish military forces by France, which sentimentally was the closest of all the Allies to the Poles, was made as early as 1914.

The historical nucleus

With the outbreak of hostilities, Poles in France enlisted eagerly under French colors. In the hope of furthering the Polish cause and to manifest their loyalty to France, Poles then in France formed two units in the towns of Bayonne and Reully, respectively, which volunteered in a body in the French Foreign Legion. At that time only French citizens were permitted to enlist in the regular French Army. These two units, together with other Poles already in the Foreign Legion, formed a separate Polish company in the Foreign Legion. This company, officially known as the Second Company, French Foreign Legion, numbered 200 men when it went into action on October 22, 1914. This unit, which forms the historical nucleus of the Polish Army in France, had a most brilliant career. Several times it was almost annihilated; its banner, officers, and nearly all the men received the highest French decorations for action. The autumn of 1914 and winter and spring of 1915 found the Bayonne outfit holding front-line trenches near the Aisne River in the vicinity of Reully, Champagne, Mally, and

Sillery. At the latter place the unit experienced its first real engagement. On May 9, 1915, at the Battle of Arras the unit went over the top together with French troops and was practically wiped out. The unit during this engagement was commanded by Major Osmonde. It attacked Vimy Hill in the Berthouval sector, took three lines of German trenches, but sacrificed its commander, all the officers, and most of its men. Only 50 men survived. After receiving scant reinforcements the unit was at last practically annihilated on June 16, 1915, when it tried to regain a line of trenches which a detachment of the One Hundred and Fiftieth French Infantry had evacuated near Souchez in the Notre Dame de Loretto sector. The few men left were recalled to the rear, a part of them were incorporated in the French Army while the remainder decided to fight their way to Poland by way of Archangel, where other Polish forces were being organized.

Poles admitted into the French forces

France took notice of the glorious record and sacrifices of the Bayonne unit, and as a special gesture of appreciation, on motion of Senator Marin, Poles were thereafter permitted to enlist in the French Army on equal grounds with Frenchmen. Polish nationalists in Paris were eager to use this occasion to place the question of Poland's independence on an international plane, but official French circles turned a deaf ear, since they did not care to invoke the ill will of Russia, who was France's ally and Poland's bitter enemy.

The nationalists were obliged to await a more opportune moment when events would favor their cause. During the latter half of the year 1915, as the conflict assumed stupendous proportions, France began advocating the policy of "nationalist causes." In November 1915 Prime Minister Briand identified the war as a struggle for the "freedom of nations which are to enjoy complete independence." A month later Italian Prime Minister Sonnino proclaimed "independence, safety, and mutual respect among nations" as the ultimate aim of the war.

Polish independence

Thanks to the propaganda of Polish nationalists and achievements of Poles fighting for the Allies, the Italian Parliament on December 7, 1915, passed a resolution embodying the hope "that Poland will regain her independence." In April 1916 an attempt was made to obtain Russia's placet to the idea of an independent Polish state, but with no success. On November 5, 1916, the Central Powers issued an edict calling to being an independent Kingdom of Poland. While this move on the part of the Germans had little practical value, the very fact that it was made immediately placed Poland's cause on an international plane and was instrumental in forcing the Allies to take official cognizance of the matter. Almost immediately afterward Russia released pressure in that part of Poland under Russian control and discontinued persecution of pro-Polish activities.

This development stimulated the hopes of the Polish colony in Paris. At that time the two focal points around which this colony centered were: (1) The Committee for the Relief of Wounded Poles, and (2) the offices of the Polish political national weekly *Polonja*, edited by Wacław Gasiorowski, historian and journalist. This publication created a bond of understanding among all Poles in France and in the colonies. It was read by most all Poles in the French Foreign Legion. Knowing the minds of the Poles in France, Gasiorowski was predestined to become their spokesman. To him is credited the idea of forming an independent Polish Army in France. In the spring of 1917 Erazm Piltz, then head of the Bureau Politique Polonaise in Paris, and Adam Mokiejewski, lieutenant colonel of the French Army, joined Gasiorowski in his plans.

The idea gained headway when the Russian revolutionary government proclaimed on March 30, 1917, that the partitions of Poland were a great injustice and the Government recognized Poland's independence. Similar declarations followed shortly from the other allies. France's confidence in Russia as a military power began wavering, especially when Russian expeditionary forces in France and Saloniki began turning communistic. Le Temps, then headed by André Tardieu, swayed by popular sentiment in Poland's favor. Official opinion was turned by a report concerning the strength and development of the Polish legions in Poland. This report, which was delivered by the French military attaché in Bern, also stated that if France and England do not want to be left with 1,000,000 Polish soldiers on their hands they must declare Poland's independence.

Formation of independent Polish unit

In May 1917 the French Government gave its final approval and consent. The official declaration of the Government provided for the formation of skeleton corps of the new army with Poles serving in the French Army and in the Russian brigades. Further material was to be obtained from Polish volunteers in Holland, Brazil, and North America. Permission to form the army was countersigned by Minister of War Painlevé. General Duport, Chief of Staff of the French Army, who was extremely well disposed toward the plan because of the memory of the famous Bayonne unit which fought under him, instructed his second in command, General Valentin, together with Colonel Goubet, Chief of Section II, General Headquarters, and Colonel Drech, Chief of Section I, General Headquarters, to draft a project for the organization of the new army. President Poincaré's decree concerning the army appeared in the *Journal Officiel* on June 4, 1917. This decree constituted the legal basis for the formation of the army.

Franco-Polish Mission

According to an order of the Minister of War dated June 6, 1917, there was formed a Franco-Polish military mission commanded by General of Division Archinard, who was known for his activities in French colonial wars and in the subjugation of the Sudan. The functions of this mission were outlined only in a very general manner. It was to cooperate with the French central authorities in matters concerning recruiting and organization of the Polish Army; also to render opinions and suggestions where necessary. Lieutenant Colonel Mokiejewski was named Archinard's chief of staff.

The mission set about determining how many men could be had for the army and where they could be recruited. According to an estimate which was submitted to General Archinard, the French Army could supply 2,000 eligible Poles and approximately 8,000 could be obtained from among German prisoners and the Russian brigades. Hope was placed in volunteer enlistments of Poles in America to make up the balance of the army. It was estimated that these volunteer enlistments would amount to about 100,000 men.

World-wide recruiting

The first concentration camp, having a capacity of 3,000 men, was opened in the little town of Sille le Guillaume in the department of Sarthe on June 27, 1917, with Captain Jagniatkowski, former French colonial officer in command. The other French officers at the camp were: Major Blanchard, Captain Dechamps, Captain Dutrey, and Lieutenant Bufquin. On August 15, 1917, there were 240 officers and 247 men in camp, and by September 1, 1917, this number increased to 382 men. On October 1, 1917, there was a total of 832 men (all from the French Army) divided into four companies. A network of recruiting stations in France in such places as Paris, Lille, Boulogne sur Mer, Le Mans, Bordeaux, Lyon, and Nice gave very scanty results. It was then decided to place more emphasis on recruiting abroad. Large-scale recruiting campaigns were launched in the United States, Brazil, and Canada.

Ignace Paderewski, the famous pianist, later to become noted as a statesman, was active in the United States and Canada.

The United States and Canada yielded the bulk of the volunteers, Brazil and Argentina giving relatively few. Brisk recruiting was begun in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Detroit, and other smaller places having a Polish population of any size. The principal concentration camp for the United States and Canada was located in the Canadian Army camp at Niagara-on-the-Lake. Officer and noncommissioned officer training schools were located at the camp in Niagara-on-the-Lake and in Toronto. The reason for the great success of the movement in the United States is largely the fact that Poles in America were highly patriotic besides being more or less trained in military discipline and rudimentary field tactics. As early as in April 1917 the largest Polish semimilitary and athletic society, the Sokols, passed a resolution at a convention held in Pittsburgh to prepare a force of 100,000 men who would be ready to answer any call to arms to help Poland regain her independence. The fulfillment of this resolution was made impossible when the United States entered the war. Nevertheless the Franco-Polish delegation managed to get recruiting under way—thanks to the aid which the Poles in America extended to them. There was formed in Chicago an all-Polish national committee, which, in turn, evolved a military committee composed of Dr. Starzynski, Mr. Helinski, and Mr. Znamiecki.

First American volunteers

Meanwhile the camp in Sille-le-Guillaume was being placed in order. The first official inspection of the camp and the four companies was made by General Faurle. Several hundred volunteers arrived shortly from England and Holland. The first contingent of Poles from the United States, numbering 1,200, arrived at Bordeaux on December 26. Other contingents followed shortly afterward. The camp in Sille became crowded, and two new camps had to be opened, one in Laval and one in Mayenne. Thanks to the influx of volunteers from the United States, it was now possible to go ahead with the formation of the first regiment of infantry (chasseurs). This regiment, which was composed of Poles from America, Polish soldiers from the Russian brigades, and Poles formerly in the German Army recruited from French prison camps, was officially formed on January 10, 1918. At first this regiment had only two battalions. Battalion 1 was quartered in Laval; battalion 2 in Sille-le-Guillaume. Also a special training camp for noncommissioned officers was opened in Camp la Ruchard.

Volunteers from America continued to arrive rapidly, so that by the end of February 1918 the Polish Army in France numbered approximately 10,000 men. Work was begun on the formation of two new regiments. Mayenne was designated as the base for the second regiment of infantry and Mailly for the third regiment. Each regiment was composed of three battalions of infantry and one staff company composed of signal, engineer, musician, artisan, and quartermaster units. Cavalry was being formed in Alençon, artillery in Le Mans, engineers in Erigne, near Angers, and aviation units near Pau.

A report dated March 10, 1918, shows the following numerical strength of the Polish Army in France:

First Regiment, 61 officers, 2,564 noncommissioned officers and privates.

Second regiment, 13 officers, 2,309 noncommissioned officers and privates.

Third regiment, 9 officers, 2,389 noncommissioned officers and privates.

Artillery, aviation, cavalry, and staff, 46 officers, 909 noncommissioned officers and privates.

Total, 129 officers, 8,171 noncommissioned officers and privates.

A month later, on April 10, 1918, the total increased to 204 officers and 10,638 men. These three regiments, on arriving at full strength, comprised the First Division, commanded by General Vidalon. Regimental colors were presented by the cities of Paris, Nancy, Verdun, and Belfort.

Action at last

Upon completing its organization the first regiment was hurried to the front near Rheims, where it was included in General Gouraud's army. On July 15, 1918, the regiment participated in the heavy fighting in the St. Hilaire sector. On July 22, 1918, it captured Centre-Chaiton, and during the night of July 24 its fifth company, following heavy fighting and great sacrifices, stormed the Bois de Racquette position. The regiment's losses during this time amounted to approximately 100 killed and 500 wounded. On August 1, 1918, the regiment retired to the camp in St. Tauche, where it underwent special training, together with the second and third regiments. Organization of the army as a whole now passed into the hands of General Capdeport. Additional camps were opened in Potigny-Ussy, Lessay, St. Quentin, and several other places.

Need for Polish leader

About this time the French high command became seriously concerned with developments at the front and the new army became neglected. The absence of capable officers was felt very keenly and the treatment of the men was none too good. Above all, the men desired to be led by a general of their own nationality—a man possessing military and moral authority capable of symbolizing the country and cause for which they were fighting. Thus far no such symbol could be placed before the men, as neither the Franco-Polish Military Mission nor the civilian national committee, which was formed in August 1917, could answer these requirements. In fact, the national committee had been looking for such a leader for some time.

Gen. Jozef Haller

Negotiations between the national committee and Polish military and political circles in Russia resulted in Gen. Jozef Haller being named for the position. General Haller was formerly commander of the Second Brigade of the Polish Legions and later commander of the Second Corps of the Polish Legions which fought against the Germans in the Ukraine and Poland and later fought their way to Russia, where they united with other Polish military formations being organized in Siberia. Haller's nomination, which was made with the acquiescence of Commander Pilsudski, reached him in Siberia. On July 3, 1918, he sailed from Archangel on the British steamer *City of Marseilles*, together with Major Bajer and Captain Malinowski, Captain Budowski, Captain Sokolnicki, Lieutenant Zaremba, and Lieutenant Ketting. They arrived in Havre on July 13, 1918.

Haller was received by Minister of Foreign Affairs Pichon and Clemenceau, but his nomination as commander in chief of the Polish Army in France was deferred until the legal relation of the army to France and the other allies was settled. This status was finally settled by an agreement signed on September 28, 1918, by France and the national committee. The national committee, by the way, acted as a ministry of foreign affairs for Polish interests in France and partly as a ministry of war for the Polish Army in France.

Disposition of Poles on the western front

The base of the First Division, commanded by General Vidalon (first, second, and third regiments), which was still at the front, was transferred to Domfront from Sille-le-Guillaume, which hereafter became the base of the Second Division (fourth, fifth, and sixth regiments). The camp in Le Mans concentrated artillery. The cavalry camp in Alencon and the engineer camp in Erigné were made subordinate to headquarters in Le Mans. The strength of the army at this time is given as 16,915 men and 430 officers, of which 200 officers and 9,962 men were at the front in the First Division.

The Germany Army was rapidly disintegrating and the Allies were preparing to deliver their decisive blow, which was to be made in the direction of Metz. The First Division of the Polish Army, then occupying a sector near St. Die-Nord in the Vosges, under the command of the Tenth French Army headquarters, was to participate in the offensive. During the first week of November, i. e., just before the offensive was to be launched, the division was shifted to the front of the Eighth French Army. It detrained at Ramberville and was included in the powerful "shock" group under General Mangin. This group was composed of the Eighth and Tenth French Armies and two American armies. On November 14, just as orders had been issued for the attack and the division was being moved into attack position in the Foret de Parroy sector, orders were received announcing the armistice.

Dispersion of the Haller unit

In the meantime events in Poland had caused the responsible leaders to call for the assistance of Haller's troops. Russia protested against the Kresy being given to Poland, and proposed the Bug as the Polish frontier. In reply Gen. Jozef Pilduski launched an attack on the Bolsheviks on April 16, 1919. Three days later the first group of Haller's troops arrived in Poland, and the remainder followed in the next 2 months. Some of the divisions went immediately into action against the Ukrainians, who were attacking Lwow; other divisions were used to strengthen the

Bolshevik front. One division was detailed to occupy former German Poland and the Corridor, which German troops were evacuating. On September 1, 1919, by order of Commander in Chief and Chief of State Pilsudski, the army was incorporated in the regular Polish Army. Many of the regiments remained intact for some time, despite the amalgamation, and were responsible in no small degree as such units for the final success of Polish arms.

Preparations for return to the United States

Not long after the arrival of these troops in Poland, the American Legation began to receive applications for discharge and return to the United States by soldiers who were American citizens. In reporting these cases to the Department of State, the American Minister, Mr. Hugh Gibson, first suggested that the troops should be returned to their base in France, rather than discharged in Poland, but later he suggested that United States Army transports be used to return the troops to the United States.

Two other factors tended to hasten the matter of repatriation, namely, the danger of Bolshevik propaganda among the troops and the lack of clothing and other material. With winter not far distant, the Polish authorities realized the necessity for repatriating these troops as soon as possible. In August 1919 the Polish Foreign Office informed the American Legation that it planned to demobilize gradually some 10,000 to 12,000 of Haller troops, and desired to embark these men from Danzig, due to the congestion of French ports. The Polish Government asked the United States to lend it transports, for which it would pay all expenses. Their plan called for demobilization between September 1919 and February 1920.

Repatriation

Thereafter some 14,000 Haller troops were returned to the United States in United States Army transports by August 1920. Many technical questions arose, such as the matter of passports and alien visas for the troops, the admittance of alien troops into the United States under the immigration laws and regulations, and the enforcement of the United States public health laws, but these problems were satisfactorily disposed of by the various United States Government agencies involved, viz, the American consulate general in Warsaw, in charge of Consul Harry A. McBride and later of Consul General Leo J. Keena; the United States Public Health Service in Warsaw; the American Commissioner in Danzig; the American military attaché in Warsaw; the American Polish Relief Expedition; the American Red Cross, and the Young Men's Christian Association in Poland.

The Bolshevik threat on Warsaw in August 1920 caused an interruption in the repatriation of these troops, as they were needed for the defense of Warsaw.

However, after the Bolsheviks were turned back the problem of repatriation again arose, the Polish Government stating that some four to six thousand troops were awaiting their return to the United States. After some negotiations the *President Grant* was sent to Danzig in place of the smaller transports, but only about 1,400 troops were embarked. It appears that this was the last American vessel to transport troops to the United States.

The great difference in number of troops remaining in Poland for repatriation and the number which actually sailed can only be explained by the lack of records and disorganization existing in the Polish War Department. They had little or no idea of the number of Haller army men left in Poland. However, it must be taken into consideration that:

- (1) Many men at the last moment decided to remain in Poland.
- (2) There were a number held by the Bolsheviks as prisoners.
- (3) A great many were sick in hospitals or have died.
- (4) Some were not notified of the arrival of the transport, due to the inadequate means of communication. Men who were demobilized scattered over Poland and could not be found in time.

Altogether the American Government transported about 15,000 Haller troops to the United States. The cost of travel from New York to their homes was paid by the Polish Legation in Washington.

The Polish Government undertook the repatriation of those remaining who subsequently desired to return to the United States. The consulate general's records show that 1,106 visas were granted to ex-Haller soldiers on July 29, 1922, covering 2,053 persons. A few stragglers were returned later, but the bulk of the army was repatriated by the fall of 1922.

JURISDICTION OF COURT OF CLAIMS TO HEAR CLAIM OF EMANUEL BRATSES

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3866) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Emanuel Bratse, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 13, after "amended", insert "Provided further, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12671) for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Companies and substitute therefor the bill S. 4684, and the immediate consideration of the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the Rivers and Harbors Committee commending the wonderful service and courtesy of the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, which I offered at a meeting of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on June 16 last:

Hon. J. BURWOOD DALY, Pennsylvania, offered the following resolution:

As this is possibly the last meeting of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the Seventy-fourth Congress, I suggest that the sincere thanks of the committee be extended to the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, our distinguished chairman, not only for his great ability, his comprehensive knowledge, and the untiring efforts he has shown in the work of rivers and harbors legislation, which has won the admiration and respect of the whole committee, but also for his uniform courtesy, his kindly help and devotion to the interests of the membership of the committee, and his brilliant service for his constituents and his country that has gained for him the personal and affectionate regard of the entire Congress.

We sincerely trust that the people of Texas will return him to the Halls of Congress as long as he is willing to come, that they and his country may long have the benefit of his knowledge and ability and that God will give him the health and strength to continue the work that has marked him as one of the most outstanding and valuable Members of Congress.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

LEASING OF LAND ON THE FORT MOULTRIE (S. C.) MILITARY RESERVATION TO OWNERS OF CERTAIN COTTAGES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4432) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lease land on the Fort Moultrie (S. C.) Military Reservation to the owners of certain cottages thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to lease for a period of 20 years to the owners of the six cottages erected on land reclaimed from the ocean and now determined to be part of the military reservation of Fort Moultrie, S. C., the land upon which such homes were erected by the owners in the belief that title was vested in the commissioners of Sullivan's Island, from whom it was secured by the owners: *Provided, however,* That such leases shall contain the provision that if at any time said property is needed for military purposes the buildings must, upon notice, be immediately removed and the leases canceled, and the further provision that such buildings shall be removed without expense to the United States Government and that the lessee shall have no claim against the United States Government by reason of any damage whatsoever to said buildings or person from any cause.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LABOR WANTS HIM

Mr. STACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a letter I have just received from Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the president of the American Federation of Labor:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1936.

HON. MICHAEL J. STACK,

Member, House of Representatives,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The records you made as a Member of Congress show that you were a most consistent and valuable supporter of legislative measures sponsored and approved by the American Federation of Labor. For this reason I am pleased, in behalf of the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor, to endorse your candidacy for renomination and reelection to the United States Congress. I commend you to labor and labor's friends in your congressional district. I sincerely hope that they will rally to your support and that you will be nominated and reelected as a Member of Congress.

Wishing you success, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

WM. GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

F. W. ELMER

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4490) for the relief of F. W. Elmer, and immediately consider the same.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask what this bill is about. The House has never passed upon it, as I understand it.

Mr. COLMER. I may say in answer to the gentleman that the House committee has approved this bill for \$1,500, and I understand that one of the official objectors will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. How much did the Senate bill carry?

Mr. COLMER. Two thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And the House committee reduced it to \$1,500.

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And an amendment to that effect will be offered?

Mr. COLMER. I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] is prepared to do that.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to offer an amendment at the appropriate time, reducing the amount from \$2,500 to \$1,500.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500 to F. W. Elmer, of Biloxi, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for legal services rendered to the United States in the case of the State of Mississippi against S. M. Taylor, a Federal prohibition officer, who, in the performance of his official duty, shot and killed a citizen, and who was acquitted of the charge of murder in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL DALTON

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1146) for the relief of Michael Dalton, and consider the same.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000 to Michael Dalton, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for injuries received by said Michael Dalton on November 14, 1930, when he was struck by a United States mail truck at Third Street and Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES W. GRIST

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3879) for the relief of James W. Grist.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of James W. Grist for disability alleged to have been incurred by him in the course of his employment at the Government Printing Office between September 1928 and June 1929 and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

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

MARGARET MURPHY

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1790) for the relief of Margaret Murphy, and immediately consider the same with an amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, Margaret Murphy shall, after the date of the approval of this act, be paid compensation at the rate of \$80 per month for injuries sustained November 28, 1928, while employed in the Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., which compensation shall be in lieu of compensation and salary she is now receiving while there employed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$80" and insert "\$60."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees 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. 10919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the text of the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8555) entitled "An act to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and

well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, to repeal certain former legislation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4727. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Lawrence County, Ala.; and

S. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in the commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Antietam.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2435. An act for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.; and

H. R. 12490. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees 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. 12395) entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 281 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10094. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269).

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12671) for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Companies, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What does this bill provide?

Mr. DALY. It confers jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to settle disputes between the United States and companies that purchased three warships.

Mr. COSTELLO. This is the matter of the First, Second and Third Steamship Companies.

Mr. DALY. Yes. The Government took the ships back, and there was some dispute about improvements made to them. The Department is in favor of having this matter sent to the Court of Claims.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is it not a fact that they filed suit in 1935 with the Court of Claims, and due to the negotiations that followed along about 1934 or about that period these companies entered into an agreement with the Government whereby they accepted \$250,000 in settlement of their claim? Subsequently the actions in the Court of Claims were dismissed. In other words, of their own accord they entered into an agreement to settle their claims with the Government, and now this bill would authorize them to come back, set aside those agreements, and in spite of the fact that the statute of limitations has run, be given the right to come back and sue for the balance over the agreement.

Mr. DALY. I am reliably informed that this bill was introduced at the request of the Department.

Mr. COSTELLO. There is a letter here in the report from the Department of Justice signed by Homer Cummings which opposes the bill. For that reason I shall have to oppose the present consideration of the bill.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RECESS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock p. m.

FIFTY-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF ONE HUNDRETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF STATE OF ARKANSAS INTO THE UNION

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11688) providing for a change in the design of the 50-cent pieces authorized to be coined in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Union, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if these are to be silver coins?

Mr. DRIVER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Then we are going to have more free silver, or are they going to sell them?

Mr. DRIVER. They are going to sell them.

Mr. RICH. It is one more of these coin bills. They put them in over there and we take them out over here, and round and round they go. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Lines 5 and 6, strike out "of not less than 25,000".

Line 6, after "of", insert "not less than 25,000 and not more than 50,000 of".

After line 14, insert:

"Sec. 2. The coins upon which the additional design authorized by this act is to be placed shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint, shall bear the date 1936, irrespective of the year in which they are minted or issued, and shall be issued in the same manner and for the same purposes as the coins issued under the provisions of such act of May 14, 1934, except that not less than 25,000 such coins shall be issued at any one time and no such coins shall be issued after the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Cora Akins;

H. R. 3777. An act for the relief of the Herald Publishing Co.;

H. R. 9191. An act for the relief of the dependents of James B. Kiley;

H. R. 12257. An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States Court for China to offenses committed on the high seas;

H. R. 12324. An act to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended;

H. R. 12410. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 12455. An act to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12458. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the intracoastal waterway throughout Broward County, Fla.;

H. R. 12876. An act to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of resettlement or rural-rehabilitation projects; to authorize payments to States, political subdivisions, and local taxing units in lieu of taxes on such premises; and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such methods of control of grasshoppers as in his judgment may be necessary.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12831. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Hartford, Conn.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1567. An act to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the War Minerals Relief Act;

S. 1793. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California", approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 602);

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes";

S. 3843. An act to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, and all other exhibits for exposition purposes; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to define the term of certain contracts with Indian tribes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2953) entitled "An act to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 5) entitled "An act to prevent the adulteration, misbranding, and false advertising of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics in interstate, foreign, and other commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for the purposes of safeguarding the public health, preventing deceit upon the purchasing public, and for other purposes", and agrees to the same with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4670. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the original Norfolk, Va., land grant and the two hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the city of Norfolk, Va., as a borough.

The message also announced that the Senate had—

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join a similar committee appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the present session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some further communication to make them; and that, in compliance with the foregoing, the Vice President appointed as said committee on the part of the Senate Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. McNARY.

SANDY NATIONAL PARK IN VIRGINIA AND KENTUCKY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, when the House recessed this evening the bill (H. R. 87) to establish the Breaks of Sandy National Park in Virginia and Kentucky was under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman would withhold that. There is not a dollar of expense involved.

Mr. TABER. I will withhold the objection to allow the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. MAY. I shall be glad to give an explanation of it. This is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a gift, without one dollar's expense, of some wild lands that embrace a part of a park that is already established by the State.

Mr. TABER. It is already established by the State?

Mr. MAY. Yes; the State owns the park and a land company is giving this land.

Mr. TABER. If it was turned in to the State, that would be fine; but if we have more parks for the Interior Department to pay for, that is not so good.

Mr. MAY. This does not cost a dime.

Mr. TABER. Well, it would cost money to take care of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

JESSE ASHBY

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of the House whereby the bill (H. R. 3179) for the relief of Jesse Ashby was passed and substitute therefor the bill, S. 3175.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Senate bill (S. 3175) will be substituted.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Jesse Ashby growing out of losses suffered under contract dated April 28, 1931, for painting plaster walls, Department of Commerce Building, Washington, D. C., is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims with jurisdiction to hear the same to judgment and with instructions to adjudicate the same upon the basis of losses and/or damages suffered due to delays caused by the Government and/or to change made by substitution of Wall Hide sealer and first coat for the size coat as specified in the contract and/or to repainting surfaces where cracks in plaster were replastered and/or to the porous and chalky condition of the plaster making it necessary to apply more than three coats of paint as specified, for all of which labor and material the Government received the benefit and for which no compensation has been made.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, what is the amount of this bill?

Mr. SCHAEFER. There is no amount at all. It permits a claimant to take a case before the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

COHEN, GOLDMAN & CO., INC.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1041) for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this relief?

Mr. PEYSER. This is a claim against the Government for \$19,030. The Government had a counterclaim of \$150,000 and brought suit. The Government claimed this amount that is being asked. They withdraw their suit. I will read from the report. The case came to trial in October 1929, but before trial the Government withdrew. When the suit was called, but before trial, the Government moved to dismiss the case on the ground that the Government, after very thorough investigation, was not able to prove the claim. The amount that we have asked for was allowed by the Government as a credit against their original claim, and they had a suit for the difference. That suit was withdrawn, and the report shows the exact statement, if the gentleman wants to see it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, coming in at this late hour with these claims, in the last few minutes of Congress, we are going to have a hard time to get any more bills through to spend money. Therefore I will have to object. I do not think this is right.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CANAL DREDGING CO.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2747, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear the claim of the Canal Dredging Co.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much is this going to cost the Federal Government?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is not going to cost anything; there is no cost.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman does not think it will cost anything?

Mr. CHANDLER. It just permits the Court of Claims to hear this claim, but it will not cost anything.

Mr. TABER. How can the Court of Claims act on it without it costing anything?

Mr. CHANDLER. It gives the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear the merits of the controversy; that is all.

Mr. TABER. If it is not going to cost anything, and if the Court of Claims cannot do anything, I think we had better object. I object.

VALIDATING CERTAIN CONVEYANCES BY KICKAPOO INDIANS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12924) validating certain conveyances by Kickapoo Indians of Oklahoma, made prior to February 17, 1933, providing for actions in partition in certain cases.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. DISNEY. The status of the bill is that it has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Indian Affairs. An identical bill has passed the Senate and has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SNELL. What is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. DISNEY. It involves the question whether or not certain Kickapoo Indian land in Oklahoma is alienable. There is a question as to whether or not those Kickapoos who removed to the nation of Mexico could alienate their land without the restrictions being removed. The land of those aliens who remained within America is inalienable. There was a decision one way in 1921 and an opposite decision in 1931, and five of those farmers down there have got some land they paid for a time or two and are really not sure yet whether they have good title. The Interior Department and the Department of Justice recommend the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will it cost the Government anything?

Mr. DISNEY. No; it cannot possibly cost anything.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 4152 in place of the House bill. It is identical with the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all conveyances made to Ira L. Couch, A. J. Ownby, Fred L. Rooker, Wallace Estell, Jr., J. D. Shepherd, or any of them, or to their grantors, purporting to convey an inherited interest in Kickapoo lands allotted in Oklahoma in and to the following-described real estate, to wit: The NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, and lot 1 of the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 19, T. 12 N., R. 2 E.; lot 11, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 17, and lot 3, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 18, and lot 3, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 20, and lot 2, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 20, and lot 2, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 18, T. 12 N., R. 1 E.; the N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 19, T. 11 N., R. 3 E.; the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ and lot 2 of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 8, T. 12 N., R. 1 E.; lot 4 of sec. 16, lot 5 of sec. 17, and lot 1 of sec. 20, T. 12 N., R. 1 E.; lots 3 and 4 of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 7, T. 12 N., R. 1 E.; W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 3, T. 11 N., R. 2 E.; E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 3, T. 11 N., R. 2 E.; E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 10, T. 11 N., R. 2 E.; lots 7 and 8 of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 13, T. 11 N., R. 2 E.; the N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 4, T. 11 N., R. 2 E., where such instrument or instruments were made after September 11, 1922, and recorded in the office of the registrar of deeds for the county in which said lands are located, prior to February 17, 1933, are hereby ratified and confirmed as valid conveyances of an inherited interest.

Sec. 2. That any such grantee, his heirs or assigns, in any such deed conveying an undivided interest to any part of said land may maintain a suit to partition the same against any restricted Indian who is a part owner of said lands in the United States District

Court for the Western District of Oklahoma in accordance with the law governing partitions in the State of Oklahoma. The United States shall be made a party to such action, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear and determine such causes, and service may be had on the United States by serving one copy of the petition or bill in equity on the United States attorney for the western district of Oklahoma 41 days before said cause is set for trial, and any conveyance ordered made by said court in such proceedings shall operate to remove all restrictions on the lands conveyed to the grantee therein, except where such grantee is a restricted Indian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 12924) were laid on the table.

CLEAR LAKE AND LOST RIVER, CALIF.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6773) to deepen the irrigation channel between Clear Lake and Lost River, in the State of California, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for an investigation to determine whether the water rights of the United States have been violated in the Clear Lake watershed, California, and for other purposes."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. PIERCE. This bill affects a water right on the border line between California and Oregon, between the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT] and my district. The bill passed the House and went over to the Senate. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT] and I agreed to an amendment to satisfy the Biological Survey and then the Senate amended the title, which should have been done. I am asking that the House accept the Senate amendment.

The bill appropriates no money, but it gives the interested parties the right to use their own funds to settle this question.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. To whom does it give authority to use it?

Mr. PIERCE. It settles the rights between these parties.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What parties are they?

Mr. PIERCE. It relates to water rights on the border line between California and Oregon.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The amendment the gentleman agreed to was passed by the Senate, was it?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And the gentleman now seeks to have the House concur in the Senate amendment?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. RICH. It does not call for the expenditure of any money out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. PIERCE. It is their own money. No public money is involved.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR-SAVING DEVICES IN INDUSTRY

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 49, with an amendment, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman is prepared to accept the amendment I proposed?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. I shall offer the amendment as suggested by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When does the gentleman expect to have this report made?

Mr. CONNERY. When we come back in January of next year.

Mr. RICH. Not until then?

Mr. CONNERY. No. They are making this investigation now. They have funds under the W. P. A. to run the investigation and we want the data reported to this Congress in January, next year.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman will have a 40-hour bill introduced?

Mr. CONNERY. Thirty-hour bill with me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 49

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor is requested (1) to compile a list of the labor-saving devices, mechanical and otherwise, put in operation in the United States after December 31, 1912, which are still in use; (2) to estimate the number of persons in the United States now unemployed by reason of the use of each kind or type of such devices; (3) to estimate the number of persons who would be employed in the United States in each of the various divisions of industry, commerce, and agriculture, but are not so employed by reason of the use of such devices; and (4) to report his findings in detail in the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress, together with such observations and recommendations as the Secretary deems pertinent and useful. Every officer or employee of the United States is requested to supply the Secretary with such information relating to any matter under investigation or study pursuant to this resolution and contained in the records of the office of such officer or employee as the Secretary may request. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "labor-saving devices" includes any improvement, made after December 31, 1912, of a labor-saving device put into operation on or before such date, and the term "United States" means the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

The committee amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "is requested" and insert "be required."

Page 1, line 3, after the word "otherwise", insert "such as automatic machinery, machinery in general, conveyors, speed-ups, efficiency methods eliminating loss of time and repetition of motions, monopolies, mergers of industries, and all other means adopted toward reducing the cost of production under our competitive system."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1912" and insert "1920."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "use", insert "and being constantly improved."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "now", and after the word "unemployed" insert "at the time of completion of such a list."

Page 2, beginning in line 1, after the word "devices", strike out all down to and including the word "thereof" in line 20 and insert the following:

"Or methods in each of the various divisions of industry, commerce, and agriculture in the United States; and (3) to report the findings in properly digested and coordinated detail in the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present or the next following Congress, together with such observations and recommendations as the Secretary deems pertinent and useful. Every officer or employee of the United States shall be required to cooperate and to supply the Secretary with such information relating to any matter under investigation or study pursuant to this resolution and contained in the records of the office of such officer or employee as the Secretary may request. Such a list of labor-saving devices are to be kept up to date from year to year, with such additions and revisions as may be dictated by progress and changes in industry, commerce, and agriculture. For the purpose of this resolution the term 'labor-saving devices' includes any improvements, made after December 31, 1920, of a labor-saving device or method put into operation on or before such date, and the term 'United States' means the United States and all the territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: Page 3, line 16, to the committee amendment, after the word "thereof", insert "Provided, however, That the request for this information and compilation shall be limited to such information and such compilations as may be accomplished by relief labor or allotments of relief funds from appropriations already made."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4457) authorizing the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and directed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an additional circuit judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, who shall possess the same powers, perform the same duties, and receive the same compensation as the present circuit judges of said circuit.

Sec. 2. That when a vacancy shall occur in the office of circuit judge for the third circuit, by the retirement, disqualification, resignation, or death of a circuit judge at present in commission, such vacancy shall not be filled, and thereafter there shall be but four circuit judges in the said circuit.

Sec. 3. That this act shall take effect upon its approval by the President.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in an endeavor to provide adequately for the several districts in the United States where it was represented to the Judiciary Committee that additional judges were needed, a subcommittee was selected for the express purpose of very carefully considering these several bills. In all, there were approximately 30 bills presented to this subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

After a very careful consideration of each of these bills, eight were reported favorably. In all but one case, and that bill has not been considered, the report of the committee was unanimous.

In this particular circuit, having a population, as it does, of nearly 9,000,000 people, one of the judges is upward of 80 years of age. He has not been on the bench for nearly 2 years. The result has been that opinions have not been handed down with the promptness that members of the bar throughout the circuit and the litigants felt they should have been.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TABER. If this judge is 80 years old and has not sat for 2 years, what is needed in that district is retirement of that judge and the appointment of another one. It would seem as if the gentleman does not present a situation that would justify the permanent appointment of a judge.

Mr. WALTER. This bill does not provide for the permanent appointment of a judge. It provides for the appointment of an additional judge and upon the death, resignation, or removal of any of the present judges the number will revert to the present number.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is this not the sort of situation that exists: Here is an old man on the bench and he will not retire?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And nobody has the nerve to go and ask him to retire?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know about that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. You better take word back to him it is the unanimous suggestion of this Congress that he retire.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. We brought in a rule for the consideration of about seven judgeships. I understand this is the

only outstanding instance that was not taken care of in accordance with the action of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WALTER. That is the fact.

Mr. SNELL. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Judiciary Committee asked for a rule covering about seven judgeships. We granted the rule and those bills were passed. This is the only instance that was not taken care of at that time under the rule. We would have taken care of this proposition—

Mr. SNELL. What is the reason this one was not included?

Mr. WALTER. It was overlooked in the preparation of the reports on the other bills. That is the only reason.

Mr. SNELL. Does this come as a unanimous report from the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. WALTER. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee and I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON], a member of the Judiciary Committee on your side, who is one of the leading members of the bar in this circuit, urged most strenuously the passage of this measure.

I do not know whether it is ever going to be possible for us to meet the situation where judges will not resign when they are incapacitated for some reason or other. It is a very difficult problem but under the existing law there is nothing for us to do when situations of this sort exist but to take the action I am earnestly seeking the House to take. We owe a duty to the citizens of our Nation to afford them speedy disposition of their causes and I am quite certain that the Committee on the Judiciary would only report a bill of this sort if it was certain of the need therefor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COX. I have not been able fully to understand the words of the gentleman. Do I understand that an 84-year-old judge in Pennsylvania is about worn out?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know about that, but I do know that he has been on the bench for many years.

Mr. COX. I may say to the gentleman that in some States they are not worn out at 94, because North Carolina is sending one to the convention next week who is 94 and he is attending the convention with his 6-year-old son. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALTER. That is probably because of the difference in the climate, and I trust an example has been set for my friend from Georgia.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OBSCENE BROADCASTS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Solicitor of the Post Office Department and the law to which he refers in this letter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the subject of the Solicitor's letter?

Mr. CONNERY. I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania that he will recall that a day or two ago I called the attention of the House to obscene matter spoken over the radio in New York City.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we do not want to see such obscene matter in the RECORD, and therefore I shall have to object.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold his objection for a moment I may explain that I asked the Post Office Department whether this matter would be allowed to go through the mails, and they said "no"; and that is what the letter referred to.

Mr. RICH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent extended to me, I direct attention to the address which I delivered on the floor of the House on June 17 last.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I directed the attention of the Congress to the fact that, contrary to the written language of the Communications Act of 1934, those to whom we had entrusted the enforcement of the Communications Act had failed, apparently willingly, to protect the American people from the intrusion into their homes of radio broadcasts which are profane, obscene, or indecent.

While several Members of the House who had the opportunity of reading copies of these radio broadcasts which I at that time exhibited on the floor readily agreed that such were obscene, profane, or indecent, it might be contended by some that such opinions were not in themselves legal or sufficient.

In order that no injustice be done, and, further, that I might myself be positive as to these broadcasts being obscene, profane, or indecent within the meaning of the law I submitted these broadcasts to the Government itself for an official interpretation.

Naturally, desiring a speedy response, I did not make such request to the Communications Commission, which had had copies of these and similar broadcasts before them for a considerable period of time without their taking any action thereon. However, as the language enacted by the Congress in the Communications Act, prohibiting the utterance of profane, obscene, or indecent language by means of radio communications, followed the decisions of the courts in matters prohibiting the mailing of profane, obscene, or indecent matter, I sent a copy of these broadcasts to the Post Office Department and asked if copies of these radio broadcasts could be transmitted through the mails.

The Post Office Department, through the Solicitor, without delay or hesitancy, the same day, replied in writing that copies of these radio broadcasts were not mailable and cited the law, which, in part, reads as follows:

Every obscene, lewd, or lascivious, and every filthy book, pamphlet, picture, paper, letter, writing, print, or other publication of an indecent character * * * is hereby declared to be non-mailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier.

The letter of the Solicitor of the Post Office Department is self-explanatory and reads, in full, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF SOLICITOR,
Washington, June 18, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR.,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CONNERY: The Postmaster General has referred to me your letter of the 18th instant, transmitting for a ruling as to its mailability a copy of a radio dramatic sketch recently broadcast over the air.

This matter has been carefully considered and it is the opinion of this office that the copy in question is unmailable under section 211 of the United States Penal Code (18 U. S. C. 334), a copy of which I am pleased to enclose herewith for your convenient reference.

Very truly yours,

KARL A. CROWLEY, Solicitor.

Section 326 of the Communications Act, in part, reads as follows:

No person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall utter any obscene, indecent, or profane language by means of radio communication.

The illustrations which I have cited and the radio broadcasts which the Solicitor of the Post Office Department ruled upon, I regret to say, are not isolated cases.

A year or so ago when 15 Members of the House joined with me in protesting against similar indecent radio programs sponsored and paid for by the Mexican Government over one of the principal American radio networks, the Federal Communications Commission not only failed to act on the petition and the protest of these 15 Members of the House but, actually, they had the effrontery of openly attempting to deceive these Members of the House by citing as a reason for their failure to protect the homes of the American people from the intrusion therein of these inde-

cent radio programs language in a court decision, which language and which court decision was proclaimed many years before radio broadcasting was known.

Variety, a well-known and well-established theatrical publication, which, to say the least, is liberal in its views and not at all prudish, in its issue of April 17, 1935, referring to a broadcast over one of the principal radio networks, in part, stated:

Letters and phone calls received by the web direct and through its associated stations described the screen players' material as profane and offensive to both religion and decency and took the broadcasters to task for not considering the young people who might be tuned in. In it the Deity and Savior were addressed familiarly and repeatedly.

Petitions and protests of representatives of the church, of women's organizations, of the people against such indecent radio utterances seemingly meet with silent consideration on the part of the Federal Communications Commission.

Apparently those we have entrusted with the regulation and the supervision of radio broadcasting either are unwilling or unable to protect the American people from the intrusion into their homes of indecent, profane, or obscene radio programs so long as someone will pay the radio broadcasting stations for broadcasting such indecent radio programs.

These un-American and indecent radio utterances are never broadcast by those few radio stations operated by educational, religious, labor, farm, or other non-profit-making stations.

Those who seek to expand and to increase culture, education, and understanding among our people meet with the icy stare or the silent treatment when they seek a license to operate a radio broadcasting station or to increase the facilities of the small stations they are now permitted to operate.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has specifically prohibited a monopoly in radio broadcasting—section 314, Communications Act—and yet we find today, less than 1 year since the Federal Communications Commission was appointed, that of the 40 clear-channel stations in the entire United States every one of them is controlled or operated by one of the three networks.

While the Government of the United States issues through the instrumentality of the Federal Communications Commission a franchise for the operation of radio broadcasting stations, such franchise being granted to the holder without any remuneration accruing to the Government despite the great need which exists today for revenue, the present Commission has permitted—yes, I might say, encouraged—the trafficking in these governmental properties for the enrichment of the privileged few who hold favor with the members of this governmental agency, namely, the Federal Communications Commission.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, testifying before the House Appropriations Committee December 6, 1935, stated that holders of such radio broadcasting franchises were disposing of such franchises for prices which were "far and beyond the value of their assets." The Chairman further stated:

I know of a case where within 6 months a corporation able to pay offered \$3,000,000 for one station. Now, of course, that station has no such value.

Is it not fair to assume that the admission above quoted proves that the Commission has first-hand knowledge of the trafficking which is going on in governmental properties, and yet nothing has been done to protect the Government since last December?

Further, the Chairman stated:

Another thing is the possibility of a racket following this thing in the way of stock issues. They are beginning to get wise to the fact that they might by a stock issue still retain control of their stations and sell enough stock to not only pay the cost of the station but some profit in addition to that. * * * Now, just how much they can issue before they get into the value of the license given them by the Government, for which they pay nothing, is a question.

Yet almost weekly the same Commission, the Chairman of which gave utterance to the above quotations, is approving the leasing or the assigning, for prices far beyond the

value of their assets, other than the value attached to the governmental franchise, which, as the Chairman stated, costs them nothing, of radio stations to one or the other of those who, to all intents and purposes, hold a monopolistic control of radio broadcasting in the United States despite the prohibition against monopoly contained in the very act which this Commission has been entrusted with the enforcement of.

A few years ago the Catholic Church, aided by the Protestant Churches and those representing the Hebrew people, alarmed at the indecency of several motion pictures, initiated a movement to have the American people abstain from patronizing those theaters which exhibited pictures which were indecent or not fit for the young people to see.

The result of that campaign was that but very few indecent pictures are now produced, as a result of the American people so decidedly indicating that they would support the campaign initiated by the Catholic Church.

It is not at all improbable that the American people may find it necessary, unless the Congress acts—as I expect that they will—to take similar action by refusing to purchase the products of those concerns who use the radio facilities of such radio stations as permit the broadcasting of indecent or otherwise unfit radio programs.

In closing I might add that where the Government itself owns and operates radio-broadcasting stations—as in Great Britain and Canada—and where no advertising is permitted, such indecent radio programs are unknown.

WILLIAM H. MORAN

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4659) to authorize the payment of an annuity to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, upon his retirement, in recognition and appreciation of his services to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall be obliged to object to this bill, but if the gentleman desires to explain the bill, I shall reserve the objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I may say that this is a request from the Treasury Department and I introduced the bill at their request. It has the approval of the Budget and I understand is in line with the policy of the President.

Mr. SNELL. Let me say a word with regard to that. We spent a number of years here in the establishment of a retirement system for Government employees, and this is the first instance, so far as I know, where an effort has been made to retire a man by special legislation, rather than under the regular retirement system, and whether the Treasury Department is favorable to this or not does not materially influence me. It seems to me if you are going to start the precedent of retiring a person because he has influence and friends for whom he has done special favors, you are going to start a very harmful practice. I am saying nothing against this particular man, because I understand he has a fine record, but, individually, I am opposed to it. If the majority that is responsible for the work of this House wants to take this responsibility, of course, it is theirs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this proposition ought to be taken up at this time in the dying hours of the Congress to retire some man who has been on the pay roll for a number of years and has had the same opportunities as other Government employees.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4659) to authorize the payment of an annuity to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service of the Treasury Department, upon his retirement, in recognition and appreciation of his services to the United States.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition and appreciation of 53 consecutive years of faithful, courageous, and meritorious service in the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department, the last

18 years of which were served in the capacity of Chief of such Division, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to William H. Moran, out of the annual appropriation "Salaries, Secret Service Division", beginning upon his retirement and continuing throughout his natural life, in semi-monthly installments on the fifteenth and last days of each month, such sum as may be necessary, when added to the annuity which he will receive under the laws relating to the retirement of Government employees, to secure to him a total annuity of \$4,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio to 20 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes the payment to William H. Moran, when he retires, which will be on January 1, next year, in addition to his ordinary retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act, a sufficient amount to make his total annuity \$4,000. The additional amount will come out of the salary appropriation and not out of the civil-service retirement fund. This gentleman has served continuously for 53 years in the Secret Service of the United States Government.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is there any instance on record where anything like this has been done before, or will this create a precedent?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot answer that. I have been here only 7 years myself, but I do know there are cases where men are continued on the roll by special provision in an appropriation bill. I do not know that there is an exact precedent for this. I would not say there is or is not.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This, I am sure, will establish a bad precedent that will cause at least 20,000 bills to come in here in the next few Congresses. It ought not to pass.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Budget have approved it. It was sent up here, and I was requested to introduce it by the Secretary of the Treasury. It has the approval of the President, and they feel that because of the peculiar circumstances involved in this one case the bill ought to pass. I do not know of any other case where a man has served continuously 53 years for the Government in one department in a hazardous position. I do know that in one case this man saved the Government \$80,000,000 by detecting a bond fraud.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The precedent which this bill will establish—and the gentleman says he does not remember a bill like this having been passed before—will bring a flood of Government employees who may not be covered by the annuity laws who feel that they are not getting enough, and they will pounce down on each individual Congressman and ask him to introduce that kind of a bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think the gentleman will find any other man in the service who has continuously served for 53 years in one branch of the Government service, who is now 72 years of age, and who in the ordinary course of events will not be with us much longer. It is customary in the cities throughout the country to retire police chiefs on half their salary. This gentleman will get only \$4,000 if this bill is passed for the remainder of his life.

Mr. GILCHRIST. What is his salary now?

Mr. RAMSPECK. His salary is \$8,000 a year.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. During the 53 years that he has served, of course the Government has deducted from his pay monthly and laid up that sum in a fund which will be given to him under the Retirement Act.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MAY. And what does that amount to at the present time?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He will get \$1,375 a year in the ordinary course of retirement from that fund.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He will get only \$1,375 a year while captains and other subordinates under him will get much more because they are in the Metropolitan Police division. Some of the captains under Mr. Moran in the White House will get \$1,800 a year. If Mr. Moran were the head of the police of the District and retiring, he would get \$4,000 a year.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. If he were the Chief of Police in the District of Columbia and retiring, he would get \$4,000 a year, which is under the law authorized by Congress.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many lives of our Presidents has Chief Moran and his department protected under his command?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He goes back 53 years and for 7 months he was in Europe with President Wilson and looked after his protection. I do not know how many Presidents he has protected. It goes back further than I can remember.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would the gentleman tell the House how many important investigations this efficient official has conducted which have resulted in the saving of many, many millions of dollars to this Government? I ask this question because I happen to know that in the oil investigation, for instance, one of the many important investigations of which he had charge, his efficient services unearthed evidence that enabled this Government to rescue a treasure of enormous value. I believe Chief Moran is entitled to the relief which this bill provides and I wish the gentleman from Georgia would tell us how many of these investigations of enormous importance to the country he has conducted in his long public service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I don't know how many, but I know there have been a great many. I know of one case where he saved the Government \$80,000,000.

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I call the gentleman's attention to the case of Mr. George W. Hesse.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, I yield to the gentleman for a question and I do not want to go into the facts of other cases.

Mr. BLANTON. But I want the gentleman to remember the case of George W. Hesse, who had served many years so faithfully, and when his case came up the point was made that it would establish a bad precedent. Our good friend Andy Smith, whom we all love, has served this Government 59 years and he will not get any additional pension. We must not establish this bad precedent. It would cost millions of dollars in every future Congress.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad that he is still with us. I do not yield further. I yield now to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The members of the Civil Service Committee, of which I am one, and of which the able gentleman is chairman, gave very careful consideration to this special case. In the gentleman's opinion it is not a dangerous precedent to give to those in this Government who have given meritorious service, this recognition, is it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think not, because of the peculiar circumstances involved in this one case and because of the hazardous service he has rendered and the age he has reached now and the long years of service he has rendered.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think what all of us want to know is how much does he get under the retirement fund and how much more will he get under this bill, to make up the \$4,000 a year?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Under the regular retirement fund he will get \$1,375 a year.

Mr. DONDERO. So he would have an increase of \$2,625?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Two thousand six hundred and twenty-five dollars from the salary fund, making a total of \$4,000. His salary is now \$8,000. If he were chief of police of the District of Columbia and retired, he would get \$4,000 a year. That is the law that Congress passed for that.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is absolutely unnecessary to debate this case any further, because I think everybody is ready to vote. Regardless of the fact that this gentleman is a most efficient officer, we must remember that he has done no more than was his reasonable duty.

For fear there might be some who do not know what this bill is about, let me read three or four lines in the last part of the bill.

Beginning upon his retirement and continuing throughout his natural life, semiannual payments on the fifteenth and last days of each month, such sum as may be necessary, when added to the annuity which he will receive under the laws relating to the retirement of Government employees, to secure him a total annuity of \$4,000.

It has been made very clear that there never yet has been any precedent for this sort of action. We are trying tonight to do something which we have never done before. As the gentleman from Texas said, it is safe to predict that we will have thousands of these cases every year. So why open the floodgates?

The argument by the distinguished majority floor leader, Mr. O'CONNOR, applies to thousands of people. The gentleman says this man will be discriminated against because there are some younger men in the service who, when they arrive at the age of retirement, will draw more than he will draw. Every year there are hundreds of men going out who have reached the age of retirement, who will not draw as much as those who will follow them. So if you start this program to equalize persons thus classified, you will have a thousand coming in here every year asking for equalization. They then should do so—this bill deserves to be overwhelmingly defeated. I am sure that will be your decision. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], such time as he may desire.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it seems altogether unnecessary and superfluous that anyone should rise in opposition to this bill, which on the face of it is inherently bad.

We are now approaching the close of a prolonged and arduous session of this Congress. Gay as our hearts may be and happy as we may be in the camaraderie that pervades this body, that is unequalled among any other group in all the world, our hearts are sad tonight because of the absence of one of the most able, one of the most fearless, one of the fairest, one of the most lovable Speakers who ever presided over this body, Joe Byrns. There is no Member, regardless of party, who has a higher personal regard or a more genuine affection for our present Speaker, Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that having sat through the sessions for the last 2 days I have been somewhat dismayed and more displeased at certain tactics that have been employed in the closing hours of this session.

As just one humble Member of this House, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the fact that important legislation is brought in at the last moment and is passed without being read, let alone considered by the membership of this House. It seems to me that this bill is just another illustration of Members who are now tired, fatigued, and worn, anxious to adjourn and go back to their homes, rushing through legislation without serious consideration or ample debate.

I am heartily in accord with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], who has just spoken, and with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who now occupies the chair. I do not know why he was placed in the chair at this particular moment unless they did not want to hear his opposition to this bill. [Applause.] I am in accord with them when they say this would establish a dangerous and a bad precedent,

and as just one Member I hope we shall forget all our differences long enough to register a unanimous protest against such proposed legislation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing to listen to the argument of the gentleman from Missouri who has just spoken. He first talks about legislation coming in at the last minute. The gentleman talks about legislation coming in at the last minute and that he has not had an opportunity of reading the bill. The bill has been printed for a long while. Well, the gentleman has not served in a Republican-controlled House. I have.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. I do not know how much I served, but I was here in the Seventy-first Congress, and that was almost Republican, just as the Seventy-fifth Congress will be. [Applause.]

Mr. McCORMACK. I can hear the gentleman very plainly. What my friend predicts about the Seventy-fifth Congress is something that will occur in the future and rests with the voters.

The gentleman talks about legislation coming in at the last minute. Now, let us be frank. That is one of the conditions of the closing days of any session, whether the Republicans control the House or the Democrats control the House. I was not critical of my Republican friends when they were in control. It is a condition that confronts whatever party is in control of the House.

The gentleman talks also about the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and, of course, from his intimation, he wants us to infer that the Speaker called the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi to preside in order to take his voice away from this debate. I do not think that becomes the gentleman either, in addition to his other statements.

So far as Chief Moran is concerned, this bill does not establish any precedent. Fifty-three years in the service of the Government, all his life devoted to the service of Presidents, whether Republican or Democratic—Presidents of the United States. I do not look at the President from the angle of Republican or Democrat. This man served 53 years protecting the lives of the Presidents of the United States, 18 of those years as Chief of the Secret Service. During this time, as Chief of the Secret Service, he protected the lives of six Presidents of the United States. It seems to me that such service makes this bill a justifiable exception.

This money does not come out of the retirement fund. He receives no more out of the retirement fund than he would receive by law. The extra money is provided out of another fund. This bill, therefore, does not establish a precedent so far as the retirement fund is concerned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RANKIN). The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill be passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 36, noes 125.

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof the motion was rejected.

UNION PARTY PLATFORM AND STATEMENT OF WILLIAM LEMKE, CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement and platform of the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE, Union Party candidate for President of the United States. I believe the country is entitled to statements from all Presidential candidates. Their platforms and programs should all be published in the RECORD for the information of the public.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. LEMKE's statement and the platform follow:

I have accepted the challenge of the reactionary elements of both of the old parties and will run for President of the United States

as the candidate of the Union Party, in accordance with the thousands of messages and requests which I have received from over the Nation.

The Honorable Thomas Charles O'Brien, of Boston, has signified his willingness to seek the Vice Presidency on the same platform.

I have arranged with friends of mine to proceed with filing the name of the Union Party, the emblem, the names of Presidential electors, my own name, and that of Mr. O'Brien in order to fulfill the specific law of each State relative to filing.

I am hoping that the platform which I have submitted to my friends will meet with wide approval. To my own mind, it is the only platform which will embody the principles which will save democracy and put a permanent end to the so-called depression.

Some three-quarters of a century ago this Nation was at the crossroads. The issue of human slavery confronted our people. A decision as to whether the Nation should remain half free or half slavery had to be made. Political parties of that day temporized with the issue of human slavery and brought about the Civil War and incidentally the formation of a new party headed by Abraham Lincoln, dedicated to the preservation of the Union and elimination of human slavery.

Today we are again at the crossroads and the issue again is slavery—economic slavery. Today we are in the midst of another war—a war against a man-made depression. It has reduced our Nation to the lowest economic state in its history, leaving a trail of suffering, starvation, and want in a land of plenty. Two major parties have had ample opportunity to seriously attempt to remedy the economic ills of our Nation. They have been found wanting.

There is only one solution. That is through the formation of a new party, which I am launching today, to be known as the Union Party of the United States.

CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN

As far as the election of Members of Congress is concerned, the Union Party will support Members who voted for progressive and liberal legislation, for the farmer, labor, veterans, and the small-business man, including the Frazier-Lemke bill, regardless of party or party affiliation.

WILLIAM LEMKE.

UNION PARTY PLATFORM

1. America shall be self-contained and self-sustained—no foreign entanglements, be they political, economic, financial or military.
2. Congress and Congress alone shall coin and issue the currency and regulate the value of all the money and credit in the United States through a central bank of issue.
3. Immediately following the establishment of the central bank of issue Congress shall provide for the retirement of all tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds and certificates of indebtedness of the Federal Government and shall refinance all the present agricultural mortgage indebtedness for the farmer and all the home mortgage indebtedness for the farmer and all the home mortgage indebtedness for the city owner by the use of its money and credit which it now gives to the private bankers.
4. Congress shall legislate that there will be an assurance of a living annual wage for all laborers capable of working and willing to work.
5. Congress shall legislate that there will be an assurance of production at a profit for the farmer.
6. Congress shall legislate that there will be assurance of reasonable and decent security for the aged, who, through no fault of their own, have been victimized and exploited by an unjust economic system which has so concentrated wealth in the hands of a few that it has impoverished great masses of our people.
7. Congress shall legislate that American agricultural, industrial, and commercial markets will be protected from manipulation of foreign moneys and from all raw material and processed goods produced abroad at less than a living wage.
8. Congress shall establish an adequate and perfect defense for our country from foreign aggression either by air, by land, or by sea, but with the understanding that our naval, air, and military forces must not be used under any consideration in foreign fields or in foreign waters either alone or in conjunction with any foreign power. If there must be conscription, there shall be a conscription of wealth as well as a conscription of men.
9. Congress shall so legislate that all Federal offices and positions of every nature shall be distributed through civil-service qualifications and not through a system of party spoils and corrupt patronage.
10. Congress shall restore representative government to the people of the United States to preserve the sovereignty of the individual States of the United States by the ruthless eradication of bureaucracies.
11. Congress shall organize and institute Federal works for the conservation of public lands, waters, and forests, thereby creating billions of dollars of wealth, millions of jobs at the prevailing wage, and thousands of homes.
12. Congress shall protect small industry and private enterprise by controlling and decentralizing the economic domination of monopolies to the end that these small industries and enterprises may not only survive and prosper but that they may be multiplied.
13. Congress shall protect private property from confiscation through unnecessary taxation with the understanding that the human rights of the masses take precedence over the financial rights of the classes.

14. Congress shall set a limitation upon the net income of any individual in any one year and a limitation of the amount that such an individual may receive as a gift or as an inheritance, which limitation shall be executed through taxation.

15. Congress shall reestablish conditions so that the youths of the Nation, as they emerge from schools and colleges, will have the opportunity to earn a decent living while in the process of perfecting and establishing themselves in a trade or profession.

SURVEY OF CABINET GORGE ON THE CLARK FORK OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4062) to provide for a survey of the Cabinet Gorge on the Clark Fork of the Columbia River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have the entire bill read at this time?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. 388), known as the reclamation law, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to make surveys and investigations to (1) determine the power markets that might be served from a suitable hydroelectric power project at the Cabinet Gorge site on the Clark Fork of the Columbia River in the proximity of the Montana-Idaho State line; and (2), provided such markets can be developed, to make further investigations to determine the design and cost of a dam to be constructed at said site.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the President and Congress a report, together with his recommendations on the investigations herein authorized, not later than 8 months from the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the reclamation fund, not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4062) to provide for a survey of the Cabinet Gorge on the Clark Fork of the Columbia River.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering a second; and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to act as tellers.

The question was taken; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 91, nays 49.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the original purpose of this bill was to provide for a study and survey of the Cabinet Gorge project in order to determine whether a hydroelectric plant may be built at Cabinet Gorge and power used to pump water to rehabilitate five or six existing irrigation districts that are in distress on account of lack of water because their source of supply is failing. The lakes and wells are drying up and there is a shortage of water.

It is the purpose of this bill to make the necessary surveys and investigations to determine if it is practical and feasible to generate power at Cabinet Gorge and use it to rehabilitate these projects. The bill has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Budget. It has been passed by the Senate and has been approved by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House, of which I have the honor of being chairman. The committee report on this bill has been written by a member of the minority. Therefore I feel the bill is entirely in order and merits the support of the Members of the House.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KVALE. Does this involve the Flathead power system on the Flathead Indian Reservation?

Mr. WHITE. It has nothing to do with the Flathead Indian Reservation.

Mr. KVALE. It has nothing to do with the Yellowstone Basin at all. It has to do with waters that flow to the coast?

Mr. WHITE. It does. This bill has been approved all down the line and simply provides that money shall be used out of the reclamation fund to determine the practicability and feasibility of the project and rehabilitate these irrigation projects, and these old settlements will be restored and an abundant supply of water provided.

Mr. LAMNECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LAMNECK. How much will this project cost if finally approved?

Mr. WHITE. That is exactly the reason for the introduction of this bill.

Mr. LAMNECK. Is it true that it will cost \$263,000,000?

Mr. WHITE. That is absolutely absurd.

Mr. LAMNECK. I am taking the words of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. I do not know where the Appropriations Committee chairman got his figures. It is absurd.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Is it not a fact this money will come out of the reclamation fund and not the Treasury?

Mr. WHITE. That is the fact.

Mr. FULMER. If it is impossible to impound that water by building a dam, it will mean millions, no doubt, to the farmers in a number of irrigation projects that may eventually have to be abandoned unless they can get water?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is correct. The first object of the bill is to rehabilitate these irrigation projects and maybe extend it to the adjoining territory.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TABER. How much does the gentleman say this project will cost?

Mr. WHITE. I would not know until the surveys had been made and a determination reached. The purpose of this bill is to ascertain how much it will cost and the feasibility and practicability of the whole thing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Should we not wait until we have had an examination made? And where is the money coming from?

Mr. WHITE. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota what we are seeking to do is to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to make the surveys and determinations.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I am interested to know whether or not in connection with this proposed project there are to be any new arid lands brought into production through irrigation?

Mr. WHITE. No; I will say there is not. All the land in this particular country is settled and is now in use. There might be some land put under irrigation, but it is not arid land and it is not new land. It is land already under cultivation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL].

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with this area, since it is just over in Idaho, adjacent to the district I represent in Washington.

The Clark Fork of the Columbia River flows through Lake Pend d'Oreille, which is one of the largest fresh-water lakes in the United States outside of the Great Lakes. The lower end of Pend d'Oreille Lake is about 7 miles from the land involved in this project. The lands are on what is known as Rathdrum Prairie. There are about four privately developed reclamation projects totaling about 15,000 acres situated on Rathdrum Prairie. Those projects have been

getting their water from Hayden Lake and from wells out of which they pump.

In later years the waters in Hayden Lake have been falling, the level of the lake has been going down, and the water tables where the wells are from which they pump, have been gradually lowering also. They have to pump water on these lands, and the rates that they pay now for the electrical power are so high that it is unprofitable, and they are about to lose their homes on these developments.

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

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Is this a Government project at the present time?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. No; they are not. They are private projects.

Mr. SNELL. But you want the Government to take them over and develop them?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. We want the Government to investigate them and determine whether it is feasible to put in a dam and create power at Cabinet Gorge on Clark Fork, in order to provide cheap electricity for pumping water out of the lower end of Lake Pend d'Oreille to put on these lands to rehabilitate the lands and develop them as irrigation projects.

Mr. SNELL. How large a dam and how high a dam does the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. That is one of the things the investigation is to determine, as well as to determine whether there is a market for the power.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman understand that it is currently reported it will cost from \$200,000,000 to \$250,000,000 to complete the project?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I cannot conceive that any such figure would be in contemplation because it simply means the building of a dam in a gorge across a small river and then putting in an electrical power plant and transmission line down to the lower end of Pend d'Oreille Lake to pump water out of the lake and run it through a canal to these lands.

Mr. SNELL. This would bring more land into cultivation?

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. It will simply rehabilitate the land that was sought to be reclaimed under these private projects.

Mr. SNELL. But it is not being reclaimed at the present time.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. They have some water, but the water is not sufficient and is failing.

Mr. SNELL. Then it will bring more water and in this way produce more agricultural products.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. It will produce more products on the land that is now developed.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations fought a very gallant battle here in the House this week for the purpose of terminating, or at least limiting to the reclamation fund, this reclamation folly. Tonight in the last hours of the Congress we are confronted with this bill.

I have in my files a letter written to Fred Brinckman, the legislative representative of the National Grange, from a resident of the State of Washington in and about the area that it is proposed to reclaim by this bill, in which the writer states that bringing more land into production in this area means nothing short of confiscation for those who have already invested their life's savings in this area.

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

Mr. CULKIN. No; not now.

This is the situation with which you are confronted. On the Columbia River the Federal Government has expended \$63,000,000, or will expend \$63,000,000 when the present appropriations have been used in the building of a dam on the upper Columbia. This dam, in my judgment, will

be of the same lasting character and the same sort of world wonder as the pyramids are now. It will have no other function. This project, according to the Reclamation Bureau, will cost \$490,000,000 and will bring 1,200,000 acres of land into production.

On the lower Columbia River we will expend at Bonneville approximately \$40,000,000 for a joint navigation and power project.

It would seem, therefore, that the State of Washington and the adjoining area is well supplied with all necessary power and all necessary new land.

May I say to you that in the same State of Washington in the last year some 10,000 acres of orchards were pulled for the reason there was no market for the fruit. There is in that area thousands of acres of reclaimed land on which no settlers have gone or will go.

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

Mr. CULKIN. In a minute.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to correct some of the statements the gentleman is making.

Mr. CULKIN. Oh, the gentleman can do that in his own time. I protest most vigorously against this raid on the Treasury, which is apparently innocent in character, but I assert that it is simply the nose of the camel getting under the reclamation tent. I know the House is tired and exhausted and tired of speech making. [Applause.] And I know these gentleman who are so generous with their applause wish to get this raid through the House without any preliminaries. Nevertheless, I emphasize that this authorization, preliminary and simple as it may seem in character, is, in fact, only preliminary, and a demand for an additional three or four hundred millions dollars will follow. Further, every foot of land that is reclaimed in this area means that the value of land in Kansas, Iowa, Idaho, Nebraska, and all of the Western States will depreciate in value. In addition to that, by bringing this land into production, you prejudice, you injure the men who are already on the reclaimed lands of the West and the men who are on the acreage in the East.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Idaho is the father of the bill. I am very fond of him, and I yield to him for a question but I do not yield to him to make a speech.

Mr. WHITE. I am not going to make a speech, but does the gentleman realize that the products of this land in this section reach up against Canada, and they have a big market in Canada in the lumbering and mining sections, and will not come into competition with the products of the Eastern States at all?

Mr. CULKIN. That is the most guileless, the most ingenious piece of sophistry that I have ever heard. Did any one ever hear of Canada buying any agricultural products from the United States—especially since the promulgation of the reciprocal-trade agreement?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I will try to answer his question. All of the time that the Republicans had a duty of 42 cents a bushel on wheat—

Mr. CULKIN. Oh, I have yielded for a question, not a speech.

Mr. RANKIN. And I am going to answer the gentleman's question. We were shipping wheat into Canada because wheat was higher there than in the United States. When we had a tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat, wheat was higher in the market at Winnipeg by 10 cents than in the United States market.

Mr. CULKIN. Oh, the gentleman goes back into the dark ages. That was before the great western areas of Canada were settled.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; Republican dark ages, and they never will be that dark again, for the dark days are over.

Mr. CULKIN. Happy days and Landon will soon be here. Gentlemen, do not let these mad reclamationists get their nose into the Federal Treasury via this new and terrible reclamation abortion in the last hours of this Congress. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield myself 5 minutes. Already there has been expended since the 4th of March 1933 between twenty-four and twenty-five billions of dollars. This present bill is not a big item on the surface, but it leads, according to the information that has come to me, to a couple of hundred millions of dollars more money. Do we want to start on it? Gentlemen will remember that we tried to find out from the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL] what they thought this project would cost, but we could not do it. The best information that we can get is that it will cost from two to three hundred million dollars.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment. We get this story; that there are some settlers on a project up there who are suffering from lack of water. We have had that story with reference to every irrigation project that has been before the House in the last 60 days, but we also get the story that there will be more land brought under cultivation if this project goes through.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think if the gentleman will recall my statement, I said there would be no more land brought in cultivation, that the land is already under cultivation but not irrigation.

Mr. TABER. It will not raise crops although the land is under cultivation?

Mr. WHITE. Dry farming.

Mr. TABER. Dry farming? Probably dry farming is not successful out there and they would like to have the Government spend two or three hundred million dollars to make it wet farming. Is that it?

Mr. WHITE. I will answer the gentleman. There are five irrigation projects there that are short of water, and the purpose of this bill is to make a study and survey to find out how they can be rehabilitated, and those people can be made secure in their home and in their property.

Mr. SAMUEL B. HILL. I should like to know the source of the information that justifies the statement that this will cost \$200,000,000 or \$100,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Why, inference from statements that have drifted in here and there through the Reclamation Service. We suggested that that idea was before us, and we tried to find out when the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Idaho were before the House what they thought it would cost, and we found out nothing. If they have anything to tell us in the 5 minutes they have left, they ought to tell us. I shall not yield any more to them because I have not the time, but I believe we ought not to start on any more irrigation projects at this time. I think we have gone as far as we ought to go in that sort of thing, and we ought to stop.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I do not know much about this project, but I read the report. The bill when it first came here was labeled as one to rehabilitate irrigation districts. The report made by the friends of the bill says that it is for the purpose of putting more water upon this land; that is, for the purpose of remedying an inadequate situation that now obtains with reference to the land. They propose to put this water on, but they say they are not going to bring more land into cultivation. They do admit they are going to raise more crops, however. The very purpose of it is to raise more crops, to produce a greater surplus, and this is at a time when we are proposing to limit and curtail production and bring it into balance with consumption.

To my mind, it is an asinine thing now, when we are spending money to prevent a surplus of crops, to make

appropriations to bring more land into crop production. To my mind, it is unjust because it is unfair to the rest of the farm country which is raising crops, without Government help or subsidies. We ought not to allow the Government to compete in this way with the farmers of the country who finance their own farms. The Government has as much right to build mills to manufacture shoes in competition with the private shoe factories. Do not allow the Federal Government to build and finance more farms to produce more crops, to contribute more surpluses to further cheapen farm products. Farmers are having enough trouble already.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, and particularly the Democratic Members of the House [applause], if there ever was a Congress of the United States that has been ruthlessly spending the taxpayers' money, this is the Congress. If there ever has been a Congress that has been doing foolish things, this is the Congress. [Applause.] You go out now and buy, under instructions from the Secretary of Agriculture, 40,000,000 acres of land to put them out of cultivation. Then you turn around and build dams and dams and irrigation projects in the Northwest, and you put into cultivation over 300,000,000 acres of ground. [Applause.]

Then you turn around and you spend money building dams out in the West to make electric power a yardstick to determine power projects, after you have started a project down in the Tennessee Valley to make a yardstick for power where the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is trying to prove to the people of this country that they are getting power for a certain figure, cheaper than was ever gotten in any part of the country, when the taxpayers of this country are footing the bills. Yet Mr. RANKIN claims the Government does it at a profit. [Applause.] They do not have that yardstick finished, and they are hoodwinking the American people every minute of the day. They do not know how to figure costs. Now, you are trying to build, under this bill, what we call a power project. Read the bill. It says "for a suitable hydroelectric power project", and then you take the floor and say it is for the benefit of agricultural lands in the committee report. The survey cost is \$25,000. We do not need more power in the Northwest nor do we need more lands at this time. So defeat the bill. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. EKWALL].

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen closely, and I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to listen, because I am going to answer a question which he has asked for 6 months, namely, "Where are you going to get the money?" Under this bill it is provided we will get the money from the reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is a revolving fund, and it means that no money will come out of the Federal Treasury. So the gentleman from Pennsylvania may go home and get the first night's sleep he has had in 6 months. [Laughter and applause.]

It is like waving a red flag in front of him to mention anything about reclamation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN]. [Laughter and applause.]

I think the West is entitled to this consideration. The bill merely authorizes a survey and investigation. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the gentlemen on the Republican side who are opposed to reclamation in any form that it is the source of the market for the stuff that they consume from the East. Corn and pork from Iowa, and manufactured goods from the industrial East. I wish I had time to go further into that subject.

I want to tell these gentlemen that when I started my campaign for Congress, I was talking to one of the most conservative Republican businessmen in the city of Spokane—Mr. Funicane, of Holley Mason Hardware Co. He said to me, "WHITE, those Republicans have gone crazy in passing the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill." He said, "The president of the Spokane and International Railroad told me that on account of the Hawley-Smoot bill they had lost 1,000 carloads of business of soft fruits and vegetables from the irrigated sections of the State of Washington to Canada, during the month of September of that year, on account of the retaliatory tariff measures." [Applause.]

Let me remind you opponents of irrigation that the products of the irrigated districts marketed over the border in Canada have contributed to the business prosperity of the Northwest—your market for your products, one of the best in the United States. Go into the railroad yards and to the warehouses of these western cities and towns, you Members from central and eastern farming States, and see for yourselves the vast quantities of your finished products—cereals, packing-house products, hams, bacon, lard. You from the industrial East, carload after carload rolling into your best market. Would you curtail this market? Do you desire to arrest the development of this country? Do you want to deprive the unemployed of your cities of an opportunity to become self-supporting? Must we continue to tax ourselves to support them in idleness? If you could realize what the development and prosperity of the irrigated communities of the West mean to the welfare and the prosperity of people of your district, I am sure you would not oppose this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 51, noes 170.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

TO FREE INTERSTATE BRIDGES FROM LOCAL TAXATION

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3107) to exempt publicly owned interstate highway bridges from State, municipal, and local taxation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be reported in full.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each interstate highway bridge and approaches thereto which has heretofore been constructed or acquired or which shall hereafter be constructed or acquired by any State, or by any commission, board, or agency of a State; or by any county, city, town, or other political subdivision or public corporation, or by any commission, board, or agency thereof; or by any commission, board, or authority created by the Congress or by a compact entered into between two States with the consent of the Congress, each thereof being herein sometimes termed a public authority, and which has been, or shall be, constructed pursuant to an act of the Congress consenting to or authorizing such construction, is hereby declared to be a Federal instrumentality for facilitating interstate commerce, improving the postal service, and providing for military purposes, and shall be exempt from all State, municipal, and local taxation so long as such bridge shall be owned and operated by such public authority either as a free bridge or as a toll bridge: *Provided, however,* That if such bridge shall be operated as a toll bridge, it shall not be exempt from such taxation unless all tolls received from the operation thereof, less the actual cost of operation and maintenance, are applied to the repayment to such public authority of the cost of construction or acquisition of such bridge or to the amortization of such cost, with reasonable interest and financing costs; nor unless after the amount contributed by such public authority, with reasonable interest and financing costs, in the construction or acquisition of such bridge has been repaid from the tolls; or after a sinking fund sufficient for the amortization of such cost shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that it is necessary to bring up this matter under suspension at this time. I have not been dilatory in bringing this matter to the House, but on two occasions it was passed over on the Consent Calendar without prejudice. This bill was passed by the Senate unanimously. It came to the House and went to the Interstate Commerce Committee, where hearings were held, and both the subcommittee and the full committee reported this bill to the House favorably. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War have either approved of or voiced no opposition to the bill. When the matter came up on the Consent Calendar the objectors on both sides seemed to be in accord and assured me they would interpose no objection. One gentleman, for reasons sufficient to himself, saw fit, which he had the right to do, to ask that it be passed over without prejudice.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to free publicly owned interstate bridges from State, municipal, or local taxation. In my opinion if this bill passes such bridges will be free from tolls from 1 to 3 years sooner than they would be if this bill is not passed.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand, the bill provides that such bridges are henceforth to be considered instrumentalities of the Federal Government provided that all of the revenue from the bridges is used for the retirement of the bonds, and upon retirement of the bonds the title to the bridges reverts to the municipalities so that eventually these bridges will become the property of the municipalities which are now taxing them.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is practically correct except title is now in the State. The State does not have to wait until the bridges are free. The title rests in the public agency.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The point I make is that eventually these bridges will become the property of the municipality which is now taxing them; and, of course, they will not tax their own property.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And, under the operation of this bill these bonds will be retired that much quicker.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for 1 second. Let me cite an example, an outstanding example of the situation that confronts some States and municipalities. The city of St. Louis paid about \$12,000,000 to build a free bridge. The city of East St. Louis and the people of Illinois get as much benefit from this bridge as do the people of the city of St. Louis and State of Missouri. The city of East St. Louis taxes this bridge something around \$75,000. Title to the bridge will never go to the subdivision that is taxing it. Title will always remain with St. Louis.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the question of toll bridges in this country, it seems to me, is very much misunderstood.

This bill has nothing to do with privately owned toll bridges. These are publicly owned interstate bridges. For many years dangerous streams had to be crossed by ferry because cities, counties, and States were unable to build bridges. A few years ago it became possible for cities, counties, and States to borrow money to pay for bridges and to pledge nothing but the revenues from the bridge—that is, to pledge the tolls to the payment of the indebtedness.

When the tolls are so applied, then the bridges will be free and no tolls charged thereafter. All over this country at the present time we have bridges which have been built in that manner, and they will be free as soon as the tolls have been sufficient to pay off the indebtedness.

The purpose of this bill is to make these bridges, publicly owned, free from local taxation. The practice has been for some little town over on the other side of the river, which is getting the benefit of a free bridge when the tolls

are paid, upon seeing a chance to make some money because a pier happens to rest on their side of the river, to stick a tax upon the bridge. This means that the tolls will have to be increased, or it will take longer to pay off the bonds or the indebtedness, and, consequently, through a selfish policy, these public necessities are kept from being free years longer.

This bill makes the bridges Federal instrumentalities, and they cannot be taxed by a local community, by county, or State. If this bill is passed, and it is just that it should be passed, we will have free bridges in a much shorter time.

There are some few communities where they are getting property taxes from toll bridges, yet they get a little more benefit in taxes than in costs from tolls. They want to keep the thing under taxation as long as they can, in order that their little communities may be so benefited, and the general public thereby gets the worst of it.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. I want to make this observation to my colleague from Kentucky: A subcommittee of which I have been a member now for a great many years has given a great deal of serious thought to the question of the continuity of these privately owned toll bridges, with the hope that some time it may be possible to have them as free bridges.

Mr. O'NEAL. Is the gentleman referring to privately or publicly owned bridges?

Mr. HOLMES. I am referring to both.

Mr. O'NEAL. This bill refers only to publicly owned bridges.

Mr. HOLMES. We are dealing with bridges that go over navigable streams, the only ones Congress has jurisdiction over.

Mr. O'NEAL. And publicly owned.

Mr. HOLMES. And publicly owned. Our committee unanimously recommended this bill. We have given it some thought and study for the past 3 years. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has also given it consideration and unanimously reported this bill, believing it was about time we created some legislation of this type to act fairly as between communities.

Mr. O'NEAL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much I find myself in opposition to our splendid colleague from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] so far as the merits of this bill that he is so interested in are concerned, but I feel I would be negligent in my duty if I did not oppose it with all my ability. It seems to me that the Federal Government is going a long ways when it undertakes to declare toll bridges built by cities and States instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the use of the Postal Service and the national defense, and tell these States and cities, as well as various other subdivisions, they cannot levy a tax against the property, although it may be assessable under the laws of the States affected.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the Federal Government should keep out of this particular field. It involves a very serious question of State rights as to whether or not the Federal Government has a constitutional right to tell one State by congressional enactment that it cannot tax the property of another State located within its own borders. I noted with much interest the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky that if we pass this bill tonight we are going to do away with toll bridges. I do not think the gentleman meant that just as it sounded. I make the statement on my own responsibility that if we pass this bill tonight, or at any subsequent session of the Congress, toll bridges in the United States will not disappear within the life of most of the Members of this body.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the tolls be increased?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not know whether they will or not. This bill will not decrease the toll.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. THOMPSON. Absolutely not. We have to keep in mind the bridges covered by this bill have been built by cities and they are managed by cities or counties and States. They are loaded down with overhead, and in most all of the cases the money has been borrowed from the P. W. A. or the R. F. C., and they never will be paid off, and we know they will not be. Unless some action is taken by the Congress of the United States to cancel these loans the tolls will remain on forever, because the history of toll bridges in the United States, whether privately or publicly owned, is nothing but a string of failures, particularly those built in the last 10 years. There is hardly an issue of bonds against a toll bridge in the United States today that is not in default, and yet they tell you if we take off the tax that some little community may lay on valuable property we are going to bring about free bridges.

Mr. LAMNECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LAMNECK. Will not this deny the municipalities and taxing units a source of revenue, most of which is paid by people who do not live in the taxing district at all?

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. In principle, why should a publicly owned bridge be taxed any more than a highway or any other city-owned or State-owned utility?

Mr. THOMPSON. That would be very true if the question of reciprocity between the States were involved. I think if two States want to enter into a compact to make the property of each other, confined within their borders, tax free, that is perfectly all right, but I fail to see why the Federal Government should inject itself into a matter that is strictly State business.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman comes from Illinois, across the river from my State, and he knows about the beautiful \$12,000,000 bridge that the city of St. Louis built as a free bridge. The city of East St. Louis gets just as much benefit from it, and millions of citizens of Illinois come across this bridge every year, but still the city of East St. Louis taxes this bridge about \$75,000 a year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not care to get into an argument with the gentleman, except to say that the city of St. Louis built that \$12,000,000 bridge so as to draw trade from Illinois into the city of St. Louis, so that the people of Illinois would do their shopping in St. Louis. This is the case in nearly every instance. Cities went out and borrowed money and created bridge authorities to build bridges in order to attract business to their community, and I think it is a perfectly commendable effort on their part.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows that this bridge was built to take away business from the toll bridge, the Eads Bridge, which was the first bridge constructed across the Mississippi River. That is why St. Louis built the bridge and made it a free bridge, so that everyone who wanted to cross the Mississippi River would not have to pay tolls to a private corporation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I suppose business in St. Louis fell off after they put up this free bridge. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand that this bill will affect any toll bridge on a Federal highway totally within the boundaries of a State unless it happens to be on a border line?

Mr. THOMPSON. Absolutely not, because if it were not an interstate bridge the Congress would not have any control over it and they would have to seek relief from the State legislatures of the States affected.

Mr. COLMER. Even though it were on a Federal highway?

Mr. THOMPSON. That has nothing to do with it whatever.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Illinois stated a while ago that these toll bridges were not making enough money to pay dividends on their bonds or on their investments.

Mr. THOMPSON. To pay their interest and amortize the bonds.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that a great many of these toll bridges have done just what the utilities have done; that is, issued watered bonds or watered stock and inflated their investments far above what was justified and therefore made it impossible, under such circumstances, for them to make enough money or wring enough money from the public to pay dividends.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot tell the gentleman about that, but I can say that in a majority of the cases the Federal Government is the creditor. In other words, these municipalities have set up bridge authorities, issued some kind of bonds that satisfied the lender, whether it was the R. F. C. or P. W. A., or private sources.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. Do I understand that the bill under consideration has to do with the selection of tolls?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; it does not. It has to do with the exemption of property owned by a State or a subdivision thereof in another State.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then there is no connection between this bill and any tolls necessary to be paid to the Democratic Party for campaign purposes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am sorry to say there is none.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I believe an interstate bridge has been held to be an instrumentality of interstate commerce. If this is true, why should we allow a municipality to place a burden on interstate commerce? Is not this against the very spirit of the Constitution, which gives the Congress of the United States control over interstate commerce?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not believe a toll bridge is an instrumentality of interstate commerce; a free bridge might be.

Mr. SPENCE. The Supreme Court has held that a bridge is an instrumentality of interstate commerce where it crosses a navigable stream which is the boundary of a State.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not see that it makes any difference whether a toll bridge is owned by a private bridge company or by a city.

I do not see the difference. The city had a selfish interest to go into it, principally to improve its own business, and that is commendable. No one can find fault with that, but why should a city on the opposite side of a river in another State have some of its valuable property used for an approach taken off the tax rolls so that another State or community in another State can get the benefit of it?

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. Would the gentleman's objection apply to a situation where the loans are paid off and the bridge becomes a free bridge?

Mr. THOMPSON. I don't think it would; no, sir. That is a different proposition, but if they ever get their loans paid off I don't think any of us will live to get the benefit of it.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to point out that this bill is a Senate bill. I do not know who is the author of it but

one of the large bridge construction engineering firms of the United States is vitally interested in it. It is a reputable firm. They have done the engineering on practically all of the large bridges built with Federal loans and grants during the last 4 or 5 years and they are naturally interested, so that they can go out and sell these communities to build more bridges, a good many of which do not improve the transportation system of the country and are built only for selfish reasons.

Mr. KELLER. Is not the gentleman aware that in the State of Kentucky the bridges have paid for themselves all over the State, and they have been made free?

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course the Congress when it grants the right to build a bridge over a navigable stream puts that provision into the law. They are not being charitable; that is the law.

Mr. KELLER. Possibly; but while the gentleman says that they will not pay out, yet they have paid out and they have become free.

Mr. THOMPSON. That might have been in the old days when construction costs were cheaper.

Mr. KELLER. Oh, in recent years.

Mr. THOMPSON. I say that this is a very far-reaching question and, in my opinion, Congress should not undertake to tell these different States how they should handle matters of this character. If the States want to make reciprocal agreements with each other or enter into compacts regarding the treatment of property owned by one State in another, let them do it; but it seems to me that the Federal Government has enough to take care of without telling local communities they shall or shall not be exempt from taxes. I hope the bill will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky has 9 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I really believe that there is no jurisdiction here. I do not see how we can assume jurisdiction. This is what this bill aims to do. It aims to exempt publicly owned interstate highway bridges from State, municipal, or local taxation. What right have we to dictate to the States or to municipalities to exempt these bridges from taxation, especially when these bridges are owned and operated by the States or municipalities? I merely know what is aimed at by this bill. A certain bridge has been taken over by a certain city, and the aim here is to relieve that city of certain State taxes which we have no right to do. It is absolutely against the rights of the respective States to dictate to them what they can tax and what they cannot tax.

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

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the women in America realized what the T. V. A. is doing for them, there would not be a candidate for public office from Maine to California who would dare to oppose it.

It is doing more to brighten their lives, lighten their burdens, relieve their drudgery, and increase the comforts and conveniences of their homes than anything else has ever done in the entire history of this Republic.

Electric lights, electric irons, electric refrigerators, electric stoves, fans, water heaters, vacuum cleaners, radios, washing machines, water pumps, sewing machines, grills, toasters, dishwashers, and numerous other labor-saving appliances may now be used under the T. V. A. rates for less money than it formerly took to light the home under the old power company rates. It is a new life, a new civilization for the women of this country.

No wonder they are for Roosevelt. He is doing more for the toiling, struggling women of this country by helping to put cheap electric energy within their reach than any other President has done for them in the last 100 years.

Besides we are extending this service into the rural sections, reaching thousands of farm homes that never could have enjoyed the blessings of cheap electric energy, at least during this generation, if it had not been for the T. V. A.

Let me give you an example of how cheap electricity relieves the drudgery of women who have to do their own work. Sometime ago I passed by a rather modest home and saw a little woman out in the yard doing the family washing. Although the weather was extremely hot, she had a blazing fire built around a large pot and she was standing over it punching the clothes down with a long stick, when she was not engaged in replenishing the fire, pumping water—or rather drawing it from the well—looking after her children, or running in and out of the kitchen to see about the dinner that she was cooking. She would then bow down over that board and that hot water and with her hands scrub those clothes for probably an hour or two. Then she would lay them on a block and take a battling stick and beat them till it seemed as if she was knocking all the buttons off. I presume she had to sit up at night and sew those buttons back on—while she rested.

She would then rinse those clothes in cold water, wring them out with her hands, hang them on the line, and hurry into the house and prepare supper. By that time the day was gone.

Tired and worn, looking older at 35 than she ought to look at 60, she sat down to the family meal—without ice and without fans. Of course, her day's work was not over; there were dishes to wash, children to bathe, and other household duties to perform before she could get any rest.

The next day, after her other household work was completed, she had to iron those clothes. She built a hot fire in the fireplace or in the stove, heated her iron, and spent the rest of the day leaning over it ironing the family clothes—absorbing about as much heat as the iron did.

Of course, this is only a portion of the household duties which go on from day to day and from week to week, in endless succession. This picture may not appeal to all of you. Some of you may not realize the drudgery women have to perform.

These are the women who keep the homes, rear the children, and help advance and perpetuate our civilization. I thought of the words of Joaquin Miller:

The bravest battle that ever was fought,
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
'Twas fought by the mothers of men.

Nay, not with cannon, or battle shot,
With sword, or nobler pen;
Nay, not with eloquent word or thought,
From mouths of wonderful men.

But deep in a walled-up woman's heart—
Of woman that would not yield,
But bravely, silently bore her part—
Lo! there in that battlefield!

No marshaling troop, no bivouac song;
No banners to gleam and wave!
But oh, these battles they last so long—
From babyhood to the grave!

Yet faithful still as a bridge of stars,
She fights in her walled-up town—
Fights on, and on, in the endless wars,
Then silent, unseen, goes down!

Now, here is the new picture.

The next time I saw that home it looked like a new place. The house had been repainted, and other improvements indicated that it had taken on new life. A new power line had been built out to it, and the house was fully electrified, at T. V. A. rates. An electric pump had been installed, and the house was supplied with running water. It was not even necessary to press a button, since the pump was automatic.

An electric washing machine had been provided, with an electric wringer attached, as well as an electric iron. The drudgery of washing clothes was gone. The clothes were simply placed in the washing machine, a switch was turned, and in 2 hours the clothes were washed and hanging on the line. The electricity necessary to operate that machine for

a family of five people costs less than \$1 a year, under the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

That woman looked 20 years younger than she did when I had last seen her scrubbing those clothes in the hot sun. She was happy and enthusiastic over these new additions to her home. She showed us through her kitchen. It was as clean as a soda fountain. An electric refrigerator provided more ice than the family needed and at the same time kept the meats, eggs, milk, butter, and vegetables cool and fresh.

An electric range had replaced the old wood or coal stove and, as she expressed it, "rendered cooking a pleasure"; and, strange to say, it cost less to operate it than it did to furnish fuel for the old one.

That woman uttered one expression that told the whole story. She said, "We have just now begun to live."

This is typical of the changes that are taking place in the T. V. A. area.

One woman writes me that "T. V. A. is the greatest blessing that ever came to the people of this section." She has lights in her home and garage, a radio, electric refrigerator, electric iron, electric range, a vacuum cleaner, and a hot-water heater. During the month of March she used 82 kilowatt-hours of electricity and it cost her \$2.14.

Another one says, "It is the best thing that ever came to us." She uses lights, radio, refrigerator, range, fans, vacuum cleaner, sewing machine, hot-water heater, waffle irons, toaster, and percolator, all operated by electricity. During the month of February, the worst month of the year, she used 483 kilowatt-hours, which cost her \$7.83.

Under the old power-company rates in effect before T. V. A. came the cost of that 483 kilowatt-hours would have been \$36.41.

Here is one from a woman who lives 16 miles from the railroad, who says, "It is the greatest thing that ever came to the rural sections." She uses lights, radio, refrigerator, irons, fans, washing machine, and water pumps. During the month of February she used 38 kilowatt-hours, which cost her \$1.52.

Another one writes:

I think T. V. A. is the greatest boon that has ever come to our country, and if you never did anything else to glorify your service, your name will go down in history for this one thing, bringing T. V. A. to our rural people.

She has lights in her home and garage, radio, refrigerator, iron, vacuum cleaner, fans, air conditioner, toaster, hot plates, water pump, bed pads, and a small electric heater for her invalid son, who is a disabled World War veteran. During the month of February she used 443 kilowatt-hours, which cost her \$7.67. Under the old power-company rates the cost would have been \$33.61, or more than four times what it cost her under the T. V. A. rates.

Another one writes me that T. V. A. power "simply means the difference between drudgery and luxury."

I could fill the RECORD with such testimonials; my files are full of them, all expressing their gratitude for what this cheap electricity is doing for them.

Electricity can be supplied to the people in every city, town, hamlet, and community in any State in the Union at the T. V. A. rates; and I, for one, propose to keep up the fight until that is done. If the people in every county in America will get on every candidate for public office and know that he is honestly and conscientiously for them on the power question before they ever let him get elected to any office, from constable to President, we will have this cheap power in every home in America in less than 3 years. It will be supplied at T. V. A. rates, and those rates will be reduced as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] stated a few moments ago that the people I represent who are using T. V. A. power are getting that power below the cost of production, and that the "taxpayers of the country are footing the bill." He says, "Yet, Mr. RANKIN says the Government does it at a profit." He then goes on to criticize the T. V. A. yardstick, repeating the same old propaganda the Power Trust has been peddling for the last 3 years.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly I will yield to the Republican leader from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Everything the gentleman has been saying about power is all wrong. He does not know how to figure costs, and that is what I want the public in this country to know.

Mr. RANKIN. That is on a par with what the gentleman has been saying ever since he has been in Congress. He is just as far wrong on that as he has been on everything else. [Applause and laughter.]

When the Republicans were in power you were selling electricity to the power companies at Muscle Shoals at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, and your Army Engineers showed that it was being produced and delivered at the switchboard at 1.352 mills a kilowatt-hour, or less than 1½ mills.

But now, when the T. V. A. sells it wholesale at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour—three times what your administration was selling it at to the Power Trust—you say that it is being sold below the cost of production and that the taxpayers of the country are footing the bill.

I wonder who was footing the bill when the power interests were buying this power at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour and selling it to us at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour, or 50 times what they paid for it? You see, the Power Trust had a yardstick also. By the way, let us compare those yardsticks. I have them both here, so we will just compare them. Now, remember, they were both selling the same power, produced at Muscle Shoals. You understand the yardstick is the rate the people who use electric light and power have to pay for it.

Now, here are the yardsticks: We will take the Power Trust yardstick, or the Republican yardstick, or the Hoover yardstick—or, in order to do full justice to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we might call it the "Rich yardstick", since he has been calling the T. W. V.'s the "Rankin yardstick."

Here it is; here is what the power companies were charging the ultimate consumers for this power which they were buying at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. I will run each yardstick table up to 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month.

Former power-company yardstick rates

10 cents per kilowatt-hour for first 30 kilowatt-hours per month.....	\$3.00
8 cents per kilowatt-hour for next 170 kilowatt-hours per month.....	13.60
7 cents per kilowatt-hour for next 300 kilowatt-hours per month.....	21.00
6 cents per kilowatt-hour for next 350 kilowatt-hours per month.....	21.00
5 cents per kilowatt-hour for next 150 kilowatt-hours per month.....	7.50
Total, 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month.....	66.10

That is what we were paying for this power before the T. V. A. Act was passed—power that cost the power company 2 mills a kilowatt-hour. That is about what you were all paying in every State prior to that time. Many of you are still paying those exorbitant rates. In fact, we would all be paying those rates now and from now on were it not for the T. V. A. and the power policies of this administration.

Here are the T. V. A. yardstick rates for this same power which the Government was selling to the Power Trust at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour under a Republican administration, and which the T. V. A. is selling wholesale at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour under a Democratic administration. Here are the T. V. A. retail rates, the yardstick rates, what the people actually pay for it.

3 cents a kilowatt-hour for the first 50 kilowatt-hours per month.....	\$1.50
2 cents a kilowatt-hour for the next 150 kilowatt-hours per month.....	3.00
1 cent a kilowatt-hour for the next 200 kilowatt-hours per month.....	2.00
4 mills a kilowatt-hour for the next 600 kilowatt-hours per month.....	2.40
Total, 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month.....	8.90

I hope every consumer of electricity reads these two tables, and especially every domestic consumer. I am especially anxious for every woman in America to read them, and particu-

larly the ones who have to do their own household work. Cheap electricity means so much to them.

I hope everyone reads the following comparative table showing the difference between the two yardsticks, making it so plain that I do not believe our friend from Pennsylvania can misunderstand it:

	Former power company rates	Tennessee Valley Authority rates
First 30 kilowatt-hours.....	\$3.00	\$0.90
Next 170 kilowatt-hours.....	13.60	3.60
Next 300 kilowatt-hours.....	21.00	2.40
Next 350 kilowatt-hours.....	21.00	1.40
Next 150 kilowatt-hours.....	7.50	.60
1,000 kilowatt-hours.....	66.10	8.90

Thus it will be seen that 1,000 kilowatt-hours a month, which cost a consumer \$8.90 under the T. V. A. yardstick rates, would have cost him \$66.10 under the old Power Trust yardstick rates, and that the cost in every bracket of this table runs from 3 to 10 times as much under the old rates as it does under the T. V. A. yardstick rates.

What we are doing toward reducing rates in the T. V. A. area we hope to do in every community in America before we get through.

Let me tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania another thing: If the women of that State realize what this cheap power means to them, Roosevelt will sweep Pennsylvania in November.

Mr. Speaker, in order to show further that these T. V. A. yardstick rates are not too low, I give here a comparison of those rates with the Tacoma rates, the Ontario rates, and the old Power Trust yardstick rates in effect prior to the creation of the T. V. A.

As I showed in a former address, Ontario has one of the finest power systems on earth, and the public plant at Tacoma, Wash., is an outstanding success. They are constantly lowering their rates and at the same time paying their plant out.

I hope every woman in America who is interested in the use of electrical appliances to relieve her household drudgeries will read and compare these rates.

Monthly consumption

	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	60 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	300 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	1,000 kilowatt-hours
Ontario rates.....	\$0.75	\$1.02	\$1.54	\$1.74	\$3.02	\$3.92	\$6.17
Tacoma rates.....	1.13	1.52	1.72	2.12	4.12	6.12	8.62
T. V. A. yardstick rates.....	.75	1.20	1.70	2.50	5.50	6.90	8.90
Old Power Trust yardstick rates.....	2.50	3.80	5.40	8.60	23.00	37.60	66.10

The Power Trust wants to destroy the T. V. A. so as to force us back to those old rates, before these cheap rates spread to reach the people you represent. The newspapers they own or control are doing everything they can to that end. What do they care how much drudgery the men and women of the country have to undergo? What do they care how much misery the housewives of the country have to endure? They are paid to fight the T. V. A. and destroy it if possible.

There is one newspaper that circulates in my section that has gone so far in this fight that it has been striking my name from every news article in which I was mentioned. It has even struck my name from Associated Press articles that went out from the White House. I know this to be a fact, for I have copies of the paper in my files, and the Associated Press has furnished me with copies they sent out. They even went so far as to publish on their front page an interview which I recently gave out touching a matter of vital interest to the people of Mississippi, but struck my name out and substituted the name of another person who was not even in Washington at the time, and knew nothing at all about the proposition.

That paper seems to be owned or controlled by the Power Trust. It has succeeded in keeping T. V. A. power out of Memphis, and out of certain sections of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee, with the result that the women in those localities are paying the penalty in drudgery and misery. The powers behind that paper would like to see Roosevelt destroyed, but they have not the courage to come out and say so.

Is it freedom of the press when a corrupt corporation or set of corporations can buy up a once great newspaper and use it in this way? You will ask what the object is in thus prostituting the functions of the press. The answer is, They are trying to control politics in Mississippi and Tennessee. They want to elect men to office who will be subservient to the corrupt influences that now own or control that publication. They want to destroy the T. V. A. They try to control public sentiment with false news statements or misleading headlines.

That paper owns a radio station, but when I broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up they do not let it go over their station. My people have to get my addresses through Dallas, Tex., Louisville, Ky., Cincinnati, Ohio, or some other station.

What is my offense? What crime have I committed to justify such treatment? I will tell you: I helped to create the T. V. A. to save the water power of this country for the people who own it; and I have been instrumental in getting the power produced at Muscle Shoals distributed to the people I represent at something like what it is worth. I have helped to make it possible for the men and women in that area to enjoy the use of electricity and to relieve them of the nerve-racking, back-breaking, youth-destroying drudgery they were having to endure before the T. V. A. came.

In other words, I helped to stop the Power Trust from robbing the people I represent and to make it possible for them to enjoy some of the comforts and conveniences of this life. But, worst of all, I have helped to promulgate the T. V. A. yardstick to show what electricity is worth and in that way helped to start a drive to get cheap electricity into every home in America. These are the "crimes" I have committed. The only thing I regret is that I have not yet been able to reach all the people in the district and throughout the whole country with these low rates. But we are on our way.

Fortunately that paper cannot hurt me or the cause I represent, for its opposition is a badge of honor and its support is like the "kiss of death."

Here is another "crime" I have committed against the interest of the Power Trust. I have sponsored a program of rural electrification through which we have secured cheap electricity to thousands of farmers in that area, and we are going to reach the rest of them before we quit.

The T. V. A. represents a great movement that is destined to reach every home in this broad land. Its influence is not confined to the Tennessee Valley area, but is already being felt from coast to coast in the way of reduced light and power rates and the increased use of electrical appliances.

Wherever rates have been reduced the consumption of electricity has been augmented or extended, the use of electrical appliances has been increased, woman's work has been made easier, her drudgery has been diminished, and light has been added to her life along with additional comforts and conveniences she had never known before.

It has been the habit of the American people to boast of the progress made in the invention of labor-saving machinery—from the reaper to the hydraulic dredge. These new machines have usually been designed to do the work of men to lighten man's burden. But they have usually left the women in the home, invariably in the kitchen, doing the same old drudgery in the same old way.

If a new machine came along that was designed to do the woman's work she usually had to operate it with her hands or feet. Invariably it just made it possible for her to do two things at once or enabled her to do work that formerly had to be done by someone else, thereby adding to her lot an additional burden barely within her strength, and increasing rather than diminishing the load she already bore.

It has been said that when the cooking stove was substituted for the old open fireplace with its ponderous vessels and

cumbersome pot racks, men boasted that women could then do the firing and handle the heavy vessels themselves; and when the water pump was introduced it was pointed out that the women could then pump the water, whereas the men had formerly windlassed it from the old open well.

A former Pennsylvania Congressman once told me a story of an old farmer up in his district who had a very thrifty and industrious wife and a large crowd of sorry boys. Oil was discovered on the old man's land and the family suddenly became rich. One night just after the first well came in they were all sitting around the fire talking about what they were going to do with the money—they knew they were going to get a large amount, but had no idea how much. Finally one old boy spoke up and said, "Well, I'll tell you what we ought to do first, and that is we ought to buy ma a new ax."

That illustrates some people's ideas of generosity when it comes to doing something to relieve women of the drudgery which usually falls to their lot.

No wonder women are getting away from such drudgery and taking places in stores, offices, and factories that were formerly filled by men. They tell us that a woman's place is in the home, and I believe the average woman had much rather stay in her home if that home were relieved of the drudgery and monotony that grinds away a woman's life, robs her of the joys of living, and makes her old before her time.

Woman has toiled and wept and prayed that something might be done to make her work lighter. Suddenly a new light was flashed upon the horizon of her existence that inspires her with a new hope. Her prayers are answered and her dreams have come true. There is placed within her reach and at her command the greatest servant mankind has ever known—electricity.

For the old oil lamp that smoked up the house, singed her hair and eyebrows, burned her children, and gave just about enough light to obscure everything in the room—for it is substituted an electric light in every room that will really illuminate the house without smoke, without grease, and without danger.

Next, a radio is installed for her. That may shock some of the old guard. I saw a Republican Congressman turn his nose up almost to the ceiling a few years ago as he remarked with derision that if you provided a farmer with cheap electricity, one of the first things he would buy would be a radio.

Well, why not? Why should not a farmer have a radio? It furnishes the cheapest, most wholesome, most elevating, and most enlightening entertainment known to man. It relieves the drab monotony, brings the latest news, and affords the finest music at all times of day, and at the very minimum of cost.

I have sent out some questionnaires to the electric consumers in my district and I find that 95 percent of them have radios. One woman living in the rural district said to me that the best thing about the radio is that it helps to keep her children at home, that they no longer had to leave home to seek entertainment. She said it made the home more pleasant and attractive, intensified the children's love for it, and made them want to stay there. That is the greatest argument for the radio I have ever heard. I hope to live to see one in every farm home in America.

Then came other labor-saving appliances, such as electric irons, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, electric ranges, water pumps, and others too numerous to mention.

The rest of you Congressmen may do as you please about this power issue. Some of you, I know, are intensely interested, some are indifferent, while some are secretly or openly antagonistic. But so far as I am concerned, there will be no turning back. I have already succeeded in getting a majority of the counties in my district connected up with the T. V. A., saving them more than \$500,000 a year on their light and power bills, and making it possible for them to enjoy the use of electrical appliances, and I am going to get it to the rest of them before I quit.

We have already succeeded in taking this cheap power to thousands of farmers in my district—people who never would have had even electric lights in their homes, people

who would have lived and died and their children would in all probability have lived and died without ever having electric lights in their homes if it had not been for the T. V. A. I expect to keep up the drive until we reach them all. Not only am I striving to secure this service for the farmers of my own district but I want to see every farm home in America electrified at rates the farmers can afford to pay. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago I started a fight in this House on privately owned toll bridges. On the first roll call that I forced on a private toll bridge bill, 12 Members of the House joined me. I did not become discouraged but continued my opposition to such bills year after year until I won that fight. This Congress no longer grants franchises for privately owned toll bridges. My contention was if a bridge was needed the State or a subdivision of a State should build it, not a private corporation. I further contended if the State could build roads it likewise could build bridges.

Now we have a situation in my city that is typical of many other places and it justifies the passage of this bill.

East St. Louis, Ill., taxes our bridge, a free bridge. The bridge cost St. Louis about \$12,000,000. East St. Louis is taxing our free bridge \$75,000 a year. However, East St. Louis is going to build a toll bridge in the near future and when it builds the toll bridge St. Louis undoubtedly is going to tax the East St. Louis Bridge for an equal amount. Other communities, however, will not have such an opportunity where their bridge is being taxed.

Suppose New Jersey and New York and other States separated by rivers should start taxing their bridges? It is possible. Here is an opportunity to prevent it.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. The gentleman knows that a situation like that can be worked out by agreement between the State of New Jersey and the State of New York and between the State of Illinois and the State of Missouri. Why should the Federal Government get into it?

Mr. COCHRAN. But I will tell the gentleman from Illinois that I know our officials have been trying for years to work it out with his State, but the Illinois Legislature has refused to come to an agreement.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know between Covington and Cincinnati there was an old bridge built in about 1858, before Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated, that is still in use and still charging tolls?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know anything about it but two great cities like Covington and Cincinnati should buy the bridge or build a new one if it is a privately owned toll bridge. Then again, 1858 was several years before I came to Congress. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It seems to me that when you mention a toll bridge to this Congress everybody thinks something very peculiar must be going on.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was brought before the committee. The committee held hearings on it. They went into the legality of the right of the Government to speak on the subject of these taxes. As the gentleman from Massachusetts told you, they reported unanimously in favor of this bill.

In 4 minutes I do not have time to correct all the mistakes that have been made and all the misstatements that have been made. There have been free bridges all over the United States that were built from tolls paid by those who have used the bridge; bridges that were built by borrowed money, that did not cost the State one dime, that did not cost the State, county, or the municipality one red cent. Every dime came from the people who paid tolls.

The debt is being paid off and the cities, counties, and States have properly running into millions of dollars for which the taxpayers of those cities, counties, and States never paid one dollar. What is the situation? I can best illustrate it by the experience of my own city. A bridge was built there costing \$5,000,000. The money was borrowed. Not one cent of the taxpayers' money went into the building of that bridge. Bonds were issued against the bridge. All tolls were pledged to the payment of bonds. The result is that \$2,000,000 has been paid off. But now a little town across the river comes along and wants to put a large tax on the bridge because piers are located within its jurisdiction and they say they have the right to tax it.

This means that the bridge authorities will have to charge a greater toll or that tolls will have to be charged for a longer period of time. This bill provides that no town, no community, no State, shall levy taxes against such a bridge as is exempted in this bill, thus causing the bridge to carry tolls for a longer period of time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMPSON) there were—ayes 100, noes 44.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS BILL

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I call up the bill (S. 5) to prevent the adulteration, misbranding, and false advertising of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics in interstate, foreign, and other commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for the purposes of safeguarding the public health, preventing deceit upon the purchasing public, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the amendment of the House and move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

Mr. PARSONS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, as I think it can be better understood if explained by some member of the committee.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. COX (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I understand this amendment is something over 80 pages in length. It will take an hour and a half or 2 hours to read it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. MILLARD (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I move that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. SIROVICH and Mr. HOLMES objected.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist upon his point of order?

Mr. DONDERO. Not very strenuously.

The SPEAKER. Will it satisfy the gentleman if the Chair can secure order in the Chamber?

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, if a quorum is not present during the consideration of legislation dealing with one of the largest industries in the country, one which vitally affects the lives of the people—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. REECE. In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REECE. This is the same bill which was brought up yesterday under suspension of the rules and was sent to conference. The conferees have reached no agreement. I wish to know what is the status of the bill in the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee, the Chair will ask the Clerk to read the following message from the Senate in connection with this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 15 (calendar day June 20), 1936.

Resolved, That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5) to prevent the adulteration, misbranding, and false advertising of food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics in interstate, foreign, and other commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for the purposes of safeguarding the public health, preventing deceit upon the purchasing public, and for other purposes, with an amendment as follows.

The SPEAKER. This is the way in which this motion comes before the House.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this bill, coming in as a bill and not as a conference report, should be referred to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAMNECK. I make the point of order that under the rule this bill must lay over for 24 hours.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is a two-thirds vote necessary to consider this Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a measure which affects very vitally every man, woman, and child between the two oceans, because every man, woman, and child uses food, drugs, or cosmetics.

Legislation on this subject came up in 1933 and was known at that time as the Tugwell bill. The bill was never accorded a hearing by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; but after that, recognizes the necessity for legislation for the protection of the American public, the committee did hold hearings on another bill dealing with the same subject matter. I declare to you tonight that this is not the so-called Tugwell bill and bears no kinship to the original Tugwell bill.

We passed this bill yesterday under suspension of the rules. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and For-

eign Commerce, and I, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this legislation, assured the Members of this House that so far as we were concerned the conferees would stand by the House action on this important legislation when we went into conference with the Senate conferees.

There has not been full agreement between the Senate and House conferees. We did agree on everything except the advertising provisions, or perhaps I should say the section providing for the control of advertising. That was the only real controversial issue between the conferees of the House and the Senate, and the Senate has agreed to the House bill with certain and very few exceptions.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BIERMANN. Under the regulations as they now exist, the Federal Trade Commission has to do with advertising in the newspapers, and a newspaper that circulates false advertising innocently is not held liable. The advertiser himself is held liable. If the control of this advertising is moved over to the Department of Agriculture, what assurance have we that the newspapers of this country, and particularly the little country newspapers that have no facilities for investigating advertisements, will not be held liable for inadvertently circulating some false advertisements?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I may answer the gentleman by saying that my understanding is that the newspaper will not be held liable, but the man who pays for the advertisement will be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. There is a specific provision in this bill relieving the newspapers under such circumstances.

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. BIERMANN. How does the gentleman expect us to vote for the bill when he does not answer any questions?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The gentleman from Texas stated correctly that such a case as that to which the gentleman from Iowa refers is specifically excepted.

Mr. BIERMANN. That was true when the advertising feature was under the Federal Trade Commission, but we moved it over to the Department of Agriculture, and nobody knows how they are going to handle it.

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Will the gentleman inform me if this is the original Copeland bill as introduced in the Senate?

Mr. CHAPMAN. If the gentleman had been present when I began my remarks he would have heard me say that this bill bears no relationship to the original Tugwell bill, a hearing on which was never held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MERRITT of New York. I did not say anything about Tugwell. I asked if this is the original Senator Copeland bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that in thirty-odd places the House committee rewrote the so-called Copeland bill. It is not the same bill. It is in most important particulars virtually a new bill.

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Will the gentleman answer this question: What is the difference between the original Copeland bill and the bill that is pending before the House at the present time?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I will do that if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

There are certain differences. Amendments were added to the bill, some of which I favor and some of which I do not favor, but I am here tonight supporting the bill as it has come back to us from the Senate.

One of the first changes in this bill made by the Senate tonight is one which I deeply regret, because it affects a large proportion of the people of this country and also a great industry in my own State. The Senate deleted the whisky provision from this bill, which I should like to have seen enacted into law, because I want to see my friends protected and want them to get good whisky if they drink it at all. [Laughter and applause.] I also want to see those who manufacture legitimate, honest whisky protected from the dishonest manufacturers. That is one thing the Senate took out of this bill as it passed the House, and as the conferees of House and Senate agreed upon it. I regret it, but think this bill ought to be passed anyhow.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. It is our understanding when this bill passed the House by unanimous consent yesterday that the conferees would sustain the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and insist on the House bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. HOLMES. I should like to ask how the gentleman stands on the question of advertising.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I say to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the House conferees, and the chairman of the full committee was present, stood foursquare on that question, and sustained the House committee's action.

Mr. HOLMES. How does the gentleman stand now on this amendment, which the Senate has submitted to the House?

Mr. CHAPMAN. There was a disagreement reported by the conferees. Then the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], in his individual capacity, offered an amendment on the control of advertising. It was his personal amendment.

Mr. HOLMES. May I propound another question?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. In view of the gentleman's statement to this House that he stands unequivocally and 100 percent back of the House bill, is it his recommendation to the House that we reject the Senate amendment?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I will say to the gentleman that in conference I stood 100 percent for it although I do not think it is the best solution of the problem. In so doing I lived up to my agreements and kept the faith absolutely. Tonight I favor the adoption of the amendment to which the Senate has agreed and know that failure to adopt it will kill this much-needed remedial legislation.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I think we might just as well understand this matter. The controversy in our committee hinged on whether the Federal Trade Commission or the Department of Agriculture should have jurisdiction over advertising. We understood that the House conferees would stand by the House on that provision.

Mr. RAYBURN. And they did.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I just stated that. We kept the faith in letter and in spirit.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If I understand this amendment correctly it gives to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over commercial advertising, but gives the Department of Agriculture jurisdiction over all advertising of pure food and drugs.

Mr. CHAPMAN. No; not exactly that.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment offered does not take one thing away from the

Federal Trade Commission it has now with reference to advertising.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If that is the case why did you accept the Senate amendment, if it was as good as we had it in the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. I did not say anything about its being as good as the House amendment. I was telling the gentleman what it provided so the gentleman might understand me.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I cannot yield any further.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

The House restored the multiple seizures provision, which is very vital to the success of this law, and the Senate conferees agreed to its restoration with an amendment placing the word "grossly" before the word "misleading."

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. I cannot yield.

In case of seizures the House amendment permitted removal of the suit to a district adjacent to the claimant's principal place of business and the conferees changed this with the result that it may be removed to a point agreed upon by the parties.

With respect to advertising control, which we have just discussed briefly, we have made a division of that. In conference your House conferees stood 100 percent in favor of the action of the House. An amendment has come here, after the disagreement of the conferees, which divides it so that commercial advertising and advertising pertaining to trade practices will go to the Federal Trade Commission and advertising affecting the public health will go to the Food and Drug Administration and in this amendment I ask your concurrence.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. Under this bill what kind of advertising could there be brought in question, except advertising pertaining to health? This is a food and drug bill and advertising with respect to food and drugs would be advertising affecting health.

Mr. CHAPMAN. The functions of the Federal Trade Commission relate to trade practices in connection with commercial advertising, and not from the standpoint of consumer protection, which is the purpose of this legislation. If this bill had come up for consideration under a rule, I would have offered an amendment placing advertising control under the Food and Drug Administration. My views on that subject were made known in the statement of "Additional Views" attached to the committee report of the bill and signed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], and myself.

When it came up under suspension of the rules, so that no amendment could be offered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and I agreed to attempt in conference to sustain the House position. By that agreement we stood.

After the conference committee reported a disagreement, the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], not as a conferee but as an individual Senator, offered this amendment, which the Senate adopted. The conference is over. This comes to us as a new proposition. The amendment offers a fair compromise. The question is, Will we accept this amendment or will we strangle to death this important bill in the closing hours of this Congress? Will we stubbornly resist this reasonable compromise and thereby deny the consuming millions of American people the protection to which they are entitled? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, there is on the desk a bill comprising some 75 pages by way of an amendment coming over from the Senate and dealing with a highly important subject. I dare say there is not one Member on this floor who knows what is in this amendment. There is not a member of the committee who knows what is in it. It has come over here from the Senate as a new bill.

One of the more controversial issues involved, however, is where the jurisdiction over advertising shall lie.

The original Tugwell bill provided that the Department of Agriculture should have jurisdiction over advertising. The Copeland bill provided the same thing, and on yesterday, when a motion was made to suspend the rules and pass the bill and some Members asked me what was the difference between the Tugwell bill and the bill that was then being brought up under suspension, I said in reply that one of the main differences was the fact that the House bill provided that advertising should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, with the understanding that the House would stand by that provision of the bill. The rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. REECE. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does the gentleman realize that the most important thing upon which the health of the people of our Nation is dependent has been given over to the Department of Agriculture instead of being kept with the Federal Trade Commission, where it properly belongs? We have sacrificed everything for which we fought.

Mr. REECE. Absolutely. The issue involved here now is, will Dr. Tugwell, of the Department of Agriculture, be given jurisdiction over all the advertising involved in this amendment or shall it remain with the Federal Trade Commission, which has had jurisdiction over advertising since the Federal Trade Commission was established? There was no question but that the House was largely in favor of jurisdiction remaining in the Federal Trade Commission, a quasi-judicial body, and if orderly procedure in the consideration had been followed we would have had opportunity to vote upon that.

Now, the only way that we can express ourselves on that question is to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. If you want to place the advertising under Dr. Tugwell and give him a whip lash not only over business, but over the press of this country, vote for the motion made, but if you want to give it to the Federal Trade Commission, a quasi-judicial body, vote against it. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY].

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, we have to have a food and drug bill before we adjourn tonight. It is very important. The people of this country are looking for it. It affects the health of the country and the well-being of the citizens of the entire land. We ought to decide to turn back these clocks, and give plenty of time for the Senate to act with due deliberation on this amendment. The Senate passed the bill originally, giving jurisdiction over advertising to the Drug Administration. In the House here only yesterday we decided we wanted to place it with the Federal Trade Commission. We went into conference to carry out your mandate. We strove to obtain your will in that conference. The amendment was supposed to come in here by way of a compromise, giving part to the Federal Trade and part to Drug Administration. In my mind it is no compromise. It gives everything by way of health to the Drug Administration and everything else to the Federal Trade, and there is nothing else, in my opinion. Oh, yes, you can work out a hypothetical case where they might take it up, but it will be minor in importance, and it is my opinion Federal Trade Commission would never exercise any jurisdiction over this matter.

Let me warn you again. We ought to pass a bill, but do we want this drug administration to be prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner? The country has spoken often throughout the hearings. In 1933, the original hearings were held. Last August our subcommittee started hearings, and

we heard the opinion and voice of the country, and I am one of those who honestly believe that the people of this country want the control of advertising in the Federal Trade Commission, and if you want it there, vote down this amendment, but decide to stay here until we get a good bill, because the country is anxiously waiting for it. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this bill possibly is the most important that this Congress has had before it, because of the very vital interest every man, woman, and child in the country has in its administration. Its provisions were the subject of long hearings before the Subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee. After that report, for 3 or 4 days we debated the bill in executive session. It is true, as my friends from Tennessee and New Jersey have said, we passed a House bill yesterday, and as one conferee I thought I went into the conference trying to get a food and drug bill, not tied to any particular provision of it as a mandate from the House. I approached the conference committee with Senator COPELAND, Senator VANDENBERG, Senator BAILEY, Senator CARAWAY, and Senator CLARK, and we were there from 9 o'clock this morning until 7 o'clock tonight.

We found it totally impossible to bring back to this House, as the other conferees know, a food and drug bill upon which all conferees could agree. We agreed in conference, as I think these gentlemen will concede, to every disagreement between us except one. There were 36 amendments to this bill inserted by the House committee. The Senate conferees, in my opinion, have been most generous in conceding many of the changes we made in this bill. Now, we come to the point at this late hour in the session quibbling about whether this bill shall be buried because advertising might go here or might go there, as though that is the vital and crucial part of this bill. We have confidence enough in the Food and Drug Department of this Government to let it determine branding and say what is misbranding or labeling and all of the other provisions.

Yet we want to say we will not pass the bill because we do not have the same confidence in that department to administer fairly that part of the advertising which pertains to health, and health alone.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The question has been raised as to voting down this amendment and sending it back to the Senate. If this amendment is voted down, there will be no bill, because I am reliably informed after investigation that the Senate will surely have adjourned before 12 o'clock tonight.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I am glad the gentleman from New York asked that question, because when we disagreed in conference this afternoon it was very frankly and freely discussed in our meeting.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] said no one knows what is in this amendment, when every man on this conference saw the very amendment which is on the Speaker's desk on the table where we have been all day. That amendment is nothing except a verbatim copy of the House bill with the changes we agreed upon, and one change pertains to advertising upon which we could not agree. It was understood then, it being a Senate bill, that Senator COPELAND would take it back to the Senate, important as the bill is, and submit the whole matter by way of amendment, and the Senate approved that. The Senate approved the unanimous recommendation of the Senate conferees, as I say, a fair and able group of gentlemen, who sat with us today. As Senator BAILEY expressed it, "Why quibble over this little provision or that little provision?" We want a pure food and drug bill as the people of this country are demanding.

I have in my possession a letter which came to us from almost every woman's organization in this country petitioning the conferees to get together on this bill because of its great importance.

As I said yesterday on the floor, the commerce committee of the American Bar Association recommends this bill.

Hon. Joan Dickinson, Deputy Attorney General, who prosecutes every violation under this bill as Deputy Attorney General of this country, sitting as a member of the commerce committee of the American Bar Association, recommends, after 3 days' hearings, in which he participated, the passage of this bill. He recommended that advertising be left not partially with agriculture but altogether.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has again expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce worked very hard on this bill. We reported it to the House and yesterday it was passed almost unanimously. However, within the last few minutes we find a bill presented to this House, not from the conferees, but a bill that came direct from the Senate, and we are asked to concur in the Senate amendments. No one knows what is in that bill. At least I do not. We could not tell when it was read from the Clerk's desk. It is true that it is an important bill, and we want to see a bill passed, but I believe it is wrong to take up a bill of this character and vote upon it without the membership knowing what is in it. The big controversy in the committee was over the advertising. Our committee was almost unanimous in placing the jurisdiction of advertising with the Federal Trade Commission. We understood when it passed the House yesterday that the House conferees would stand by the committee and leave that power in the hands of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. The House conferees did stand, and brought about a disagreement on that very point.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Is the provision in this bill in regard to advertising the same provision that was passed by the House yesterday?

Mr. RAYBURN. Certainly not, because Senator COPELAND was not in favor of it any more than the House conferees were in favor of his provision about advertising.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS].

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, how many of the Members of this House know anything about this bill or have had an opportunity to examine it? How many times has it been read in this House tonight? No one could understand what was in it.

Many times has it been read in this House to you, and no one understands it.

Why was it passed here on yesterday or the day before under suspension of the rules and almost unanimously? You know why; because we understood that the provision placing control of advertisements in the Federal Trade Commission would stay in the bill. [Applause.] That is the reason.

What is the history of this bill? It came over to the House last year. It stayed there and they did not bring it out until the last part of this session—an important bill. And then they asked you gentlemen to concur in the Senate amendment—a way of getting around that which we did not want and which we would not have passed had we known this was going to occur. It places those who stood by this bill and who wanted this bill in an embarrassing position when yesterday we told you we had to accept that bill or the bill could not be passed.

Now, Members of the House, what are you going to do about it? Are you going to turn this over to Tugwell for enforcement or are you going to leave it with the Federal Trade Commission with such men as Judge Davis and other men from this House on that Commission? [Applause.]

Will you do it? [Applause.]

Oh, but they say the Senator says he has taken an oath that the bill shall not pass without his amendment. I say COPELAND shall not pass in this House. [Applause.]

But they say if we do not agree to his amendment they will kill the bill. Are you not getting tired of the Senate saying to this House, "If you do not agree to what we say you shall not pass a bill"? [Applause.] I say, gentlemen, it is time to stand up and demand your rights. Let us send it back to them and say: "If you do not agree with our amendment, you kill the bill."

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Does the gentleman think this is a pure food and drug act or a Copeland act?

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

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Gladly.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I may say this: That the House committee brought in an entirely new bill, and every man on the Senate committee of conference and every man on the House committee of conference agreed to the bill as it was read there at the desk, with the exception of this one amendment, and they agreed to it today.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. They say that amendment merely affects advertisements as to health. I ask you what is there in pure foods that does not affect health? And does not that give to the Department of Agriculture full jurisdiction? Am I not correct? Think about it, gentlemen, whether you want them to have it. I leave it to you. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, ever since the food and drug bill has been passed, the producers of fruits and vegetables have used a spray, and they have made an effort to have written into that measure a provision that they might have a day in court with reference to the reasonableness of regulations which vitally affect them. This can put them out of business. This bill is sent over from the Senate, and it gives them no day in court.

I appeal to every Member of the House who represents fruit interests, or who represents vegetable interests, to vote against the Senate amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, section (m) which was deleted from this bill, referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], as the whisky section, and it is really the cereal grain section, represents a sell-out to the blackstrap molasses people in foreign countries, Cuba, for instance, and a sell-out of millions of bushels of grain belonging to the American farmer.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAPMAN. There can be no whisky made out of anything except cereal grain.

Mr. STEFAN. I understood the gentleman to say that section was deleted.

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is what all connoisseurs say whisky is made out of.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that section was deleted?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. If it has been deleted, we have lost 15,000,000 bushels of corn for the American farmer every year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have received hundreds of letters from country newspapers protesting against a certain feature of this Copeland bill. That feature is exactly the amendment we are asked to adopt tonight. The newspapers protest against turning over to the Department of Agriculture the control of advertising, and the reason is that the Department of Agriculture is not particularly well qualified to pass upon advertising.

The bill that we approved yesterday gave the control of advertising to the Federal Trade Commission, which has

built up some precedent under which the newspapers are given a fair shake, and a series of precedents that amount to something that is somewhere near justice to the newspapers. If this amendment is adopted there is not a country newspaper in your district that will be free to accept advertising that deals with anything having to do with human consumption without being subjected to the harassment and the uncertainty of some regulations that may be passed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman ever known of the Federal Trade Commission receiving the criticism of the Supreme Court for any arbitrariness of action on its part?

Mr. BIERMANN. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Supreme Court criticized the Department of Agriculture for failing to give a fair trial and hearing to party litigants in matters pending before that Department.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, it is my distinct understanding the proposition to which he refers is omitted from this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to approach action on this amendment with a great deal of care. We all know the value of the Federal Trade Commission. We know of its great service to industry and how industry has relied upon it many, many times for its sound judgment and cooperation.

When this bill was passed yesterday we had the assurance of the House conferees that they would stand by the House amendment and keep all advertisement under the control of the Federal Trade Commission. If we adopt this amendment we are going to make the Federal Trade Commission Dr. Tugwell's rubber stamp. That is what we are going to do if we adopt this amendment.

As far as I know there has been nothing but harmonious cooperation between the Pure Food Administration and the Federal Trade Commission. The Pure Food Administration has approved labels and many other forms of advertising in the past, but the responsibility for carrying out and enforcing those provisions has been left to the Federal Trade Commission because that Commission is of a quasi-judicial nature. You are now turning this over to a board that has nothing but a police power—it is a policing division—to police the pure food and drug laws that we have enacted. They have no power of judicial determination. What are you going to do with all the work that the Federal Trade Commission has done in the past 20 years?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in 3 minutes it is not going to be possible to go into this thing in detail. The suggestion has been made this evening if we do not do something pretty quick something is going to happen, because the Senate will say it shall not happen. If you take it from me confidentially and will not let it go further, do not take the Senate seriously all the time. [Laughter.] I have known the Senate to surrender and do the right thing when it is told how to do it.

May I say something about the amendment which we are asked to concur in this evening? I have not had a chance to read it, but I am told upon reliable authority that it provides in effect in relation to advertising that that portion or character of advertising which has to do with business or commercial products is to be left under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, and that portion or character of advertising which has to do with public health or relates to health is to go to the Department of

Agriculture. I challenge anybody to decide which is which in connection with an advertisement of a cosmetic, medicine, or a food.

Who is to decide, under this proposed amendment, where the jurisdiction of the advertising in question shall go? Where is the line of demarcation? A part of the advertisement may be commercial, advertising the price of the product, and the rest of the advertisement may relate to its curative features. Shall it be split in two, and what officer of the Government shall decide who has jurisdiction. Obviously, we must put the jurisdiction in one place.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; half and half.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We will get that later. [Laughter.]

As a matter of fact, may I say to the Members of the House that the Federal Trade Commission, as you all know, is a semijudicial body. It has had jurisdiction over advertisements, with respect to unfair-trade practices, for years and years. It has a staff that has been trained for almost a generation to look at these things and weigh and balance them, and it has been fortified by a series of court decisions—very numerous decisions—and I understand that out of a very, very large number of decisions the Federal Trade Commission has been supported in all but two cases. Leave the jurisdiction with the Commission. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, in five minutes, of course, it is going to be impossible for me, as it would be for the members of the subcommittee who are for this motion, to clear away the fog that is here and the dust that has been kicked up.

Let us understand one thing. The amendment, concurrence in which I have asked, takes not one thing away from the Federal Trade Commission that it ever had, but this bill, in its present form, leaves more of the control of advertising in the Federal Trade Commission than it ever had before. The only thing that this amendment does is to leave every particle of advertising control in the Federal Trade Commission it ever had and more, and then it gives to the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau in the Department of Agriculture control only over advertising that relates to health.

You can say what you please about the Senate. Something has been said about the conferees. I was not a member of the subcommittee that considered this bill, and I have not been a member of the conference committee, although I sat with them for more than an hour this afternoon, believing and knowing that the millions of people throughout the land want a law revised that has not been touched in more than 30 years and brought up to date and made so it will protect the health of the children, as well as the grown-ups of this country, and the issue is clear here tonight. Do not be deceived by this little smoke screen with respect to the issue between the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission. This is the smallest part of the bill. It amounts to practically nothing when we consider the important provisions of this bill that are necessary to the health, yes, to the very life of the people of the United States, and yet we hesitate, yet we applaud men who get up here and want to throw this whole matter on the scrap heap simply because somebody has heard the word "Tugwell" used in a not very generous fashion.

There might be a little lobbying around here by some people, but there is nobody who has lobbied around this Capitol on any bill in the 23 years I have been in Congress more than the members of the Federal Trade Commission have lobbied on this bill, and I love the Federal Trade Commission. I was a member of the subcommittee that wrote the Federal Trade Commission Act and I have been a Member of the Congress that has brought into existence every commission of the Government except the Interstate Commerce Commission. I like them. I want them to stay in their proper sphere to operate and carry out the law, and when they want to step over and do a thing when the jurisdiction should better lie in another place, in spite of my love for them I am going to stand up and say that the question

before you tonight is not only a question of jurisdiction, but whether you are to have any food and drug act at all. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate bill 5.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—ayes 70, noes 190.

So the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate bill 5 was rejected.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4670) to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the original Norfolk (Va.) land grant and the two hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the city of Norfolk, Va., as a borough.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Are these silver coins?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Silver coins, and they involve no expense to the Government of the United States. The city of Norfolk will furnish the die.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the original Norfolk, Va., land grant and the two hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the city of Norfolk, Va., as a borough there shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 20,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition and of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1936, irrespective of the year in which they are minted or issued, shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the Norfolk Advertising Board, Inc., affiliated with the Norfolk Association of Commerce, upon payment by it of the par value of such coins, but not less than 5,000 such coins shall be issued to it at any one time and no such coins shall be issued after the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by such association, and the net proceeds shall be used by it in defraying the expenses incidental and appropriate to the commemoration of such event.

Sec. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same; regulating and guarding the process of coinage; providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for the security of the coins, or for any other purposes, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REECE. Whether it would be in order to move to further insist upon the disagreement of the amendment of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The rejection of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment is equivalent to a motion to further insist.

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT T. CASTELLOW

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOXEY. No matter how long we may have served in this House, Mr. Speaker, no matter what attachment we may have for those with whom we have come in contact, yet in the length of time I have served here I do not know of another man in this Congress than the one I have in mind, who can boast of the same record. He has served

here for 4 years. He has never missed a yea-and-nay roll-call vote. He has never missed a meeting of his committee, has been always on time, and at the same time has been a member of one of the most important committees in the House, that of foreign affairs. He has been an inspiration to many of us. Further, he is voluntarily retiring from this House. I shall not attempt at this time to eulogize him, but I do say that we shall all miss him, and that this Congress, his State, and his Nation will lose a great and efficient representative of the people. I refer to BRYANT T. CASTELLOW, of Georgia. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from his distinguished and beloved chairman, Judge McREYNOLDS, and also one from the distinguished Representative from North Carolina, Mr. LINDSAY C. WARREN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 17, 1936.

HON. BRYANT T. CASTELLOW,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASTELLOW: I am writing you this letter in behalf of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, of which I am chairman, and of which you have been a most faithful member for the past 4 years.

We all regret, and I regret personally, that you are leaving Congress. Your leaving will not only be a loss to your district and the Nation but it is going to be a great personal loss to me as chairman of the committee on which you have served.

No one on this committee has the record that you have. You have never missed a meeting of the committee and you have always been on time at every meeting, except once when you were a few minutes late, unavoidably detained, and you notified the chairman that you would be a few minutes late.

You have taken a great interest in all matters coming before this committee, and many times have I assigned bills to you to be reported out of the committee, as well as looking after their passage in the House and Senate, and never yet have you failed me. In other words, whenever I assigned a bill to you, I could go to sleep on it, knowing that it would have your personal attention, and if I remember correctly, every bill that you have had charge of you have followed it until its final passage. This is a great relief for me to have a member in whom I could put that confidence and in whom I know has the intelligence to put a matter over.

You are genuinely beloved by the whole committee and all of us regret very much that you will not be with us after this session of Congress.

You have shown yourself to be a man of intelligence and your suggestions and advice to the committee have been of great help.

Let me say again, your absence will be my personal loss. The best wishes of this committee will go with you in whatever you may do or wherever you may go.

Assuring you of my friendship and highest personal regards, I am

Sincerely your friend,

S. D. McREYNOLDS,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 21, 1936.

HON. B. T. CASTELLOW,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASTELLOW: I did not know until yesterday that you were retiring from Congress. I regret this exceedingly, for I have said many times that I regarded you as one of the strongest and best-balanced men in the House. You will no doubt find much more happiness away from here, but it is most unfortunate that you are leaving the public service at this time.

With high esteem and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,

Chairman, Committee on Accounts, House of Representatives.

REGULATING SALES OF GOODS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 3450, to regulate the sales of goods in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3450, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we want to hear the bill read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, this is too important a bill to be taken up at this late hour. I object.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 3976, to amend the act approved February 27, 1931, known as the District of Columbia Traffic Act.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3976, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 9 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend the acts approved March 3, 1925, and July 3, 1926, known as the District of Columbia Traffic Acts, etc., be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any individual violating any provision of this section where the offense constitutes reckless driving shall upon conviction for the first offense be fined not more than \$250 or imprisoned not more than 3 months, or both; and upon conviction for the second or any subsequent offense committed within 2 years from the date of any such previous offense such individual shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MANUFACTURING, DISPENSING, AND SELLING NARCOTIC DRUGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3514) to regulate the manufacturing, dispensing, selling, and possession of narcotic drugs in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., The following words and phrases, as used in this act, shall have the following meanings, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Person" includes any corporation, association, copartnership, or one or more individuals.

(b) "Physician" means a person authorized by law to practice medicine or osteopathy in the District of Columbia.

(c) "Dentist" means a person authorized by law to practice dentistry in the District of Columbia.

(d) "Veterinarian" means a person authorized by law to practice veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia.

(e) "Manufacturer" means a person who by compounding, mixing, cultivating, growing, or other process produces or prepares narcotic drugs, but does not include an apothecary who compounds narcotic drugs to be sold or dispensed on prescription.

(f) "Wholesaler" means a person who supplies narcotic drugs that he himself has not produced nor prepared, on official written orders but not on prescription.

(g) "Apothecary" means a licensed pharmacist as defined by the laws of the District of Columbia, and, where the context so requires, the owner of a store or other place of business where narcotic drugs are compounded or dispensed by a licensed pharmacist; but nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on a person who is not registered nor licensed as a pharmacist any authority, right, or privilege that is not granted to him by the pharmacy laws of the District of Columbia.

(h) "Hospital" means an institution for the care and treatment of the sick and injured, approved by the health officer of the District of Columbia as proper to be entrusted with the custody of narcotic drugs and the professional use of narcotic drugs under the direction of a physician, dentist, or veterinarian. The word "hospital" shall include dental and medical clinics: *Provided*, That said dental and medical clinics are approved by the health officer of the District of Columbia.

(i) "Laboratory" means a laboratory approved by the health officer of the District of Columbia as proper to be entrusted with the custody of narcotic drugs and the use of narcotic drugs for scientific and medical purposes and for purposes of instruction.

(j) "Sale" includes barter, exchange, or gift, or offer therefor, and each such transaction made by any person, whether as principal, proprietor, agent, servant, or employee.

(k) "Coca leaves" includes cocaine and any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of coca leaves, except derivatives of coca leaves which do not contain cocaine, ecgonine, or substances from which cocaine or ecgonine may be synthesized or made.

(1) "Opium" includes morphine, codeine, and heroin, and any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of opium.

(m) "Cannabis" includes the following substances, under whatever names they may be designated: (a) The dried flowering or fruiting tops of the pistillate plant *Cannabis sativa* L., from which the resin has not been extracted, (b) the resin extracted from such

tops, and (c) every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such resin, or of such tops from which the resin has not been extracted.

(n) "Narcotic drugs" means coca leaves, opium, cannabis, and every substance not chemically distinguishable from them.

(o) "Federal narcotic laws" means the laws of the United States relating to opium, coca leaves, and other narcotic drugs.

(p) "Official written order" means an order written on a form provided for that purpose by the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, under any laws of the United States making provision therefor, if such order forms are authorized and required by Federal law, and if no such order form is provided, then on an official form provided for that purpose by the health officer of the District of Columbia.

(q) "Dispense" includes distribute, leave with, give away, dispose of, or deliver.

(r) "Registry number" means the number assigned to each person registered under the Federal narcotic laws.

ACTS PROHIBITED

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, possess, have under his control, sell, prescribe, administer, dispense, or compound any narcotic drug, except as authorized in this act.

MANUFACTURERS AND WHOLESALERS

SEC. 3. No person shall manufacture, compound, mix, cultivate, grow, or by any other process produce or prepare narcotic drugs, and no person as a wholesaler shall supply the same, without having first obtained a license so to do from the health officer of the District of Columbia.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR LICENSES

SEC. 4. No license shall be issued under the foregoing section unless and until the applicant therefor has furnished proof satisfactory to the health officer of the District of Columbia of the following:

(a) That the applicant is of good moral character, or, if the applicant be an association or corporation, that the managing officers are of good moral character.

(b) That the applicant is equipped as to land, buildings, and paraphernalia properly to carry on the business described in his application.

No license shall be granted to any person who has been convicted of a willful violation of any law of the United States, or of any State, relating to opium, coca leaves, cannabis, or other narcotic drugs, or to any person who is a narcotic drug addict.

The health officer of the District of Columbia may suspend or revoke any license issued by said health officer under the provisions of this act for cause.

USE OF OFFICIAL WRITTEN ORDERS

SEC. 5. An official written order for any narcotic drug shall be signed in duplicate by the person giving said order or by his duly authorized agent. The original shall be presented to the person who sells or dispenses the narcotic drug or drugs named therein. In event of the acceptance of such order by said person, each party to the transaction shall preserve his copy of such order for a period of 2 years in such a way as to be readily accessible for inspection by any public officer or employee engaged in the enforcement of this act. It shall be deemed a compliance with this subsection if the parties to the transaction have complied with the Federal narcotic laws, respecting the requirements governing the use of order forms.

SALE ON WRITTEN ORDERS

SEC. 6. (a) A duly licensed manufacturer or wholesaler may sell and dispense narcotic drugs to any of the following persons, but only on official written orders:

(1) To a manufacturer, wholesaler, or apothecary.

(2) To a physician, dentist, or veterinarian.

(3) To a person in charge of a hospital, but only for use by or in that hospital.

(4) To a person in charge of a laboratory, but only for use in that laboratory for scientific and medical purposes.

(b) A duly licensed manufacturer or wholesaler may also sell narcotic drugs to any of the following persons:

(1) On a special written order accompanied by a certificate of exemption, as required by the Federal narcotic laws, to a person in the employ of the United States Government, or of the District of Columbia, or of any State, territorial, district, county, municipal, or insular government, purchasing, receiving, possessing, or dispensing narcotic drugs by reason of his official duties.

(2) To a master of a ship or a person in charge of any aircraft upon which no physician is regularly employed, or to a physician or surgeon duly licensed in some State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to practice his profession, or to a retired commissioned medical officer of the United States Army, Navy, or Public Health Service employed upon such ship or aircraft, for the actual medical needs of persons on board such ship or aircraft, when not in port: *Provided*, That such narcotic drugs shall be sold to the master of such ship or person in charge of such aircraft, or to the physician, surgeon, or retired commissioned medical officer of the United States Army, Navy, or Public Health Service employed upon such ship or aircraft only in pursuance of a special order form approved by a commissioned medical officer or acting assistant surgeon of the United States Public Health Service.

(3) To a person in a foreign country if the provisions of the Federal narcotic laws are complied with.

POSSESSION LAWFUL

(c) Possession of or control of narcotic drugs obtained as authorized by this section shall be lawful if obtained and used in the regular course of business, occupation, profession, employment, or duty of the possessor.

SEC. 7. A person in charge of a hospital or of a laboratory, or in the employ of the District of Columbia or of any State, or of any political subdivision thereof, or a master of a ship or a person in charge of any aircraft upon which no physician is regularly employed, or a physician or surgeon duly licensed in some State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to practice his profession, or a retired commissioned medical officer of the United States Army, Navy, or Public Health Service employed upon such ship or aircraft who obtains narcotic drugs under the provisions of section 6 of this act, or otherwise, shall not administer, nor dispense, nor otherwise use such drugs, within the District of Columbia, except within the scope of his employment or official duty, and then only for scientific or medical purposes and subject to the provisions of this act.

SALES BY APOTHECARIES

SEC. 8. (a) An apothecary, in good faith, may sell and dispense narcotic drugs to any person upon a written prescription of a physician, dentist, or veterinarian, dated and signed, on the day when issued, by the physician, dentist, or veterinarian prescribing said narcotic drugs. The prescription when issued shall also state the full name and address of the patient for whom, or of the owner of the animal for which, the drug is dispensed, and the full name, address, and registry number under the Federal narcotic laws of the person prescribing, if he is required by those laws to be so registered. If the prescription be for an animal, it shall state the species of animal for which the drug is prescribed. The person filling the prescription shall write the date of filling and his own signature on the face of the prescription. The prescription shall be retained on file by the proprietor of the pharmacy in which it is filled for a period of 2 years, so as to be readily accessible for inspection by any public officer or employee engaged in the enforcement of this act. The prescription shall not be refilled.

(b) The legal owner of any stock of narcotic drugs in a pharmacy, upon discontinuance of dealing in said drugs, may sell said stock to a manufacturer, wholesaler, or apothecary, but only on an official written order.

(c) An apothecary, only upon an official written order, may sell to a physician, dentist, or veterinarian, in quantities not exceeding 1 ounce at any one time, aqueous or oleaginous solutions of which the content of narcotic drugs does not exceed a proportion greater than 20 percent of the complete solution, to be used for medical purposes.

PROFESSIONAL USE OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

SEC. 9. (a) A physician or a dentist, in good faith and in the course of his professional practice only, may prescribe, administer, and dispense narcotic drugs, or he may cause the same to be administered by a nurse or interne under his direction and supervision.

VETERINARIANS

(b) A veterinarian, in good faith and in the course of his professional practice only, and not for use by a human being, may prescribe, administer, and dispense narcotic drugs, and he may cause them to be administered by an assistant or orderly under his direction and supervision.

RETURN OF UNUSED DRUGS

(c) Any person who has obtained from a physician, dentist, or veterinarian any narcotic drug for administration to a patient during the absence of such physician, dentist, or veterinarian, shall return to such physician, dentist, or veterinarian any unused portion of such drug, when it is no longer required by the patient.

PREPARATIONS EXEMPTED

SEC. 10. Except as otherwise in this act specifically provided, this act shall not apply to the following cases:

(a) Prescribing, administering, dispensing, or selling at retail of any medicinal preparation that contains in 1 fluid ounce, or if a solid or semisolid preparation, in 1 avoirdupois ounce, (1) not more than 2 grains of opium, (2) not more than one-quarter of a grain of morphine or of any of its salts, (3) not more than 1 grain of codeine or of any of its salts, (4) not more than one-eighth of a grain of heroin or of any of its salts, (5) not more than one-half of a grain of extract of cannabis, nor more than one-half of a grain of any more potent derivative or preparation of cannabis.

(b) Prescribing, administering, dispensing, or selling at retail of liniments, ointments, and other preparations that are susceptible of external use only and that contain narcotic drugs in such combinations as prevent their being readily extracted from such liniments, ointments, or preparations, except that this act shall apply to all liniments, ointments, and other preparations that contain coca leaves in any quantity or combination.

The exemptions authorized by this section shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) No person shall dispense, or sell under the exemptions of this section, to any one person, or for the use of any one person or animal, any preparation or preparations included within this section, when he knows or can by reasonable diligence ascertain that such dispensing or selling will provide the person to whom or for

whose use, or the owner of the animal for the use of which such preparation is prescribed, administered, dispensed, or sold, within any 2 consecutive days with more than 2 grains of opium or more than 1 grain of morphine, or of any of its salts, or more than 4 grains of codeine or of any of its salts, or more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of a grain of heroin or of any of its salts, or more than 1 grain of extract of cannabis, or 1 grain of any more potent derivative or preparation of cannabis.

(2) The medicinal preparation, or the liniment, ointment, or other preparation susceptible of external use only, prescribed, administered, dispensed, or sold, shall contain, in addition to the narcotic drug in it, some drug or drugs conferring upon it medicinal qualities other than those possessed by the narcotic drug alone. Such preparation shall be prescribed, administered, dispensed, and sold in good faith as a medicine, and not for the purpose of evading the provisions of this act.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the kind and quantity of any narcotic drug that may be prescribed, administered, dispensed, or sold to any person, or for the use of any person or animal, when it is prescribed, administered, dispensed, or sold in compliance with the general provisions of this act.

RECORD TO BE KEPT

PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, VETERINARIANS, AND OTHER AUTHORIZED PERSONS

SEC. 11. (a) Every physician, dentist, veterinarian, or other person who is authorized to administer or professionally use narcotic drugs shall keep a record of such drugs received by him, and a record of all such drugs administered, dispensed, or professionally used by him otherwise than by prescription. It shall, however, be deemed a sufficient compliance with this subsection if any such person using small quantities of solutions or other preparations of such drugs for local application shall keep a record of the quantity, character, and potency of such solutions or other preparations purchased or made up by him, and of the dates when purchased, or made up, without keeping a record of the amount of such solution or other preparation applied by him to individual patients: *Provided*, That no record need be kept of narcotic drugs administered, dispensed, or professionally used in the treatment of any one patient when the amount administered, dispensed, or professionally used for that purpose does not exceed in any 48 consecutive hours (1) 4 grains of opium, or (2) one-half of a grain of morphine or of any of its salts, or (3) 2 grains of codeine or of any of its salts, or (4) one-fourth of a grain of heroin or of any of its salts, or (5) 1 grain of extract of cannabis, or 1 grain of any more potent derivative or preparation of cannabis, or (6) a quantity of any other narcotic drug or any combination of narcotic drugs that does not exceed in pharmacologic potency any one of the drugs named above in the quantity stated.

MANUFACTURERS AND WHOLESALERS

(b) Manufacturers and wholesalers shall keep records of all narcotic drugs compounded, mixed, cultivated, grown, or by any other process produced or prepared and of all narcotic drugs received and disposed of by them, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

APOTHECARIES

(c) Apothecaries shall keep records of all narcotic drugs received and disposed of by them, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

VENDORS OF EXEMPTED PREPARATIONS

(d) Every person who purchases for resale, or who sells narcotic drug preparations exempted by section 10 of this act, shall keep a record showing the quantities and kinds thereof received and sold, or disposed of otherwise, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

FORM AND PRESERVATION OF RECORDS

(e) The form of records shall be prescribed by the health officer of the District of Columbia. The record of narcotic drugs received shall in every case show the date of receipt, the name and address of the person from whom received, and the kind and quantity of drugs received; the kind and quantity of narcotic drugs produced or removed from process of manufacture, and the date of such production or removal from process of manufacture; and the record shall in every case show the proportion of morphine, cocaine, or ecgonine contained in or producible from crude opium or coca leaves received or produced, and the proportion of resin contained in or producible from the dried flowering or fruiting tops of pistillate plant *Cannabis sativa L.*, from which the resin has not been extracted, received, or produced. The record of all narcotic drugs sold, administered, dispensed, or otherwise disposed of, shall show the date of selling, administering, or dispensing, the name and address of the person to whom, or for whose use, or the owner and species of animal for which the drugs were sold, administered, or dispensed, and the kind and quantity of drugs. Every such record shall be kept for a period of 2 years from the date of the transaction recorded. The keeping of a record required by or under the Federal narcotic laws, containing substantially the same information as is specified above, shall constitute compliance with this section, except that every such record shall contain a detailed list of narcotic drugs lost, destroyed, or stolen, if any, the kind and quantity of such drugs, and the date of the discovery of such loss, destruction, or theft.

LABELS

SEC. 12. (a) Whenever a manufacturer sells or dispenses a narcotic drug, and whenever a wholesaler sells or dispenses a narcotic drug in a package prepared by him, he shall securely affix to each

package in which that drug is contained a label showing in legible English the name and address of the vendor and the quantity, kind, and form of narcotic drug contained therein. No person, except an apothecary for the purpose of filling a prescription under this act, shall alter, deface, or remove any label so affixed.

(b) Whenever an apothecary sells or dispenses any narcotic drug on a prescription issued by a physician, dentist, or veterinarian he shall affix to the container in which such drug is sold or dispensed a label showing his own name, address, and registry number, or the name, address, and registry number of the apothecary for whom he is lawfully acting; the name and address of the patient, or, if the patient is an animal, the name and address of the owner of the animal, and the species of the animal; the name, address, and registry number of the physician, dentist, or veterinarian by whom the prescription was written; and such directions as may be stated on the prescription. No person shall alter, deface, or remove any label so affixed as long as any of the original contents remain.

AUTHORIZED POSSESSION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS BY INDIVIDUALS

SEC. 13. A person to whom or for whose use any narcotic drug has been prescribed, sold, or dispensed, by a physician, dentist, apothecary, or other person authorized under the provisions of section 6 of this act, and the owner of any animal for which any such drug has been prescribed, sold, or dispensed, by a veterinarian, may lawfully possess it only in the container in which it was delivered to him by the person selling or dispensing the same.

SEARCH WARRANT

SEC. 14. (a) A search warrant may be issued by any judge of the police court of the District of Columbia or by a United States commissioner for the District of Columbia when any narcotic drugs are manufactured, possessed, controlled, sold, prescribed, administered, dispensed, or compounded, in violation of the provisions of this act, and any such narcotic drugs and any other property designed for use in connection with such unlawful manufacturing, possessing, controlling, selling, prescribing, administering, dispensing, or compounding, may be seized thereunder, and shall be subject to such disposition as the court may make thereof and such narcotic drugs may be taken on the warrant from any house or other place in which they are concealed.

(b) A search warrant cannot be issued but upon probable cause supported by affidavit particularly describing the property and the place to be searched.

(c) The judge or commissioner must, before issuing the warrant, examine on oath the complainant and any witnesses he may produce, and require their affidavits or take their depositions in writing and cause them to be subscribed by the parties making them.

(d) The affidavits or depositions must set forth the facts tending to establish the grounds of the application or probable cause for believing that they exist.

(e) If the judge or commissioner is thereupon satisfied of the existence of the grounds of the application or that there is probable cause to believe their existence, he must issue a search warrant, signed by him, to the major and superintendent of police of the District of Columbia or any member of the Metropolitan Police Department, stating the particular grounds or probable cause for its issue and the names of the persons whose affidavits have been taken in support thereof, and commanding him forthwith to search the place named for the property specified and to bring it before the judge or commissioner.

(f) A search warrant may in all cases be served by any of the officers mentioned in its direction, but by no other person, except in aid of the officer on his requiring it, he being present and acting in its execution.

(g) The officer may break open any outer or inner door or window of a house, or any part of a house, or anything therein, to execute the warrant, if, after notice of his authority and purpose, he is refused admittance.

(h) The judge or commissioner must insert a direction in the warrant that it be served in the daytime unless the affidavit is positive that the property is in the place to be searched, in which case he must insert a direction that it be served at any time in the day or night.

(i) A search warrant must be executed and returned to the judge or commissioner who issued it within 10 days after its date; after the expiration of this time the warrant, unless executed, is void.

(j) When the officer takes property under the warrant, he must give a copy of the warrant, together with a receipt for the property taken (specifying it in detail), to the person from whom it was taken by him, or in whose possession it was found; or in the absence of any person, he must leave it in the place where he found the property.

(k) The officer must forthwith return the warrant to the judge or commissioner and deliver to him a written inventory of the property taken, made publicly or in the presence of the person from whose possession it was taken, and of the applicant for the warrant, if they are present, verified by the affidavit of the officer at the foot of the inventory and taken before the judge or commissioner at the time, to the following effect: "I, _____, the officer by whom this warrant was executed, do swear that the above inventory contains a true and detailed account of all the property taken by me on the warrant."

(l) The judge or commissioner must thereupon, if required, deliver a copy of the inventory to the person from whose possession the property was taken and to the applicant for the warrant.

(m) The judge or commissioner must annex the affidavits, search warrant, return, inventory, and evidence, and at once file the same, together with a copy of the record of his proceedings, with the clerk of the police court.

(n) Whoever shall knowingly and willfully obstruct, resist, or oppose any such officer or person in serving or attempting to serve or execute any such search warrant, or shall assault, beat, or wound any such officer or person, knowing him to be an officer or person so authorized, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years.

PERSONS AND CORPORATIONS EXEMPTED

SEC. 15. The provisions of this act restricting the possession and having control of narcotic drugs shall not apply to common carriers or to warehousemen, while engaged in lawfully transporting or storing such drugs, or to any employee of the same acting within the scope of his employment; or to public officers or their employees in the performance of their official duties requiring possession or control of narcotic drugs; or to temporary incidental possession by employees or agents of persons lawfully entitled to possession, or by persons whose possession is for the purpose of aiding public officers in performing their official duties.

COMMON NUISANCES

SEC. 16. Any store, shop, warehouse, dwelling house, building, vehicle, boat, aircraft, or any place whatever, which is resorted to by narcotic drug addicts for the purpose of using narcotic drugs or which is used for the illegal keeping or selling of the same, shall be deemed a common nuisance. No person shall keep or maintain such a common nuisance.

NARCOTIC DRUGS TO BE DELIVERED TO STATE OFFICIAL, AND SO FORTH

SEC. 17. All narcotic drugs, the lawful possession of which is not established or the title to which cannot be ascertained, which have come into the custody of a peace officer, shall be forfeited, and disposed of as follows:

(a) Except as in this section otherwise provided, the court or magistrate having jurisdiction shall order such narcotic drugs forfeited and destroyed. A record of the place where said drugs were seized, of the kinds and quantities of drugs so destroyed, and of the time, place, and manner of destruction shall be kept, and a return under oath, reporting said destruction, shall be made to the court or magistrate and to the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, by the officer who destroys them.

(b) Upon written application by the health officer of the District of Columbia, the court or magistrate by whom the forfeiture of narcotic drugs has been decreed may order the delivery of any of them, except heroin and its salts and derivatives, to said health officer of the District of Columbia for distribution or destruction, as hereinafter provided.

(c) Upon application by any hospital within the District of Columbia not operated for private gain, the health officer of the District of Columbia may in his discretion deliver any narcotic drugs that have come into his custody by authority of this section to the applicant for medicinal use. The health officer may from time to time deliver excess stocks of such narcotic drugs to the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, or may destroy the same.

(d) The health officer of the District of Columbia shall keep a full and complete record of all drugs received and of all drugs disposed of, showing the exact kinds, quantities, and forms of such drugs; the persons from whom received and to whom delivered; by whose authority received, delivered, and destroyed; and the dates of the receipt, disposal, or destruction, which record shall be open to inspection by all Federal or District of Columbia officers charged with the enforcement of Federal and District narcotic laws.

NOTICE OF CONVICTION TO BE SENT TO LICENSING BOARD

SEC. 18. On the conviction of any person of the violation of any provision of this act, a copy of the judgment and sentence, and of the opinion of the court or magistrate, if any opinion be filed, shall be sent by the clerk of the court, or by the magistrate, to the board or officer, if any, by whom the convicted defendant has been licensed or registered to practice his profession or to carry on his business, and the said board or officer may in its or his discretion suspend or revoke the license of the convicted defendant to practice his profession or to carry on his business. On the application of any person whose license or registration has been suspended or revoked, and upon proper showing for good cause, said board or officer may reinstate such license or registration.

RECORDS, CONFIDENTIAL

SEC. 19. Prescriptions, orders, and records, required by this act, and stocks of narcotic drugs, shall be open for inspection only to Federal and District of Columbia officers whose duty it is to enforce the laws of the District of Columbia, or of the United States relating to narcotic drugs. No officer having knowledge by virtue of his office of any such prescription, order, or record shall divulge such knowledge, except in connection with a prosecution or proceeding in court or before a licensing or registration board or officer, to which prosecution or proceeding the person to whom such prescriptions, orders, or records relate is a party.

FRAUD OR DECEIT

SEC. 20. (a) No person shall obtain or attempt to obtain a narcotic drug, or procure or attempt to procure the administration of a narcotic drug, (1) by fraud, deceit, misrepresentation, or subterfuge; or (2) by the forgery or alteration of a prescription or of any written order; or (3) by the concealment of a

material fact; or (4) by the use of a false name or the giving of a false address.

(b) Information communicated to a physician in an effort unlawfully to procure a narcotic drug, or unlawfully to procure the administration of any such drug, shall not be deemed a privileged communication.

(c) No person shall willfully make a false statement in any prescription, order, report, or record required by this act.

(d) No person shall, for the purpose of obtaining a narcotic drug, falsely assume the title of, or represent himself to be, a manufacturer, wholesaler, apothecary, physician, dentist, veterinarian, or other authorized person.

(e) No person shall make or utter any false or forged prescription or false or forged written order.

(f) No person shall affix any false or forged label to a package or receptacle containing narcotic drugs.

(g) The provisions of this section shall apply to all transactions relating to narcotic drugs under the provisions of section 10 of this act, in the same way as they apply to transactions under all other sections.

EXCEPTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS NOT REQUIRED TO BE NEGATED

SEC. 21. In any complaint, information, or indictment, and in any action or proceeding brought for the enforcement of any provision of this act, it shall not be necessary to negative any exception, excuse, proviso, or exemption, contained in this act, and the burden of proof of any such exception, excuse, proviso, or exemption, shall be upon the defendant.

ENFORCEMENT AND COOPERATION

SEC. 22. It is hereby made the duty of the major and superintendent of police of the District of Columbia to enforce all provisions of this act except those specifically delegated, and to cooperate with all agencies charged with the enforcement of the laws of the United States relating to narcotic drugs.

PENALTIES

SEC. 23. Any person violating any provision of this act shall upon conviction be punished, for the first offense, by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, and for any subsequent offense by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EFFECT OF ACQUITTAL OR CONVICTION UNDER FEDERAL NARCOTIC LAWS

SEC. 24. No person shall be prosecuted for a violation of any provision of this act if such person has been acquitted or convicted under any United States statute governing the sale or distribution of narcotic drugs, of the same act or omission which, it is alleged, constitutes a violation of this act.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

SEC. 25. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

INCONSISTENT LAWS REPEALED

SEC. 26. All acts or parts of acts which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

NAME OF ACT

SEC. 27. This act may be cited as the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 28. This act shall take effect July 1, 1936.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 20, after the word "institution", insert the words "or clinic."

Page 2, line 25, strike out beginning with the word "The" down through and including the word "Columbia", on page 3, line 3.

Page 3, line 20, strike out the word "Cannabis" and insert the word "Cannabis."

Page 5, line 6, insert the following:

"Licenses shall be issued for a period of 1 year and may be renewed for a like period. A fee of \$5 shall be paid to the health officer for any license so issued or renewed. The said health officer is authorized to have printed such licenses as may be necessary and to be paid for out of the money collected by him for the issuance of licenses. At the close of each fiscal year any funds unexpended in excess of the sum of \$100 shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia."

Page 6, line 21, after the word "To", strike out the following: "a person in charge of."

Page 6, line 22, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the official written order is signed by a physician, dentist, veterinarian, or pharmacist connected with that hospital."

Page 8, line 5, after the word "lawful", insert the word "only."

Page 9, line 2, after the word "signed", insert the following: "in ink or indelible pencil."

Page 10, line 7, after the word "prescribe", insert the words "in writing."

Page 10, line 9, insert the following:

"Such a prescription shall be dated and signed by the person prescribing on the day when issued and shall bear the full name and address of the patient for whom the narcotic drug is prescribed and the full name, address, and registry number under the

Federal narcotic laws of the person prescribing, provided he is required by those laws to be so registered."

Page 10, line 13, after the word "prescribe" insert the words "in writing."

Page 10, line 15, insert the following:

"Such a prescription shall be dated and signed by the person prescribing on the day when issued and shall bear the full name and address of the owner of the animal, the species of the animal for which the narcotic is prescribed, and the full name, address, and registry number under the Federal narcotic laws of the person prescribing, provided he is required by those laws to be so registered."

Page 13, insert a new section to be known as section 10a and to read as follows:

"No person other than a manufacturer or wholesaler shall dispense or sell tincture opii camphorata, commonly known as paregoric, to any person without a written prescription from a duly licensed physician, dentist, veterinarian, or other authorized person."

Page 13, line 11, strike out the period and insert the following: "in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] over the radio last night. The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent heretofore granted, I submit for the RECORD a very interesting and informative speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. JED JOHNSON, of Oklahoma, chairman of the speaker's bureau of the national Democratic congressional committee, over the NBC network, on Friday night, June 19, 1936.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS AND THE NEW DEAL

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the last session of the Seventy-fourth Congress has virtually become history. Adjournment now seems certain tomorrow. It has been a hectic and strenuous session.

In the brief time at my disposal it is, of course, impossible to more than touch the high spots of the contributions made by the present Congress to the President's recovery program. It being impossible to even mention many problems that have confronted this administration, I shall confine this discussion chiefly to agriculture, unemployment, banking, and social security.

PRESIDENT HAS RESPONSIBILITY

Partisan Republican leaders are vociferously charging that this has been a "rubber stamp" Congress. That is the charge always heard whenever there is reasonable cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. But I submit that without this cooperation our system of government breaks down. The Constitution places certain responsibilities upon the Chief Executive in matters of legislation. Section 3 of article II of this document states: "He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

FATE OF NATION HELD IN BALANCE

It seems only a short time ago that thousands of anxious-faced Americans stood here in the city of Washington and watched with bated breath as Franklin D. Roosevelt was sworn into office. Yet some of us may have difficulty in recalling to memory the picture of that dark hour when the very fate of the Republic hung in the balance. I am sure that our opponents would like for the American people to forget that on that day this great Nation, the richest in all the world, was in the grip of a terrible, hope-destroying economic panic that threatened the very foundation of this Government.

FACED MANY GRAVE EMERGENCIES

Undoubtedly the American people have not so soon forgotten that practically every phase of our economic system was paralyzed. Banks were closing in almost every city and hamlet in America. Business firms were going bankrupt by the thousands; farmers saw their homes sold under the hammer for debt; millions were unemployed, and suffering was rampant in this unhappy land. The new administration was faced, not with a single problem, but with a score of grave emergencies. Immediate and drastic action was essential.

FARM CREDIT BANK EXTENDED

In a few weeks after the new administration came into office, the farm-credit system, which had broken down under Republican misrule, was revised and has helped more than a million farmers by refinancing old loans and making new ones providing

more than \$3,500,000,000 in credit to our distressed farmers. The opposition may have some difficulty convincing these 1,000,000 farmers that this three and one-half billion has been wasted. Of course, these loans are well secured. I am not one of those who feel that the farm-credit problem has been solved, but certainly the saving of a million farm homes from the sheriff's hammer by the Roosevelt administration needs no apology. It is a record unequalled by any former administration.

AGRICULTURE AFFECTS ALL CITIZENS

Inasmuch as the welfare of agriculture vitally affects every citizen of this land, need I remind you of the terrible plight in which our farmers found themselves on March 4, 1933? Let those who so freely criticize the New Deal farm program remember those dark days of 1930, 1931, 1932, and the first few months of 1933.

Farmers did not make so much as actual cost of production and were going broke at an alarming speed. The country was facing a serious economic crisis. All of us know that we cannot have a prosperous Nation unless our farmers are prosperous. The factory wheels of the East and Middle West cannot turn unless the farmers can buy the goods and services they need. As farm income declined, farmers went into debt and reduced their consumption of manufactured products. As the farmers stopped buying, factory wheels began to slow down.

Railroads had fewer cars to haul. Factory workers lost their jobs. They, in turn, were forced to reduce their purchases of farm products. It was a vicious circle which built up a surplus of farm and manufactured products that brought on bankruptcies by the thousands. Cotton sold for from 4 to 5 cents a pound, wheat was 25 to 30 cents a bushel, and the farmer who took a load of hogs or cattle to market was fortunate if he got enough for them to pay the expenses of hauling.

FARM PRICES ADVANCED UNDER A. A. A.

The new administration also took immediate and effective steps to raise farm prices by passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Farm prices immediately advanced and the annual income of American agriculture was increased \$3,000,000,000. We have not yet reached the goal of equality for agriculture, but undoubtedly we are on our way. In the last year of the Wilson administration the gross income of American farmers was \$13,600,000,000.

In 1932, under the old deal, it had declined to \$5,300,000,000, a loss of more than \$8,000,000,000. In 1935 the gross income of the American farmer was \$8,110,000,000, a gain of nearly \$3,000,000,000. It is also significant that since 1933 nearly 2,000,000 people have returned to the farm.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT

When the Supreme Court, by a divided opinion, held the Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional, the present Congress did not throw up its hands in despair but promptly passed the Domestic Allotment and Soil Conservation Act in an effort to maintain agricultural purchasing power and conserve our precious soil. Soil conservation is a matter of vital importance to every American citizen. More than 50,000,000 acres of our lands have been destroyed by that giant enemy, erosion; and more than 360,000,000 acres have been seriously damaged. Had this been permitted to continue, this rich Nation, in the not-far-distant future, would be forced to import agricultural products on an enormous scale.

REPUBLICANS DID NOTHING FOR AGRICULTURE

What did the Republicans, now promising so much, do about the farm problem? Nothing constructive, nothing permanent. They established the Farm Board that poured several millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money down the biggest rat hole that any administration has ever discovered. They also called in the old guard quack doctor, who prescribed a big dose of the high tariff. The Tariff Act of 1930 increased the rates on agricultural products 30 percent. Did that help farm prices? Well does the American farmer know it did not; but farm prices continued on the downward toboggan to bankruptcy.

HIGH TARIFF ACT OF 1930 FAILED

The tariff is the remedy that the old guard doctors have for everything, whether it is unemployment, low wages, child labor, sweatshops, or what have you.

Down at Cleveland the other day they said: "We do not need to amend the Constitution. We'll just increase the tariff again. That will cure everything."

UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Unemployment, the result of a series of economic maladjustments neglected by previous administrations, was one of the extremely serious problems facing the Nation in 1932—is still a major problem—and the people of the Nation should be seriously concerned about how unemployment is to be handled in 1937 and 1938.

The present Congress has twice made appropriations for the relief of unemployment, feeling that this is a matter of concern to the Federal Government with its vast resources. We on the Democratic side have taken the position that if this great Government could spend \$40,000,000,000 fighting a war in Europe, that we could spend a small percent of that sum fighting a war against hunger, unemployment, and actual starvation within our borders.

SAID RELIEF LOCAL PROBLEM ONLY

In 1932 the Republican Party went before the country on a relief plank stating:

"True to American traditions and principles of government, the administration has regarded the relief problem as one of State and local responsibility."

That was the administration, you will recall, when prosperity was "Hoovering around the corner" and we were told that there was nothing to get excited about, as the country was still on the gold standard and all that we needed was confidence.

G. O. P. DARES NOT DEMAND REPEAL

As chairman of the speakers' bureau of the Democratic National Congressional Committee I have addressed audiences in several States in recent months, and in discussing the first 3 years of the New Deal I have freely predicted that the Republicans in their 1936 platform would not have the temerity to advocate the repeal of a single one of the major New Deal legislative enactments.

That prediction has come true. Did the G. O. P. go on record at Cleveland favoring discontinuance of benefit payments to farmers, so severely criticized by spellbinders in recent months? Oh, no! Did they go on record as favoring repeal of the Farm Credit Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Social Security Act, the National Youth Administration, the banking legislation, neutrality legislation, the act creating the C. C. C. camps, or any other important New Deal legislation? They did not.

WOULD NOW LEND "SOME ASSISTANCE"

But they did go back to their old position on relief, with modifications. True, they did not dare go all the way back. They do not now propose for the States and local communities to carry all of the burden as they did in 1932, but promise that the Federal Government will lend some assistance, with "a fair proportion of the total relief burden to be provided from the revenues of the States and local governments."

LOCAL COMMUNITIES NOW OVERTAXED

You know what the situation was in 1932. The States and local governments were heavily in debt. Many of them had increased their taxes to the breaking point, the maximum allowed by law, in an effort to help the needy unemployed. But people could not pay their taxes. The new burdens forced business firms into bankruptcy and resulted in the sale of many a home for taxes.

What State or local community could even now shoulder 25 percent of the relief burden without increasing local taxes to a point where countless businessmen and home owners would be shouldering a burden they could not possibly bear?

NEW DEAL BANKING LEGISLATION

When the Republicans met at Cleveland to "view with alarm" and yet failed to "point with pride" to the record of the Hoover administration, did they promise to repeal the bank-guarantee law and other remedial New Deal banking acts? They did not. They dared not go on record opposing such popular legislation.

You will recall the dire predictions that were made and the abuse that was heaped upon Congress by the big Republican newspapers, with the Liberty League complex, when the Banking Act of 1935 was under consideration a year ago. Do you remember the partisan Republican spellbinders who predicted that the banking legislation was impractical? Where are those critics now? Apparently they did not get to Cleveland.

REFUSED TO PASS SOCIAL-SECURITY LEGISLATION

What about the Social Security Act? Did the Republicans demand its repeal? Certainly not. As a bid for votes they indicated they now feel that the New Deal has not gone far enough. Yet, you and I know that had the G. O. P. been victorious in 1932, there would be no Social Security Act now and the Cleveland platform would be silent as the grave on that important subject, as was all previous Republican platforms.

Personally I feel that the Social Security Act is not the last word, but rather the first word on the subject. If and when that law is strengthened and liberalized it will not be done by the opposition party, that it is conceded is not in sympathy with this law, but by President Roosevelt and a sympathetic Democratic Congress.

PLATFORM CLEAR-CUT AND PROGRESSIVE

Soon the Democratic chieftains will meet in Philadelphia to write a platform and nominate not only a real Democrat, but a great humanitarian, a great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as again standard bearer for the Democratic Party. We have every reason to believe that the Democratic platform will be a straight-forward, progressive, clear-cut document; that it will be definite and certain; that it will not try to compete with Republicans in writing a "catch-all" platform, that is all things to all people, but means nothing definite to any and straddles the real issues of the day.

Let us hope that Democrats will stand, not only on their platform, but upon the record of worth-while achievements of this administration. A record made by individuals or party speaks much louder and more definitely than campaign promises.

WILL CONTINUE TO BE "GOOD NEIGHBOR"

Let us also hope that Democratic speakers will not criticize personally the Republican nominee. The citizens of my great State of Oklahoma know the Republican nominee as a good neighbor and like him as a neighbor, and I am very much of the opinion that when the smoke of November's battle has cleared away they will vote to permit him to remain as a neighbor and continue to reside in the great State of Kansas.

"HE ALSO RAN FOR PRESIDENT"

Frankly, I am of the opinion that when the historian shall write the history of this campaign, and especially the history of the Republican nominee, that it will be said of him that he served with more or less distinction as Governor of the wonderful State of Kansas and that he also ran for President.

"LEST WE FORGET—LEST WE FORGET"

Now, when our opponents decry the mistakes of the New Deal, actual and alleged, let us ask them to stick to the subject under discussion. Let us ask them what New Deal laws they would repeal. Let us remind them that they failed to take effective and courageous action when the Nation stood on the brink of a yawning precipice where the spineless and do-nothing policy of their three past administrations had led us. Let us remind them that a hungry man cannot eat a political platform and that a declaration of principles drawn up in a few short hours by a few discarded members of the old guard representing a politically bankrupt party at a political convention will not pay a mortgage. Tell them that we have not forgotten the dark and dismal days of 1931 and 1932. No; I cannot believe our people are going to forget. Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget!

R. D. STEPHENS AND VERA STEPHENS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3808) for the relief of R. D. Stephens and Vera Stephens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to R. D. Stephens, of Paxton, Ill., the sum of \$1,000, and to Vera Stephens, wife of said R. D. Stephens, the sum of \$3,000, such sums being in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damages arising out of property damage and personal injuries sustained by them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck driven by Joseph L. Kindral, near Virgin Lake in Oneida County, Wis., on January 2, 1934: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT TO CERTAIN LANDS TO FLORENCE KERR FACEY

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3733) authorizing the issuance of a patent to certain lands in the State of Montana to Florence Kerr Facey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of the act entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing phosphate, nitrate, potash, oil, gas, or asphaltic minerals", approved July 17, 1914, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, upon payment of final commissions, to Florence Kerr Facey, of Havre, Mont., an unrestricted patent to the east half northwest quarter, and lots 1 and 2, section 19, township 32 north, range 33 east, Montana principal meridian (Great Falls 053718), upon her filing an abstract of title to the land showing her to be the equitable owner thereof, save for the pendency of any application for a permit or lease thereof under the act approved February 25, 1920, and paying into the land office at Great Falls, Mont., the sum of \$6.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN SALARIES AND EXPENSES TO EMPLOYEES OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 4581, authorizing the payment of certain salaries and expenses of employees of the General Land Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. I will explain it to the gentleman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] knows all about the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. It is a worthy bill.

Mr. DEROUEN. It is a worthy bill. That is enough. It pays 23 employees of the General Land Office who were caught in the jam when the Comptroller General ruled that they could not be paid with the money that was appropriated in the first act.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Where are you going to get this money? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the allotment to the General Land Office under section 1, title II, of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, of \$168,000 for necessary office work incident to surveys and resurveys of the public lands is hereby extended and made available for said purpose for the period of July 1 to September 11, 1935, inclusive, and the payment of unpaid salaries for said period is hereby authorized, and the General Accounting Office shall allow credit in disbursing officers' accounts for salaries and expenses so paid for said period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPERTY OWNERS DAMAGED BY HIGH WATERS IN BLACKFOOT RESERVOIR

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4142) for the relief of owners of property damaged by high waters in the Blackfoot Reservoir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to know what this bill is. I will object to it unless I know what it is.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. This is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of certain landowners who have been damaged or alleged to have been damaged by reason of the overflow of a reservoir which has been constructed in Idaho. This is simply an authorization, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate these claims and report his recommendations to the next Congress.

Mr. SNELL. How much are the claims, how many claims are there, and what do they amount to?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The claims amount to about \$60,000, if they are justified. That is all the bill provides for.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Why can he not do that now?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. He has not the authorization. This reservoir was built by the Government. It overflowed.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Cannot these people get in the Court of Claims in any way?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. They do not think they can.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how is this different from the overflowing of a river when God puts so much water in the river that the banks cannot contain it and property is damaged? Who is going to make claims for such people?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12671) for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship companies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill (S. 4684) for the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine in any suits instituted in said court, jointly or severally, by the First National Steamship Co., the Second National Steamship Co., and the Third National Steamship Co., corporations organized

and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, the claims of such companies on account of (1) certain sums deposited by the said companies with the United States Shipping Board in the year 1920; (2) certain disbursements made by the said companies for and on behalf of the United States in the year 1920 for other than physical operation costs in connection with the vessels *Independence*, *Hozie*, and *Scottsburg*, owned by the United States Government; and (3) certain permanent improvements and equipment placed aboard the said vessels and not removed therefrom when the vessels were returned to the custody of the United States; and to enter such decrees or judgments against the United States as will provide full reimbursement and just compensation to such companies on the said claims, notwithstanding the bars or defenses of res judicata or of any alleged settlement or adjustment heretofore made or any release heretofore given by the said companies, their agents or attorneys, to the United States and notwithstanding any statute of limitations: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall be given credit for any sum heretofore paid to the said companies on account of the aforesaid deposits, disbursements, and improvements.

Sec. 2. The suits authorized under section 1 hereof may be instituted at any time within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 12671) were laid on the table.

THE SYMBOLISM OF THE FLAG

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an eloquent and inspired address delivered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at Harrisonburg, Va., June 14, 1936, to the Harrisonburg Club, B. P. O. E.:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I esteem it a high privilege and honor to be permitted to participate with the Elks Club of Harrisonburg in the dedication, to the high purposes of peace and good citizenship, of an American flag, the gift of local Veterans of Foreign Wars.

From time immemorial, nations have employed standards, colors, and flags to indicate their individuality, but these national emblems, usually born of conflict, have in times past represented more the accomplishments of war than those of peace.

Our own flag, for instance, was born of the Revolutionary War. When Great Britain ceased to treat the Colonies as a mother should a child, the "three crosses of England" became repugnant to them. The British flag no longer represented their welfare. Some of the northern Colonies adopted the "pine-tree flag" with the inscription "An appeal to God"; some in the South the serpent flag, representing a coiled rattlesnake ready to strike, with the inscription "Don't tread on me."

Although we declared our independence in July 1776, our present flag was not adopted until June 14, 1777. On that date the American Congress resolved "That the flag of the Thirteen United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

Alfred B. Street, in a speech on the Battle of Saratoga, said: "The stars of the new flag represent a constellation of States rising in the west. The idea was taken from the constellation Lyra, which, in the hands of Orpheus, signified harmony. The blue of the field was taken from the edges of the Covenanters' banner in Scotland, significant also of the league and covenant of the united Colonies against oppression, incidentally involving the virtues of vigilance, perseverance, and justice. The stars were deposed in a circle, symbolizing the perpetuity of the Union; the ring, like the circling serpent of the Egyptians, signifying eternity."

The 13 stripes, with the stars, showed the number of the colonies and denoted the subordination of the States to the Union as well as equality among themselves. The whole was a blending of the various flags, previous to the Union flag, namely, the red flags of the Army and the white ones of the floating batteries. The red color, which in Roman days was the signal of defiance, denotes daring and the red blood that was spilled in the defense of freedom and liberty; the white, purity and peace; and the blue, loyalty. What eloquence do the stars breathe when their full significance is known: a new constellation, union, perpetuity; a covenant against oppression; justice, equality, subordination, courage, and purity.

Members of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, this is the flag, born of conflict, that my comrades of the World War have presented to you. Decked with only 13 stars, representing the Thirteen Original Colonies, it had first waved over Washington's raw levies at Valley Forge. As the cluster grew, it was flown by John Paul Jones and disputed on equal terms with the Cross of St. George its ancient lordship of the seas.

Andrew Jackson, whose home in Tennessee I visited last Sunday, kept it flying over New Orleans, and Stonewall Jackson, under Scott, carried it to the heights of Montezuma in the Mexican War. And the boys, who donated it to you, carried it, now bearing its full complement of 48 stars, symbolizing great and free States stretching from ocean to ocean, for the first time upon a European battlefield, where it received as its baptism of fire a salute from the arsenals of hell. Time, the great alchemist, had blotted out the tragic reconstruction era and we could all join in saying:

"Here's to the blue of the wind-swept North;
When they meet on the fields of France
May the spirit of Grant be with them all
As the sons of the North advance.

"Here's to the gray of the sun-kissed South;
When they meet on the fields of France
May the spirit of Lee be with them all
As the sons of the South advance.

"Here's to the blue and the gray as one;
When they meet on the fields of France
May the spirit of God be with them all
As the sons of the flag advance"

You, sons of the noble Order of Elks, in Harrisonburg in Virginia, in a thousand cities and hamlets throughout the United States, are sons of the flag—a flag in your hands dedicated not to war but to the high calling of peace on earth, good will to all men. Your order came into being in 1868—in the midst of the tragic era. Your order was born in a spirit of brotherly love, and through the teaching and practice of charity, justice, and fidelity, you have given form and substance to the highest and noblest symbolism of the flag. In your hands it symbolizes a capitalistic system of society operating under a constitutional form of government "of the people, for the people, and by the people." It symbolizes churches, hospitals, schools, and the sanctity of the home. It means that the strong must protect the weak and in every sense be a good neighbor. For the past 4 years our Nation has been striving to evolve a higher code of business ethics, in the full meaning of the Elks' tenets, benevolent and protective. You realize that the whole of justice is not expressed in the law. "Such sentiments", said Woodrow Wilson, "sweep across our heartstrings like airs from the presence of God, where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one."

And the veterans who donated to you this flag have marched under its banner in the trying period of a war against depression with the same courage and loyalty with which they carried it upon the fields of France. In every major economic upheaval, enemies of constitutional government seek to capitalize the spirit of unrest. They foment strikes and disorders in the industrial world; they hold out to the aged and infirm the hope of Government bounties that can never be realized; they subsidize the criminal activities of the underworld to make it appear that organized society is disintegrating; in subtle ways they suggest that our Constitution is an instrument of bondage, designed by a capitalistic class for the economic slavery of the masses. To those of us who have served in the Congress during the trying times of the past 4 years nothing has given us more satisfaction nor a greater feeling of security than the realization of the fact that the boys who served under the flag in foreign lands in times of war are still true and loyal to their flag and country in times of peace, and ready to combat all subversive doctrines that seek to undermine and destroy our Constitution, and with it the greatest degree of personal liberty that the people of any nation have ever enjoyed. They subscribe to the sentiments of Daniel Webster, who, on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, said:

"Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government, who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty, who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

Therefore, on this one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the birth of our national flag, the veterans who present it and the Elks who receive it can appropriately clasp hands in a common cause and a mutual understanding. For both, the flag is the symbol of our liberty under the Constitution—the guardian of our homes. The one group swore allegiance to it when it entered military service; the other when it accepted membership in a great fraternal order.

As the silken folds of Old Glory unfold to the breeze, as it rises to the top of yonder flagpole, I can say to you in the words of Henry Ward Beecher: "Accept it, then, in all its fullness of meaning. It is not a painted rag. It is a whole national history. It

is the Constitution. It is the Government. It is the free people that stand in the Government on the Constitution. Forget not what it means; and for the sake of its ideas be true to your country's flag."

"May the spirit of God be with them all
As the sons of the flag advance."

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—ITS RECORD AND ACHIEVEMENTS—EMERGENCY LEGISLATION UNDER ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION ANALYZED

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by an illustrious former Member of the House, W. W. Hastings.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by former Congressman W. W. Hastings at Colcord, Okla., June 15, 1936:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to come to Colcord for two reasons: First. This place is only a short distance from my old home. Near here I attended the public schools, played up and down these streams, and grew up to young manhood.

Second. Colcord is in the First Congressional District, so ably and efficiently represented by my personal friend, Hon. WESLEY E. DISNEY. He is experienced, knows the needs of the people of the district, is in sympathy with them, and enjoys the confidence of the administration and every Member of the House.

The Democratic Party was founded almost a century and a half ago to represent and serve the masses of the people of the country. It has been true to its purpose.

For the first half century of our national life, it continued in power. We experienced unexampled domestic prosperity. We expanded our territorial area from that occupied by the Original Thirteen Colonies fringing along the Atlantic, across the continent to the Pacific. Under the far-seeing and wise leadership of Jefferson, we acquired a vast territorial area by the Louisiana Purchase. He inspired his private secretary, Merriwether Lewis, and Clark to undertake their notable expedition in 1804 which brought under our flag the great Northwest, from which was subsequently carved such splendid Commonwealths as Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and others. He financed the expedition in part from a private fund.

We acquired Florida, the land of sunshine and flowers and fruits, the playground of the South, under the leadership of Monroe.

We annexed Texas and added the brilliant "Lone Star" to our constellation under the leadership of Polk.

We scaled the heights of Chapultepec in 1848, silenced the Mexican guns, settled the boundary dispute, and extended our domain to the Pacific coast from which was added Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, and California, an area of unsurpassed beauty and fertility, and from which vast quantities of gold and silver have poured into our Treasury through the enrichment of vast numbers of our individual citizens, lured there through the discovery of these precious metals.

The Gadsden Purchase in the southern part of Arizona in 1853 completed our program of expansion in Continental United States, except Alaska, which was acquired from Russia in 1867.

Through the years that followed the organization of our party, its objective has been service to the great mass of humankind and to protect the weak and unorganized from oppressive and selfish greed, enriched through special-privilege legislation and administration.

Jackson, lovingly remembered as "Old Hickory", from improvised breastworks defeated the crack troops of Great Britain under Pakenham on January 8, 1815, and with increased vigor and determination continued his fight for the unorganized masses during the 8 years he occupied the White House after his election to the Presidency in 1828 and his triumphant re-election in 1832.

The present occupant of the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt, with a sympathy for the "forgotten" masses unexcelled in the history of the Nation, is courageously leading the fight against a depression that has all but engulfed us since 1929, with a constructive program.

He is entitled to the wholehearted support, without regard to party, of all forward-thinking, progressive citizens of the Nation. Oklahoma should take the lead in emphasizing that he will have our earnest, hearty, and undivided support.

Prior to his election to the Presidency, the Republicans had occupied the White House for 12 long years, and during most of that time had complete control of all three branches of the Government. They must therefore assume full responsibility for the disastrous results that led to the stock crash of 1929, followed by a panic the like of which has never before been experienced in the history of the Nation.

During these years, the special interests represented by Fall and Daugherty and Forbes were in riotous control and left wrack and ruin in their wake.

Dominated by such leadership, there was an orgy of corruption and misrule sickening to the heart of every patriotic citizen. The stories told of the intrigues entered into in the little "Green House" on K Street during the Harding administration for the enrichment of those holding cabinet and other high positions are nauseating and disgusting. The Government of the masses was a prey to those political freebooters. Special privilege was in the saddle everywhere.

This administration was followed by the "Silent Cal" who was impotent to change the trend of affairs. The great engineer then mounted the engine and took hold of the throttle, lauded as the best qualified man by experience who ever entered the White House, and in less than 15 months, headed us into the most disastrous wreck of all time.

In his efforts to stage a comeback, he makes frequent radio addresses critical of the program of the present administration, and in the interest of big business and the special interests. The wrack and ruin was complete when his term was ended.

The farmers of the Nation were broke beyond hope of recovery. In 1932 wheat was selling at the thrasher at 25 cents per bushel, oats at 12 cents, corn at from 10 to 12 and much at less, and cotton at around 5 cents per pound, all starvation prices and below the cost of production. Taxes could not be paid, and as a result, schools were closed in thousands of the rural districts.

Mortgages were foreclosed by the millions and farm lands went into foreign ownership. Improvements were allowed to go to ruin. The crops were not rotated. The soil eroded and became less productive. In these circumstances the farmers, comprising one-third of our population throughout the Nation, lost their purchasing power.

Cattle, hogs, and other livestock fell to the lowest level in the history of the country.

As a result, the businessmen, including the merchants in the small towns, began to fail. Soon the panic extended to the larger trade centers. Finally the factories receiving insufficient orders were closed. Millions of laborers were thrown out of employment. Railroads were all headed for receivership. The panic-stricken people, seized with fear, began to withdraw their deposits from banks. Banks in increasing numbers were failing. There was no ray of hope for any business or industry. Hope had fled; despair was upon every countenance, and fear ruled because of the want of confidence in every heart and mind throughout the country.

Such were the conditions among a terror-stricken people when Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House March 4, 1933.

Congress was called into almost immediate session March 9, 1933. Conditions would not permit of delay to work out a program.

A banking moratorium order, the most courageous of any ever made, was issued. The Governors of the States joined as to State banks. Confidence was restored.

Legislation ratifying the action of the President and giving him power over foreign exchange and authority to prevent hoarding of gold was enacted by unanimous consent.

The fears of the people were calmed because they soon realized that a man of action and courage was in the White House.

A program was outlined and legislation prepared touching innumerable subjects.

Agricultural legislation to raise the price of farm products was enacted. As a result the price of most farm products has doubled and trebled. Although sharply criticized by political writers and those who exploit them, the farmers at every opportunity register their votes in favor of the program.

The Rural Credit Act was amended and farm land-bank bonds, both principal and interest, were guaranteed by the Government, thus making adequate funds for loans at lower interest rates to all farmers.

Recent legislation was enacted extending the time of making loans to farmers for 1 year at 3½-percent interest.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act was passed for the benefit and protection of those who live in cities and towns.

Critics of the New Deal program, do you object to this legislation?

Comprehensive banking legislation, including the guarantee of bank deposits up to \$5,000, was enacted.

In the 3 years preceding the inauguration of Roosevelt there had been 10,775 bank failures involving many billions in deposits, sweeping away the earnings of untold thousands.

Since this law was enacted the reports show only 25 banks failed and the ultimate or final losses to depositors are negligible.

Do you want this constructive legislation repealed?

Railroad legislation was enacted designed to assist railroads in refinancing their properties and to avoid receiverships. This was in the interest of the small shippers, the laboring man, and the thousands of bondholders.

The N. R. A. was enacted to permit industries to make codes of fair competition to regulate hours of labor and to make rules so as to establish uniform working conditions.

Part of this program has been sharply criticized, some of it held to be unconstitutional.

If no legislation had been enacted, of course there would have been nothing to criticize and nothing to challenge as unconstitutional. We prefer to do something. Of course, with such a vast program, mistakes may be expected, both in legislation and administration.

Legislation is the result of the meeting of many minds and represents compromises between the President and Members of both branches of Congress.

Do you want the President to sit down and let things "drift", as under previous administrations?

There was appropriated by the Seventy-third Congress \$3,300,000,000 to be expended either as directed in the act or by the President for the relief of people out of employment, hungry, naked, and in dire distress.

An additional \$4,880,000,000 was made available by the Seventy-fourth Congress. The deficiency appropriation bill carries a further item of \$1,425,000,000 for future relief.

In every war there is unavoidable waste. There was in the World War. The same is true of all wars. We are fighting a real war against the worst panic—left to us by the Hoover administration—in our history. In our efforts to put out a fire to save our homes there will necessarily be some waste of water.

There has been confusion as to details of administration. This is to be regretted. Naturally, there have risen differences of opinion as to the purposes for which the money should be expended.

We should welcome every constructive criticism, from whatever source it comes. Every effort should be made to correct abuses. The money should be spent as intended by Congress and the President; to give relief, to afford employment, and to aid the distressed.

Tariff legislation authorizing reciprocal agreements to expand our foreign markets was enacted.

Such an agreement was recently entered into with Canada and was almost universally commended.

Every effort should be made to restore our foreign trade for our surplus industrial and agricultural products. However, until this is done, we should enact temporary legislation to insure a fair price in our domestic markets.

We must not continue to follow a "do nothing" policy and dump our products on a domestic market below the cost of production.

The Seventy-third Congress enacted legislation for the registration of securities, both foreign and domestic, to protect prospective investors from being defrauded into buying worthless stocks and bonds. Our uninformed citizens were defrauded out of billions of dollars in the speculative months culminating in the stock crash of October 1929. Do honest people anywhere criticize this legislation to protect the people against stock gambling and international bankers?

Thousands lost their savings for years and many for a lifetime.

Those who, for selfish reasons, oppose legislation usually hide behind the Constitution as a smoke screen. Is there any wonder in the enactment of a great constructive program to restore happiness and prosperity to the masses and in correcting the abuses that have grown up in the interest of the privileged few that some legislation should be held unconstitutional? Legislation enacted under every administration has been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The same is true of practically every State administration.

The record shows 20 acts passed by Democratic administrations and 42 when the Republicans were in control held violative of the Constitution. Of these, six were under Franklin D. Roosevelt, seven under Theodore Roosevelt, and six under Lincoln, and seven under Grant.

Of course, if no effort had been made through new and emergency legislation to aid the people in their dire distress, there would have been nothing to challenge. In an effort to find an issue the number has been greatly exaggerated.

The truth is, on March 4, 1933, that all classes of people and all kinds of business, great and small—banks, railroads, industries, farmers, stockmen, and laboring men—were headed for receiverships, bankruptcy, and financial ruin. They pleaded with President Roosevelt to be saved. Through emergency legislation and administration he rescued them and brought them to financial safety. The records show that most of the program generally known as the New Deal was supported by the Republican leaders in and out of Congress. Now that the corner has been turned and they have been saved from the wreck and a few of the measures, by a divided Court, have been held unconstitutional, they conceal the fact they supported the legislation and are now the sharpest critics of it.

They are ingrates, demagogues, and hypocrites.

They are unwilling, now that they have been towed to the shore, to contribute to the relief of the poor and distressed.

They hide behind every smoke screen. They are so-called defenders of the Constitution. They are desperately afraid State rights will be invaded.

They fear for the freedom of speech, the press, and religion. They are afraid of a dictatorship. They organized the Liberty League and dozens of others with names to deceive the people, all financed by the Du Ponts and their allies, enriched through special privilege, and employ high-salaried newspaper and magazine writers to publish propaganda against the New Deal and the Roosevelt administration.

These men, for the most part, are the members of chambers of commerce. They prepare and circularize the country with resolutions, all critical of the New Deal, and all against the further contribution through taxes to relieve the unemployed, to feed the hungry, and to aid the old and infirm. Their financial, selfish souls have withered until they could not be seen with the highest powered microscope.

They resort to all kinds of misleading propaganda to deceive. The truth is, they are opposed to all kinds of progressive social-

security legislation for the benefit of the great mass of human-kind.

They know no party allegiance. They are political acrobats, who jump from one party to another with both brazenry and agility.

They never had the experience of the joy of unselfish service.

If they temporarily were inspired to act as described by the following lines of the Battle Hymn of the Republic—

"In the beauty of the lilies
Christ was born across the sea;
As he died to make men holy,
Let us die to set men free!"—

they would die of heart attack.

Their pleasure lies in counting the mounting shekels wrung from the poor. They are prevented by the Constitution, State rights, and all kinds of manufactured propaganda from contributing to the happiness of mankind.

At the head of the list stand the Du Ponts, millionaire munition makers of Delaware. They have contributed heavily to financing the Liberty League, directed by Jouett Shouse at a salary of \$35,000 per annum.

Sloan, at the head of the General Motors, in 1934 received \$201,128. He has been criticizing the New Deal before chambers of commerce across the continent.

W. R. Hearst, who owns a string of papers from New York to California, is another critic and Landon admirer. He is allotted a salary of \$500,000. Recently he announced the removal of his citizenship from the State of California because of the State income-tax law.

William S. Knudsen, executive vice president of General Motors, draws \$211,128. The highest paid executive in 1934 was Thomas J. Watson, president, International Business Machines Corporation. He received \$365,358.

Does anyone believe that either of these high-salaried executives is in sympathy with the depressed or wants to contribute through taxes to his welfare?

Charles Schwab, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel, receives \$250,000.

Eugene Grace, president of Bethlehem Steel, receives \$180,000.

George Horace Lorimer, editor of Saturday Evening Post, \$100,000. Has anyone seen an article in his magazine in favor of the New Deal? The highest priced writers in the Nation are hired to criticize Roosevelt and the New Deal in its columns.

Sewell Avery, president of Montgomery, Ward & Co., \$100,000. They can and do contribute millions to defeat progressive legislation to better the conditions of the people.

One of their subsidiary organizations is named the Sentinels of the Republic. There are dozens of them, all financed by the captains of industry, to press down more heavily the crown of thorns on the brow of labor.

They handpicked Harding in 1920, threw up a smoke screen of the League of Nations behind which he and Fall and Daugherty and Forbes concealed themselves and chuckled when they deceived the people. They were to pick the "best minds" to run the Government.

The Hoover convention at Cleveland selected Landon because his views on national questions were unknown. The convention was dominated by Hoover. He was the leading spirit. Do you want a return of the stock crash of 1929; the price of farm products of 1932? If so, vote for Landon. He was transplanted from Pennsylvania a few years ago. He has the Pennsylvania viewpoint now. Those opposed to Roosevelt looked him over, found him colorless, his views on national questions unknown, and after studying his background, this Hoover convention placed their stamp of approval upon him.

It is urged that the public debt has been increased and the Budget remains unbalanced. To this there are three answers:

First. In the name of humanity, employment must be found for those out of work so that their families shall not suffer, their children go hungry and naked.

Second. Much of the money has been loaned through the R. F. C., H. O. L. C., and other agencies, and is now being returned to the Treasury and will be used to assist in retiring the bonds.

Third. The increased indebtedness has been financed not in the interest of Wall Street, but at extremely low rates of interest so that the interest on the outstanding public debt is less than under the Hoover administration.

Fourth. The Budget has been balanced as to the ordinary expenditures. The extraordinary or emergency expenditures, including \$750,000,000 for flood control, \$1,425,000,000 for future relief for the unemployed, approximately \$2,235,000,000 for the payment of the soldiers' bonus, and other emergency expenditures, in all aggregating more than \$5,000,000,000, and none ordinary expenditures, makes it impossible while the emergency continues to balance the Budget.

Everything points to continued recovery. While the newspaper headlines and editorials criticize and abuse Roosevelt every news item points to improved conditions.

Every economist in the country predicts the worst of the depression is over.

The industries are all running. Freight earnings are better. Post-office receipts are above normal. Farm prices have trebled and but for the droughts of 1934 and 1935 the farmers of Oklahoma would be in fair condition. Every business, great and small, reports an increase. Confidence has been restored.

We must take no backward step that leads to the despair of 1932.

Roosevelt carried all but six States in 1932. The recent primary vote in Illinois when he received 450,000 more votes than the combined votes for the Republican candidates BORAH and Knox, now Republican Vice-Presidential nominee, and by the tremendous majority he received in rock-ribbed Pennsylvania, Maryland, and other States, he may carry the other six States in November 1936.

Roosevelt carried Oklahoma in 1932 by 516,468 votes to 188,165 for Hoover.

This was a majority of 328,303, or approximately 3 to 1. We must maintain this majority over Hoover's candidate, Landon, in 1936. And with him we must elect an entire State, congressional, and county ticket in sympathy with his program.

Franklin D. Roosevelt has a fine educational background. He knows the history of our Government. He has had extended experience. He was an aggressive liberal in the New York State Legislature. He served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the World War, during the Wilson administration; he ran for Vice President on the Democratic ticket with James M. Cox in 1920, and the Republicans won with their colorless nominee, Warren G. Harding, whose administration they have been trying to forget ever since; he served two terms as Governor of New York, elected for the first term by 25,000 majority and reelected for the second term by 725,000 majority.

He was inaugurated President March 4, 1933. He is a man of great courage, of broad vision, and high ideals. No man who has ever occupied the White House has shown greater sympathy for the toiling masses or for the farmers of the country. When the history of his administration is written it will stand out among the best in the history of our Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a letter addressed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] by President Green, of the American Federation of Labor on House Joint Resolution 632.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12796. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina", approved May 10, 1928, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 179; U. S. C., Supp. I, title 28, sec. 179).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1790. An act for the relief of Margaret Murphy;

S. 3055. An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3505. An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States;

S. 4490. An act for the relief of F. W. Elmer;

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to provide for an inquiry by the Court of Claims with respect to losses sustained by cooperative marketing associations in connection with stabilization activities in grain; and

S. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, and to clarify the duties of the Comptroller General in connection with said act.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on June 20, 1936, they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM B. OLIVER, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, AND A. H. CARMICHAEL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, in the shifting turns of political fortune it is not unusual for any State to lose the services of a valuable Member. It seldom falls to the lot of a State, however, to sustain a threefold loss such as befalls Alabama at the end of the present Congress.

One of these retiring Members who quits because of physical exhaustion and loss of health incident to the hard work imposed upon Members of Congress in these unusual times, held high place on one of the great committees of this House, the Committee on Appropriations, and was one of our most valuable and beloved Members, industrious, of wide information, a great Member of Congress, WILLIAM B. OLIVER. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Another Member of our delegation does not retire voluntarily nor does he retire with the consent or with the approval of any colleague in this House on either side of the aisle [applause]. A Member of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a man of superb courage, marvelous ability, unflagging industry, the dread of every antagonist that ever opposed him in debate, the intrepid GEORGE HUDDLESTON. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Another member of our delegation whose tenure has been brief who retires voluntarily, leaves us with the esteem, confidence, the affectionate regard and admiration of every Member of this House. A man who won high place in the legislature of his State from term to term, having been honored by the highest office within the gift of that body, a great lawyer. For personal reasons he prefers to retire to private life and resume the practice of his beloved profession. A man who is worthy of every confidence and every honor, a man who is capable of winning the highest place in this body, had he seen fit to continue his service. He leaves us enjoying the esteem, the admiration, and the confidence of every Member of this House, ARCHIE CARMICHAEL. [Applause, the Members rising.]

We are proud of these beloved Members of this body. We are proud of the record they leave as a great heritage to their State and to the Nation. They quit with the good wishes and affectionate regard of every Member of this body. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it might seem an anticlimax for me to attempt to add anything to what my colleague [Mr. STEAGALL] has said of the three Members from Alabama who are retiring. The applause and ovation that you have given these three gentlemen demonstrates the esteem and the affection in which they are held in your hearts, and yet I would be recreant to my strongest impulse if I did not leave some record here of my individual feelings and of my regret that these gentlemen are to depart from us.

Mr. OLIVER enjoys a unique record. Not only was he esteemed and beloved by his colleagues in this House, but for a period of some 20 years' time he was returned continuously to this House without opposition. Of the many able and splendid gentlemen who have served in this body during the past quarter of a century, he stands in the front ranks, and as long as our Nation can send to the Congress of the United States such able, conscientious, devoted, courageous, and exceptional statesmen as he, the country is safe.

No man could serve in this body with Mr. HUDDLESTON without admiring his fine courage, his absolute sincerity, his devotion to principle, and his superb ability. He leaves us, but he leaves us with the knowledge that he never retreated, he never surrendered, that he fought a good fight, and that he kept faith with his own conscience. [Applause.]

I have often said to our colleague [Mr. CARMICHAEL] that his one mistake was that he did not come to this body 25

years ago. He has written his name into the legislative history of Alabama, having placed upon our statute books perhaps more legislation for the cause of education, for the cause of public health, and of good roads, than any other man who has ever served that State. In this body he has served faithfully, loyally, and with distinction.

I know I voice the sentiments of each of you when I say that we wish to these friends, these gentlemen, all God-speed in the days to come. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the great loss the House of Representatives is about to sustain in the retirement of the three Alabama statesmen just mentioned; but Alabama is not the only State that is about to lose splendid Representatives. The State of Illinois is, I regret to say, about to lose by voluntary retirement four of the most active and able Members of the House, and it has lost by resignations and the death of our late amiable and able colleague, Mr. Buckbee, who served here many years with rare devotion and singular success, during this Congress three other Members of like qualities.

The House of Representatives and the great State of Illinois are experiencing and will continue to experience a serious, temporary deficiency in the voluntary retirement of these experienced legislators.

I have been a Member of the House for 30 long years, and I want to say quite seriously that the State of Illinois, which has made monumental contributions to the membership of this House, during this period never has been represented by more loyal and able Representatives than those who have served our State during the last two Congresses.

They have been untiring and zealous in the application of their rare ability for the public weal. Their successors shall have to work hard to equal—they cannot surpass—the enviable reputations of these gentlemen. They have made a valuable contribution here to their country's welfare in a most important era, and as they return to private life I am sure their foremost thoughts and efforts will continue to be directed to the common good of our great country.

I regret exceedingly, as I know the House and the country as a whole do, the loss of our colleagues Mr. Dobbins, Mr. Adair, Mr. Mason, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Igoe, and Mr. Arnold, the latter having been honored by appointment to an important judicial position in our Government. Mr. Igoe early in his service here was prevailed upon to accept the position of United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, which deprived the House of a legislator of inordinate ability and sagacity. I am sure that we all wish them good health and much deserved success in any endeavors.

In addition to the loss of these outstanding Members we are losing a good many other very able Members from other States by their voluntary retirement. I hope that the States will see to it that we here get in their stead loyal and able Representatives who will assiduously cooperate for the continued uniform success of beneficent Democratic principles. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully and wholly in what has been said by my colleague about the beloved Members who are leaving the House, but I would be untrue to my feelings, and I would fail to express the wish of every Member of the Texas delegation if I did not for them and for myself take this moment to express our deep regret that our friend and colleague, O. H. Cross, will not be a Member of the next Congress. [Applause.]

I know, speaking in his hearing, that I express the wish of every Member of this House when I say that in the

years to come all of us wish that he shall enjoy to the fullest extent the rich blessings of health, peace, and prosperity. [Applause.]

GEORGE BURNHAM

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the State of California is losing a man who has served our State faithfully and well during his term of office. I am sure that I express the sentiment of every man in this House on either side of the aisle when I say that we all deeply regret that GEORGE BURNHAM, of California, is not going to return to the next Congress. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. BURNHAM, by his kindly manner, has endeared himself to each and every one of us. He has represented his district in a most efficient and effective way. It is a great loss to the people of his district, his State and country that he is unwilling to seek reelection and, Colleague GEORGE BURNHAM, I am sure I express the sentiment of each and every Member of this House when I say to you that the good wishes of all of us go with you throughout the years that are to come. [Applause.]

ISABELLE GREENWAY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I entirely concur in all that the previous speakers have said of the colleagues who have been associated with us for so many years and who will be absent in the next Congress. I deeply regret, just as you do, that they will not be with us when the Seventy-fifth Congress convenes, and may I also at this time say that we are conscious of great regret, and I feel I am voicing the sentiments of all my colleagues in the House when I say we are sorry we shall not have with us in the next Congress Mrs. GREENWAY. [Applause, the Members rising.]

In the very short time that Mrs. GREENWAY has been with us she has endeared herself because of her fine qualities of mind and heart, and we sincerely hope that in a very short time Mrs. GREENWAY will return to us, if not on this side of the House on the other side of the Capitol. [Applause.]

May I say, Mrs. GREENWAY, we need women of your type in public life. You carry with you not only our regard but also the affection of every Member of this House. We hope you will have the greatest success in whatever you may undertake and the best of health to carry on the plans you are now making to relieve unemployment in the country. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest the speeches made at Cleveland by our minority leader and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER].

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may be permitted to place in the RECORD the address of the keynoter at the Democratic convention in Philadelphia, Senator BARKLEY, the address of the permanent chairman of the convention, and the address of the man who will receive the nomination at that convention and be elected President of the United States in November next.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair demands the regular order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JOHN J. M'SWAIN

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly to announce to you this evening that one of our colleagues from South Carolina is voluntarily retiring from this body and

going back to his beloved State of South Carolina, where he will engage in the practice of law. He is leaving us of his own free will and accord, and going back to practice his profession of law where he lived before coming to the Congress.

I may say that it would not be any trouble for my friend and colleague to be returned to this House if he would go back and ask his constituents to send him here. His leaving us is largely because of his physical condition, which has been brought about because he has given his every energy to the welfare and interests of the people of South Carolina and of the country.

I announce with deep regret to my colleagues that our friend and colleague JOHN J. McSWAIN will not come back to us in the next Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I concur in all that has been said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] about that generous friend and princely gentleman [JOHN McSWAIN] of South Carolina. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Will the gentleman add that without the shadow of a doubt that sentiment is concurred in by every Member who ever served under him as Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs? [Applause.]

Mr. HILL of Alabama. The gentleman from New Hampshire is absolutely right. There is no braver, manlier man than JOHN McSWAIN [applause,] and it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I salute him tonight and see him depart from this body.

A few days ago the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] has been chairman, tendered a luncheon to the members of that committee. On the occasion of this luncheon, the minority leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], and I attempted to voice our appreciation and our esteem of the gentleman from South Carolina and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD the addresses delivered by the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from New Jersey, and myself.

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

There was no objection.

PRESENTATION OF SILVER VASE TO HON. JOHN J. McSWAIN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on June 4 last the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], entertained the members of the Committee on Military Affairs at a luncheon in his office. On this occasion the members of the Committee presented to the retiring chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN], a beautiful silver vase as a token of their appreciation and esteem. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the minority leader, and I endeavored to voice our regret as well as that of the other members of the committee and of the membership of the House over the fact that Mr. McSWAIN is leaving Congress and we sought to express the great esteem in which he is held. Mr. McSWAIN made response to the remarks. Under leave granted me, I extend herewith the remarks made on the occasion.

REMARKS OF MR. McLEAN, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. McSWAIN, Mr. SNELL, and colleagues of the committee, what started out to be a simple little social gathering of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs has developed important propo-

sitions. When we arranged this party a week or so ago it was merely for the purpose of affording an opportunity to conclude the work of the committee and bid each other adieu in somewhat the same pleasant manner that we began the work of the Seventy-fourth Congress together as the guests of the chairman at his home. Undertaken facetiously, it concludes seriously.

On Saturday our chairman announced his determination to retire from Congress, and last night Joseph W. Byrns, Speaker of the House, beloved by all of us who have served under him, was taken from us. Only yesterday he asked me the hour of our meeting and gave me his assurances he would be with us today. I made the suggestion that in view of the tragedy perhaps we should cancel our program, but after conference with others it was decided to carry it out as arranged, that with due reverence and with his memory warm in our hearts and minds it would not be construed in any way disrespectful to his memory, and that no doubt it would be his wish that we should do so.

When word came to me of the determination of Mr. McSWAIN to retire, our proposed gathering provided an opportunity to honor him, and the occasion could not have been more happily arranged had we been in possession of advance information.

One does not have to prove that the Committee on Military Affairs, as now constituted, is not only an important committee but a useful, hard-working, and harmonious committee as well. All that we are ready to admit. It is a fact that every member is so familiar with its work that any one of them is prepared to act as chairman whenever occasion may require. Our deliberations are marked by the freest discussion and exchange of confidence, and partisan differences do not seem to disturb our otherwise cordial relations.

There is a reason for this. The real work of Congress is done in committee and much depends on the chairman. His duties extend beyond that of a mere presiding officer, or as the director of the committee program. The proper sort of chairman regards himself as responsible in some degree for the success of the new Members of Congress assigned to his committee, and will hold himself always ready to assist them in shaping their congressional career in and out of the committee. Mr. McSWAIN has always been considerate and thoughtful. He has assigned the work with the idea of developing in each of us knowledge of facts and procedure, and has been willing to assume responsibility for any mistakes that might occur. Those of us who have come to the committee since he has been its chairman—and that covers a large majority of its members—have been made to feel that he regarded us as the affectionate schoolmaster regards his pupils, and glories in their progress. And so we have arranged that he may have a reminder of our happy association together, our affection and esteem, which it has seemed appropriate should be presented to him by the gentleman from Alabama [LISTER HILL].

REMARKS OF MR. HILL OF ALABAMA

Mr. McLEAN, Mr. SNELL, and gentlemen of the committee, I am sure that I express the sentiments of all of us when I say how happy and how honored we are to have the distinguished minority leader of the House, Mr. SNELL, with us. The last words our beloved Speaker, Joe Byrns, spoke to me were that he would be with us at this hour and what a pleasure it would be to him. Just before I left the office our new Speaker, Mr. BANKHEAD, of Alabama, telephoned and asked me to say to you how sorry he was that he could not be at this gathering, but that a call to come to the White House made it impossible.

It was with a sad heart and with feelings of deep emotion that I heard our chairman, JOHN McSWAIN, announce last Saturday evening in my home city of Montgomery, Ala., that he would not be a candidate for reelection to Congress. I know that the deep regret which I feel over his going is shared by each and every one of you. Since our chairman's announcement of his retirement I have seen many Members of the House—there has not been a single one of them who has not borne testimony in the highest terms of his appreciation of JOHN McSWAIN and who has not expressed his regret that he is to leave us.

"What is the secret of your life?" asked Elizabeth Browning of Charles Kingsley; "tell me, for I want to make mine beautiful, too." His reply was, "I had a friend." We of the Committee on Military Affairs have had a friend. We have had JOHN McSWAIN, and because of his friendship our lives have been made fuller and richer and our memories will be sweeter and happier. We shall never forget the fine, rollicking good humor of his friendship and his hearty laugh. We shall never forget his many acts of gracious kindness, his desire always to be fair and impartial, and his efforts to help, to guide, and to promote each and every member of the committee. We have been proud of him as our chairman. Creative of thought, indefatigable of effort, independent of spirit, and always the patriot, he has during the 12 years of his service on the committee made notable contributions to its work. I think the record will show that no man has contributed more constructively, more profoundly, or more greatly to the legislation of the committee. He has ever sought to serve the best interest of the committee, the best interest of the Congress, and the welfare of his country. His name is written into the legislative history of our Nation.

Because of his exceptional ability, his unswerving devotion, and most of all because of his high courage, JOHN McSWAIN has been an outstanding chairman. During the past 12 years there have been in the House of Representatives no finer or higher exhibitions of courage than those displayed by him. Oftentimes when I have seen him sick of body and tired of mind, harassed and

vexed by a thousand trials and tribulations, I have thought of the lines of the old English ballad:

"Fight on, my men," says Sir Andrew Barton,
"I am hurt, but I am not slaine;
I'll lie me down and bleed a while,
And then I'll rise and fight againe."

Men like to follow a brave leader. JOHN McSWAIN has been a lusty warrior—worthy of the best of us. We have felt privileged to follow his leadership. He has been one of the choice and master spirits of the House—a knight without fear and without reproach.

As I stand here today realizing that JOHN McSWAIN is soon to leave us, into my mind come the lines of Scotland's sweet poet, Bobby Burns, on his friend the Earl of Glencairn:

"The bridegroom may forget the bride
Was made his wedded wife yestreen;
The monarch may forget the crown
That on his head an hour has been;
The mother may forget the child
That smiles sae sweetly on her knee;
But I'll remember thee, Glencairn,
And a' that thou hast done for me!"

This silver vase bears this inscription: "To Hon. JOHN J. McSWAIN, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, from his colleagues of the committee as a token of their esteem and affection, June 4, 1936." We present it to you, John. It literally overflows with our esteem and our love. It carries with it our wish that it may be a constant reminder to you that although you are not with us in person you remain in our hearts. Our appreciation of you and our devotion to you are as abiding as time itself.

REMARKS OF MR. SNELL, OF NEW YORK

Mr. McLEAN and members of the House Military Affairs Committee, I feel greatly honored on being invited to join with the members of the Military Affairs Committee at an informal luncheon in honor of the chairman of your committee, Mr. McSWAIN, of South Carolina.

Mr. McSWAIN and I have been very warm personal friends for a great many years, and it so happened that when Mr. McSWAIN came to Congress I was chairman of the War Claims Committee, and Mr. McSWAIN was assigned to that committee. At that time there were a great many very important matters before that committee, and I think I can truthfully say that we gave each and every one of them very careful and considerate attention. I was impressed from the very beginning with the thoroughness and careful attention that Mr. McSWAIN gave to each claim that was assigned to him.

Mr. McSWAIN has also done me the honor to invite me to visit him at his home in South Carolina. I have always thought that I should avail myself of the opportunity, but up to the present time I have been unable to do so, but I have been assured by him that the latchstring is still hanging out, and I hope to be able to take advantage of the invitation some time in the near future.

It was with very deep regret that I learned a few days ago that our old friend "Mac" did not intend to be a candidate for reelection to Congress. While, of course, I know that he has good and sufficient reason for that decision, nevertheless it is a real disappointment to his many friends here in the House that he has decided to go back to his chosen profession, the practice of law.

Whether he has any other political aspirations or not I do not know, but I am very sure that if he does have that all of his colleagues here in the House, on both sides of the aisle, firmly hope that he will be successful along that line. We are also very sure that there will be no question about his immediate success in taking up and renewing his law practice. Whatever he does his colleagues wish him Godspeed, and will always be pleased to see him when he makes, as I hope he will, frequent visits to the House of Representatives.

REMARKS OF MR. McSWAIN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. McLEAN and my colleagues of the Committee on Military Affairs, You have done me too great honor by this gathering and by the generous remarks already made by such friends as LISTER HILL, Mr. SNELL, and others. Words are inadequate to express my deep appreciation for all the kindness that you have shown me through all these years, and more especially for the material evidence of your kindly feeling toward me in the form of the magnificent silver vase, so appropriately inscribed.

My colleagues and my friends, I am voluntarily leaving the Congress after 16 years of hard work, and I beg each of you to testify that during that time I have never advocated or urged a single measure that was tinged in the slightest with selfishness for either myself or for the district that has sent me here to represent its people. I have tried to give all my service to the benefit of all the people of all the country. It is my belief that one section or part of the country cannot prosper or thrive at the expense of another section. It is impossible for one district to grow rich by Federal appropriations that must represent taxes from other districts. I have been fortunate, and I modestly believe that the country has been fortunate, in that I have no fort, field, arsenal, or other War Department activity in my district. For that reason, I have been free of the inevitable local pressure

to make terms with the War Department in order that my district might get more appropriations. I have regarded national defense as a national problem. I have not been the partisan of the Army as against the Navy, nor of the Air Corps as against the ground troops or the sea forces. I am as much interested in one instrumentality for insuring the national defense as I am in another instrumentality. I am as much for the Navy as I am for the Army, and I am no more for the air forces than I am for the ground forces and the sea forces. I have repeated these generalities in your presence, not because you are unfamiliar with my views. I know that you have already heard them hundreds of times, but I thought that the solemnity of the occasion might add impressiveness to their restatement.

I thank the minority leader for his attendance at our little gathering and I wish to record the sorrow and sense of loss in my own heart occasioned by the sudden and unexpected death of our Speaker last night, and I feel that each of you mourns the loss of the Speaker as a personal friend. His patience, his tolerance and toleration, his zeal for efficiency and for economy in government, will long remain as an inspiration to all of us who have labored with him.

While this is, in a sense, a good-bye gathering, and while it is hard for me to tear myself away from these good and strong patriotic citizens with whom I have been laboring, yet I must confess a sense of relief in that the burdens will soon pass from my shoulders. This is a very hard working committee. We have approximately fifteen hundred bills on our calendar now. It is especially hard for the chairman. Under the burden of these labors I have struggled as best I could. All of you know the mistakes that I have made, but amidst them all there has been but one great outstanding purpose and objective in my mind and heart, and that has been to promote the well-being of our country from sea to sea and from lake to Gulf, by promoting the efficiency and the economy of our defense forces. At this stage of the world's development it is absolutely essential that we maintain a reasonably adequate defensive establishment for the protection of our people against the invasion of our rights, whether by sea or by air or by land. National defense with me is a unity and not a trinity. National defense is the single concrete result that we all should seek, and it should be at the minimum of expense to insure reasonable safety. I believe that the investigation which we have conducted will promote both efficiency and economy in the Army for at least the next 50 years.

Though I must lay these burdens and responsibilities down I am sure they will be carried on by younger, stronger, and better soldiers of the common good. Especially am I happy that my dear friend, LISTER HILL, whom I love as I would a younger brother, will become the chairman of this great committee, and I feel sure that his administration of its affairs will add increased luster to the fame of the committee, and that the interests of the country, so far as the jurisdiction of this committee is concerned, will be safe in his hands, especially when they are upheld by the other members of the committee.

And now, in conclusion, I repeat that I have sought to follow the example set by those predecessors under whom I have served, such as Percy Quin, W. Frank James, John M. Morin, John C. McKenzie, and Julius Kahn, by ignoring party lines and by distributing the responsibility for decision and action throughout the entire membership of the committee. It has been my slogan that "Where national defense begins, partisan politics must end." I do not recall that party names have ever been used in any committee meeting except sometimes in a jocular way. I am sure partisan feeling has never been in my heart, and I do not believe it has been in the heart of any member of the committee on either side. We are interested in the safety of America. The problems of national defense are the same and will be the same, irrespective of which party may be in power. Our national policies, which in a large measure determine our defensive policies, and our strategic situation and its problems are all fixed quantities and do not admit of variation when the party label changes in the administration of our Government's affairs.

Already I feel the exhilaration of freedom. Already I can face my friends and constituents without being perplexed by political considerations. I am going back to South Carolina, back to my home town of Greenville, there to live among the friends of a lifetime. I am not going to be hanging around Washington, pretending to practice law, while, in fact, snatching a few fees here and there for lobbying or quasi-lobbying. Of course, I may be a visitor among you occasionally, and, of course, I would not turn down a good fee to be earned in any honorable manner, but I will be a home-town lawyer and not a hanger-on around Washington. For that reason I am enjoying a sense of exhilaration, so dear to a Scotchman's heart, arising from the realization that henceforth I will be free, and that I can and will serve my people and my country as a private citizen without constantly keeping in mind the thought of my personal political fortunes. Believe it or not, such freedom is the life breath of a Scotchman's soul.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to inform the President of the United States that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communication to make, has performed that duty. We are directed by the President to inform the Congress that he has no further communication to submit to the Congress.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMUEL B. HILL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I would be unfaithful to my highest sense of duty were I not to express my profound and sincere regrets and my own personal loss and, I am sure, the loss to each Member of this House, by the voluntary retirement from the Congress of the Honorable SAMUEL B. HILL, of the State of Washington, to take up his important work in another branch of the Government. [Applause.] To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a loss that I cannot adequately express by mere words. Since I have had the honor of presiding over the great Committee on Ways and Means, for almost 4 years SAM HILL has sat at my right as the ranking member of that great committee.

I can say in all truth and sincerity that during my more than 25 years of service here, knowing so many able and capable men, I have never known one who has served his committee and his country with greater ability and with greater fidelity than SAM HILL. He is a man of outstanding ability and is as loyal a man as ever walked the earth. He has been to me not only a friend but a most useful and indispensable helper. In the great work of our committee I have had the faithful and loyal assistance of every member on that committee, but SAM HILL, sitting at my right, has never been called upon for any service that he has not faithfully and efficiently performed in a most thorough manner. I am sure that I voice the sentiment of every Member of this House when I express a most deep, sincere, and profound regret at his leaving, and also a fervent and earnest hope that he may be as useful and as happy in his new work as he has been in the work that he so ably performed here, and that his future life may be strewn with roses of most perfect perfume. I regret that I do not have language at my disposal, that my words are inadequate, to express my profound regret at his departure from this House. [Applause.]

REPRESENTATIVE THEODORE CHRISTIANSON

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 or 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House shares with the Minnesota delegation regret at the retirement from this body of our colleague, former Governor THEODORE CHRISTIANSON. [Applause.] He has served with distinction in this body for the past 4 years. Governor CHRISTIANSON will go to the Senate, where, I am sure, he will add further luster to a long distinguished career.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I bid hail and farewell to the 125 or 150 of our colleagues who will involuntarily retire from this body. We shall miss them, but I assure them that when we take over the reins everything will go as per schedule.

WILLIAM B. OLIVER AND JOHN N. SANDLIN

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to speak. I rise to testify—to give my testimony to the splendid record of the application of the principles of intelligent economy to the administration of Federal Government by two of my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations who will not

serve in the next Congress, Mr. OLIVER and Mr. SANDLIN, of Louisiana. [Applause.]

They need no praise from my lips. Their records speak louder than the lips of men and testify to the fact that this country has lost the most valuable service of two of the most valuable Members of Congress. I thank you. [Applause.]

WARREN J. DUFFEY, WILLIAM L. FIESINGER, AND STEPHEN M. YOUNG

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ohio delegation I just want to say a word or two about the departure from our body of three distinguished Members from Ohio, Messrs. DUFFEY, FIESINGER, and YOUNG. All of us who have had occasion to serve with those three gentlemen can testify very truthfully as to their high degree of ability, and their conscientious devotion to duty. I know we regret their passing. I am sorry to say Mr. DUFFEY, because of illness, is not able to be with us here tonight, to give us an opportunity to say a word of kindness to him and to cheer him on his way. I hope and I know we all hope that he will soon recover.

Edward Markham wrote a few lines that it seems to me should indicate our feeling toward the three men of whom I am speaking, when he said:

"There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
None goes his way alone;
All that we send into the lives of others,
Comes back into our own."

The truth of these words should give those three gentlemen who are retiring from service much comfort, because they have sent into the lives of others things from which they will receive much joy in receiving them back to their own.

I thank you. [Applause.]

EDWARD MORAN AND WILLIAM N. ROGERS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'CONNOR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, we are about to lose one of our New England colleagues from this House, a Member who is voluntarily retiring, a man who could return to Congress, possibly, as often as he wanted to, but who is voluntarily retiring. He is a man who has given fine service in his terms in the House of Representatives. I refer to Mr. EDWARD MORAN from Maine, who is voluntarily retiring. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I know that the House will be very glad to learn that a distinguished member of the Committee on Military Affairs is going to be the next United States Senator from the State of New Hampshire, leaving this House, WILLIAM N. ROGERS. [Applause.]

TILMAN B. PARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the closing minutes of the Seventy-fourth Congress our hearts are saddened to be reminded that many of our colleagues, for one reason or other, will not return to the next Congress. Several are voluntarily retiring from public life. Among those distinguished Members who are leaving Congress voluntarily is a neighbor of mine, who has served with distinction from the great State of Arkansas for the past eight consecutive terms. He is not only a patriotic American, but he is a statesman and a gentleman, who has the confidence, respect, and admiration of all Members of this House. I know I voice the sentiment of all Members of this body when I say we sincerely regret that he will not return to Congress, where he has given 16 years of valu-

able, unselfish service to his State and Nation. I refer to none other than the distinguished and patriotic Member who is chairman of one of the important subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee of the House, the Honorable TILMAN B. PARKS, of Arkansas. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE SPEAKER

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased personally, and on behalf of the minority, to offer this resolution expressing our thanks and appreciation for the consideration and courtesy that has been shown us by the present Speaker. [Applause.] The same was true of him during the time that he acted as and was majority leader of the House.

I consider the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives one of the greatest positions in the gift of the American people. It is certainly second only to the Presidency of the United States. No man ever comes to that position unless he has real ability, character, and legislative experience. I consider that the present Speaker of this House has a generous amount of each of these qualifications [applause], and I am proud to call him "Mr. Speaker" and "my personal friend WILL BANKHEAD."

I desire at this time also to express my appreciation to the able, genial chairman of the Rules Committee and acting majority leader. [Applause.] As today has developed, I do not always agree with the chairman of the Rules Committee, but usually when I have criticized him on the floor of the House he has retorted in this manner: That his long association and service with another gentleman from New York who once was chairman of the Rules Committee had influenced him to do such things as he did. [Laughter.] I want him to know that I appreciate, outside of that, the consideration he has given us.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my thanks for the loyal and hearty support the Members of the majority have given me during this session of Congress. At the same time, I desire to express my appreciation to my friends on the other side of the aisle also for the consideration they have given the minority leader. [Applause.]

And to all my colleagues I wish, as you depart for home, that you have a very pleasant, enjoyable, and happy vacation; that you may have the rest you are entitled to after the arduous work of the Seventy-fourth Congress. God bless you all. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker [applause, the Members rising]—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, profoundly grateful, not only for the resolution offered by the distinguished minority leader and adopted by this House but also for his cordial and generous expressions of praise for my humble and limited services as a Member of this body.

I must confess that I make this acknowledgment of my gratitude and appreciation with a saddened heart, because I must remember that it has only been a few days since one greater than I presided over the destinies of this House. We took him to Tennessee and laid him to rest, surrounded, to use a quotation, by the proud and affectionate solicitude of a

great constituency. Peace to the ashes of a great Speaker of this House! He was the friend of every man who sat in it on either side of the aisle; and so my elevation to the distinguished and responsible post to which I have been raised by the unanimous approval of my colleagues came to me tinged with sadness and with elements of great personal sorrow and regret.

But I want to thank you, my colleagues, for this mark of your confidence and esteem.

I have served in this Chamber and in this body for 20 years, one-fifth of a century. This is a rather long time for a man to serve in any legislative body, longer probably than I have deserved to serve here. I do not know how many hundreds of men I have seen come and go during this period of service, but I may say to my colleagues here upon this floor, to those who may be listening in the galleries tonight as American citizens, to those cartoonists who desire to make smart epigrams, and to those who sometimes desire to lampoon the individuality and personality of the Congress of the United States that as long as the Congress of the United States is represented by the type of men in character and attainment that I have served with here for the last 20 years, so long is this Republic secure. [Applause.]

Oh, we have differences of opinion. This is a Government by political parties in large measure, and even on our own side or on your side there are honest differences of opinion and judgment between men who are anxious to preserve their moral and intellectual integrities as they should. But in its last analysis, this so-called dividing line between the Democrats and Republicans is but a myth and a tradition. We who sit on this side representing our great Democratic constituencies, you gentlemen who sit on that side representing Republican constituencies, or Independent or Progressive constituencies are but the agents of the American people.

We are here to perform a great and solemn act and duty. If we may make mistakes in judgment, we may make mistakes in conclusions, but it is an honor, as I see it, to serve in this body. There is not a man or woman who has ever come to this House except there was some reason of talent, attainment, credit, or honor why they should have been sent here.

I did not intend to embark upon a discourse on the character of this body and I beg your pardon for it. I am deeply grateful to you for the honor you have paid me under the tragical circumstances of my succession to the speakership.

I walked out there in the Speaker's lobby this afternoon and looked at the portraits of the great men who have filled this position in the past, and I felt in my heart that I could never measure up to the great heights of the men who had served in this exalted office. But I did pray God to let me do the very best I could within the limits of my capabilities.

So I thank you, my friends. You have had a hard and strenuous session. We have had our differences of opinion. I do not know how our tasks will be approved by the country. I imagine that some of my friends on the left will say we have made some mistakes, not only in this session but in others. This is a matter of political controversy, but this is a government of public opinion, and we will meet the issue in November. But that is not what we are thinking about here in this last meditative hour of the closing session of a great Congress midst the representatives of a great people. Whether you be from the West, the East, the North, or the South you are their Congressmen, you are their friends, and we have all on both sides of this aisle done our dead level best to help our constituencies. We have made mistakes. Maybe we can correct them. Maybe our constituents will correct some of them by sending somebody else here as their representative. [Laughter.]

In departing, allow me to express my deep gratitude and thanks for the honor you have conferred upon me. I hope you may return to your homes in good spirits and in good health and carry with you the assurance that whether you come back here or not is in the lap of the gods, politically speaking. Whether you have been here for 1 term or 10

terms, you have served in this great popular branch of the Federal Government under the ensign of your State above you as the Representative of a great and a free people, and you are representing the people of a great republic, which, despite all of this clamor about communism, fascism, and all other isms, by the grace of God will endure for centuries because of the inherent patriotism and fine judgment of the American people. I thank you. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as has been remarked, we have approached the moment of the close of the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress. It has been a session full of toil and sorrow, because the dreaded black camel has knelt at the gates of many of our friends, but this is an hour when differences are forgotten, when, as the Speaker remarked, the aisle separating the minority from the majority disappears. We are no longer at this moment Democrats or Republicans, but Members of one great family that respects and trusts one another, that honors our Speaker, that loves truth and justice and the flag of our country which floats above the Speaker's head.

Mr. Speaker, in the name and on behalf of a united membership, I salute you, sir, and wish for you long life, health and happiness. [Applause.]

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 255. An act to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Eutaw Springs, in the State of South Carolina;

H. R. 1362. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. A. Ramey, doing business as Ramey Bros.;

H. R. 1397. An act to withdraw certain public lands from settlement and entry;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Albert H. Jacobson;

H. R. 2155. An act for the relief of Francisco M. Acayan;

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Cora Akins;

H. R. 2435. An act for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.;

H. R. 2932. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the International-Great Northern R. R. Co. against the United States;

H. R. 3777. An act for the relief of the Herald Publishing Co.;

H. R. 3866. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Emanuel Bratses;

H. R. 3943. An act for the relief of D. E. Wooldridge;

H. R. 3952. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Lee;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Ella B. Kimball, daughter and only heir of Jeremiah Simonson;

H. R. 4364. An act for the relief of Andrew Johnson;

H. R. 4641. An act authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan;

H. R. 4707. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles F. Eikenberg;

H. R. 5754. An act for the relief of Emma M. Pearson;

H. R. 5829. An act for the relief of Daniel J. Hagerty;

H. R. 6668. An act for the relief of S. John Hegstad;

H. R. 6719. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 6773. An act to provide for an investigation to determine whether the water rights of the United States have

been violated in the Clear Lake watershed, California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6951. An act for the relief of Thomas J. English;

H. R. 7256. An act for the relief of Perry H. Callahan and Malcolm W. Callahan;

H. R. 7463. An act for the relief of Lawrence R. Lennon;

H. R. 7642. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank W. Trick;

H. R. 7727. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George B. Marx, Inc.;

H. R. 7736. An act to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument;

H. R. 7818. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Hyde;

H. R. 7839. An act for the relief of C. E. Rightor;

H. R. 7864. An act for the relief of Edward P. Oldham, Jr.;

H. R. 8107. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the opening of the tri-State Territory of east Texas, north Louisiana, and south Arkansas by Capt. Henry Miller Shreve, to be held in Shreveport, La., and surrounding territory in 1935 and 1936;

H. R. 8316. An act to modify section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to individual Indian money;

H. R. 8321. An act for the relief of Julia Long;

H. R. 8322. An act for the relief of Merwin A. Kiel;

H. R. 8368. An act to enforce the twenty-first amendment;

H. R. 8373. An act for the relief of James Fitzgerald;

H. R. 8502. An act for the relief of Theresa Link, Wencil Link, Edward Block, and John Meyers;

H. R. 8521. An act for the relief of Elsie O'Brine;

H. R. 8555. An act to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, to repeal certain former legislation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8597. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley;

H. R. 8688. An act for the relief of Grace Schultz;

H. R. 8720. An act for the relief of Louis Manzumin;

H. R. 8799. An act for the relief of John N. Hunter, Edmund M. Cook, Fred C. Putnam, Merchants National Bank of South Bend, Ind., and St. Joseph Loan & Trust Co., of South Bend, Ind.;

H. R. 8841. An act for the relief of Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald;

H. R. 9078. An act for the relief of Bertha W. Lamphear;

H. R. 9111. An act for the relief of Evenell Durrance;

H. R. 9191. An act for the relief of dependents of James B. Kiley;

H. R. 9313. An act for the relief of the estate of Hans Dittmanson, deceased;

H. R. 9314. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry Copple, deceased;

H. R. 9315. An act for the relief of the estate of Fred Wilkins, deceased;

H. R. 10044. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Fernand H. Gouaux;

H. R. 10094. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269);

- H. R. 10168. An act for the relief of Arch A. Gary;
- H. R. 10279. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc.;
- H. R. 10439. An act for the relief of John B. Ricketts;
- H. R. 10504. An act for the relief of Booth & Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;
- H. R. 10591. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report on traffic conditions, with recommendations for corrective legislation;
- H. R. 10919. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 11022. An act for the relief of Ethel Armes;
- H. R. 11123. An act for the relief of Edward A. Foote, Jr., and others;
- H. R. 11176. An act increasing the penalty for making false oaths for the purpose of bathing at the Government free bathhouse at Hot Springs, Ark.;
- H. R. 11180. An act to extend the boundaries of the Fort Pulaski National Monument, Georgia, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 11331. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance by the Department of the Interior to the State of Minnesota of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 3, T. 159 N., R. 35 W., fifth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota;
- H. R. 11379. An act for the relief of William H. Milton;
- H. R. 11538. An act for the relief of the Orland reclamation project, California;
- H. R. 11555. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman in the Walla Walla Valley, Wash., and the founding of the Waiilatpu Mission;
- H. R. 11581. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 11597. An act for the relief of L. A. Peveler;
- H. R. 11615. An act limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;
- H. R. 11688. An act providing for a change in the design of the 50-cent pieces authorized to be coined in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Union;
- H. R. 11926. An act to provide for a term of court at Durham, N. C.;
- H. R. 12002. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Lackawanna River, with a view to the control of its floods;
- H. R. 12007. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Penobscot River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;
- H. R. 12008. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Androscoggin River, in Maine and New Hampshire, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;
- H. R. 12062. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept unsurveyed lands in numbered school sections in the State of Arizona in exchange for certain other lands, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co.;
- H. R. 12220. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundary of the Fort Marion National Monument, Florida, in the vicinity of Fort Marion Circle, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 12257. An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States Court for China to offenses committed on the high seas;
- H. R. 12324. An act to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended;
- H. R. 12353. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925;
- H. R. 12395. An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 12410. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934;
- H. R. 12455. An act to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 12458. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the intracoastal waterway throughout Broward County, Fla.;
- H. R. 12490. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy;
- H. R. 12494. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on Lake St. Clair, Mich.;
- H. R. 12624. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 12758. An act to increase the pension to certain veterans of the Regular Establishment on the rolls March 19, 1933;
- H. R. 12796. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina", approved May 10, 1928, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 179; U. S. C., Supp. I, title 28, sec. 179);
- H. R. 12876. An act to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of resettlement or rural-rehabilitation projects; to authorize payments to States, political subdivisions, and local taxing units in lieu of taxes on such premises; and for other purposes;
- H. R. 12971. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 27, 1935 (Public, No. 73, 74th Cong.), authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Lighthouse Reservation, Mich.;
- H. R. 13001. An act to eliminate unnecessary expense in the administration of estates of deceased and incompetent veterans, and for other purposes;
- H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a game management supply depot and laboratory, and for other purposes;
- H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a reentry permit to Tomio Mori Moto and his readmission upon application while such permit remains valid;
- H. J. Res. 532. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg in 1938;
- H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution amending section 5 of Public Resolution No. 6, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 4, 1935;
- H. J. Res. 608. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1938, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrer;
- H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution to provide certain administrative expenses for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of Interior, and for other purposes; and
- H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such methods of control of grasshoppers as in his judgment may be necessary.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 81. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture;

S. 1146. An act for the relief of Michael Dalton;

S. 1567. An act to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the War Minerals Relief Act;

S. 1790. An act for the relief of Margaret Murphy;

S. 1793. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Attorney General of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California", approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 602);

S. 1896. An act to provide interest payments on American Embassy drafts;

S. 2039. An act making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons to be employed to obstruct or interfere with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies;

H. J. Res. 641. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of expenses incurred in an election contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Twentieth Congressional District of the State of New York;

S. 2268. An act for the relief of Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.;

S. 2293. An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes";

S. 2647. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claims of subcontractors, materialmen, and laborers for material and labor furnished in the construction of a post-office building at Hempstead, N. Y.;

S. 2953. An act to provide for the inspection, control, and regulation of steam boilers and unfired pressure vessels in the District of Columbia;

S. 3055. An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3107. An act to exempt publicly owned interstate highway bridges from State, municipal, and local taxation;

S. 3143. An act for the relief of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners;

S. 3175. An act for the relief of Jesse Ashby;

S. 3247. An act to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of Public Works Administration slum-clearance and low-cost housing projects, to authorize payments to States and political subdivisions in lieu of taxes on such premises, and for other purposes;

S. 3405. An act for the relief of Capt. James W. Darr;

S. 3505. An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States;

S. 3733. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent to certain lands in the State of Montana to Florence Kerr Facey;

S. 3808. An act for the relief of R. D. Stephens and Vera Stephens;

S. 3843. An act to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits of arts, sciences, and industries, and products of the soil, mine, and sea, and all other exhibits for exposition purposes;

S. 3879. An act for the relief of James W. Grist;

S. 3976. An act to amend the act approved February 27, 1931, known as the District of Columbia Traffic Act;

S. 4020. An act to authorize the acquisition of lands in the city of Alameda, county of Alameda, State of California, as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon;

S. 4152. An act validating certain conveyances by Kickapoo Indians of Oklahoma made prior to February 17, 1933, providing for actions in partition in certain cases;

S. 4241. An act to provide for the sale of a certain isolated tract of the public domain in the State of Oregon;

S. 4268. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to set apart as a national cemetery certain lands of the Fort Snelling Military Reservation, Minn.;

S. 4390. An act to amend the National Defense Act relating to the Medical Administrative Corps;

S. 4432. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lease land on the Fort Moultrie (S. C.) Military Reservation to the owners of certain cottages thereon;

S. 4457. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit;

S. 4490. An act for the relief of F. W. Elmer;

S. 4567. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew for the term of 10 years a lease to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 9, 1926;

S. 4581. An act authorizing the payment of certain salaries and expenses of employees of the General Land Office;

S. 4608. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine;

S. 4633. An act to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system;

S. 4634. An act to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system;

S. 4648. An act to promote safety at sea in the neighborhood of ice and derelicts, and for other purposes;

S. 4670. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the original Norfolk (Va.) land grant and the two hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the city of Norfolk, Va., as a borough;

S. 4684. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Companies;

S. 4699. An act to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps;

S. 4719. An act for the relief of the Bridgeport Irrigation District;

S. 4727. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Lawrence County, Ala.;

S. 4773. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims against the United States on the part of owners of certain vessels;

S. 4780. An act to extend the laws governing inspection of vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 4784. An act to permit mining within the Glacier Bay National Monument;

S. 4786. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make such adjustments and revisions found to be due on contracts entered into by the Government with crop producers under the Agricultural Adjustment Act;

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to provide for an inquiry by the Court of Claims with respect to losses sustained by cooperative marketing associations in connection with stabilization activities in grain;

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mother's Day", and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to define the term of certain contracts with Indian tribes;

S. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, and to clarify the duties of the Comptroller General in connection with said act;

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city and county of San Francisco to construct a causeway and highways on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Antietam;

S. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution to investigate corporations engaged in manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery; and

S. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution amending section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 255. An act to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Eutaw Springs, in the State of South Carolina;

H. R. 1362. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. A. Ramey, doing business as Ramey Bros.;

H. R. 1397. An act to withdraw certain public lands from settlement and entry;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Albert H. Jacobson.

H. R. 2155. An act for the relief of Francisco M. Acayan;

H. R. 2435. An act for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.;

H. R. 2932. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the International-Great Northern Railroad Co. against the United States;

H. R. 3943. An act for the relief of D. E. Wooldridge.

H. R. 3952. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Lee;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Ella B. Kimball, daughter and only heir of Jeremiah Simonson;

H. R. 4364. An act for the relief of Andrew Johnson;

H. R. 4641. An act authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan;

H. R. 4707. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles F. Eikenberg;

H. R. 5754. An act for the relief of Emma M. Pearson;

H. R. 5829. An act for the relief of Daniel J. Hagerty;

H. R. 6668. An act for the relief of S. John Hegstad;

H. R. 6951. An act for the relief of Thomas J. English;

H. R. 7256. An act for the relief of Perry H. Callahan and Malcolm W. Callahan;

H. R. 7463. An act for the relief of Lawrence R. Lennon;

H. R. 7642. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank W. Trick;

H. R. 7727. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George B. Marx, Inc.;

H. R. 7818. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Hyde;

H. R. 7839. An act for the relief of C. E. Rightor;

H. R. 7864. An act for the relief of Edward P. Oldham, Jr.;

H. R. 8316. An act to modify section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to the individual Indian money;

H. R. 8321. An act for the relief of Julia Long;

H. R. 8322. An act for the relief of Merwin A. Kiel;

H. R. 8368. An act to enforce the twenty-first amendment;

H. R. 8373. An act for the relief of James Fitzgerald;

H. R. 8502. An act for the relief of Theresa Link, Wencel Link, Edward Block, and John Meyers;

H. R. 8521. An act for the relief of Elsie O'Brine;

H. R. 8597. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley;

H. R. 8688. An act for the relief of Grace Schultz;

H. R. 8720. An act for the relief of Louis Manzumin;

H. R. 8799. An act for the relief of John N. Hunter. Edmund M. Cook, Fred C. Putnam, Merchants National Bank of South Bend, Ind., and St. Joseph Loan & Trust Co., of South Bend, Ind.;

H. R. 8841. An act for the relief of Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald;

H. R. 9078. An act for the relief of Bertha W. Lamphear;

H. R. 9111. An act for the relief of Evanell Durrance;

H. R. 9313. An act for the relief of the estate of Hans Dittmanson, deceased;

H. R. 9314. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry Copple, deceased;

H. R. 9315. An act for the relief of the estate of Fred Wilkins, deceased;

H. R. 10044. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Fernand H. Gouaux;

H. R. 10168. An act for the relief of Arch A. Gary;

H. R. 10279. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 10439. An act for the relief of John B. Ricketts;

H. R. 10504. An act for the relief of Booth & Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;

H. R. 10591. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report on traffic conditions, with recommendations for corrective legislation;

H. R. 10919. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11022. An act for the relief of Ethel Armes;

H. R. 11123. An act for the relief of Edward A. Foote, Jr., and others;

H. R. 11176. An act increasing the penalty for making false oaths for the purpose of bathing at the Government free bathhouse at Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 11180. An act to extend the boundaries of the Fort Pulaski National Monument, Georgia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11331. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance by the Department of the Interior to the State of Minnesota of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 3, T. 159 N., R. 35 W., fifth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 11379. An act for the relief of William H. Milton;

H. R. 11538. An act for the relief of the Orland reclamation project, Calif.;

H. R. 11555. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman in the Walla Walla Valley, Wash., and the founding of the Waiilatpu Mission;

H. R. 11581. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11597. An act for the relief of L. A. Peveler;

H. R. 11615. An act limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

H. R. 11926. An act to provide for a term of court at Durham, N. C.;

H. R. 12002. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Lackawanna River with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 12007. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Penobscot River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12008. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Androscoggin River, in Maine and New Hampshire, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12062. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept unsurveyed lands in numbered school sections in the State of Arizona in exchange for certain other lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co.;

H. R. 12220. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundary of the Fort Marion National Monument, Florida, in the vicinity of Fort Marion Circle, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12353. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925;

H. R. 12490. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy;

H. R. 12494. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on Lake St. Clair, Mich.;

H. R. 12624. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12758. An act to increase the pension to certain veterans of the Regular Establishment on the rolls March 19, 1933;

H. R. 12971. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 27, 1935 (Public, No. 73, 74th Cong.), authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Light-house Reservation, Mich.;

H. R. 13001. An act to eliminate unnecessary expense in the administration of estates of deceased and incompetent veterans, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a game management supply depot and laboratory, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a reentry permit to Tonio Mori Moto and his readmission upon application while such permit remains valid;

H. J. Res. 532. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg in 1938;

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution amending section 5 of Public Resolution, No. 6, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 4, 1935;

H. J. Res. 608. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1938, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrator;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution to provide certain administrative expenses for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of Interior, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 641. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of expenses incurred in an election contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Twentieth Congressional District of the State of New York.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President announced that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 19, 1936:

H. R. 8033. An act for the relief of Juanita Filmore, a minor;

H. R. 8442. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes;

H. R. 8759. An act to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, approved June 10, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 9483. An act to extend the provisions of the Forest Exchange Act, as amended, to certain lands, so that they

may become part of the Umatilla and Whitman National Forests;

H. R. 10712. An act to authorize the transfer of land from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 11819. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

H. R. 11820. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

H. R. 11916. An act to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 12074. An act to consolidate the Indian pueblos of Jemez and Pecos, N. Mex.;

H. R. 12408. An act for the relief of Robert D. Baldwin;

H. R. 12461. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Burtons Ferry, near Sylvania, Ga.;

H. R. 12514. An act authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County, Md., over Hart Island and Miller's Island to a point near Tolchester, Kent County, Md.;

H. R. 12622. An act for the relief of Dr. Harold W. Foght;

H. R. 12685. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Horry, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Waccamaw River, at or near Red Bluff, S. C.;

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions;

On June 20, 1936:

H. R. 12. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to divide the eastern district of South Carolina into four divisions and the western district into five divisions" by adding a new division to the eastern district and providing for terms of said court to be held at Orangeburg, S. C.;

H. R. 300. An act for the relief of F. P. Bolack;

H. R. 686. An act for the relief of John Collins;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of Frank A. Boyle;

H. R. 2262. An act for the relief of William H. Locke;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of Julia Miller;

H. R. 2400. An act for the relief of Blanche Knight;

H. R. 2495. An act for the relief of Thomas Berchel Burke;

H. R. 2496. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Moran;

H. R. 2497. An act for the relief of William H. Hildebrand;

H. R. 3160. An act for the relief of Irene Magnuson and Oscar L. Magnuson, her husband;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of Jessie D. Bowman;

H. R. 3907. An act for the relief of James L. Park;

H. R. 4219. An act for the relief of John J. Ryan;

H. R. 4565. An act for the relief of Lucile Smith;

H. R. 4619. An act for the relief of Joseph Salinghi;

H. R. 4688. An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4699. An act for the relief of Estelle M. Gardiner;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Brenner;

H. R. 5870. An act for the relief of K. S. Szymanski;

H. R. 5900. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Moore;

H. R. 6258. An act for the relief of D. E. Woodward;

H. R. 7270. An act for the relief of Clara Imbesi and Domenick Imbesi;

H. R. 7555. An act for the relief of W. N. Holbrook;

H. R. 7743. An act for the relief of Mrs. David C. Stafford;

H. R. 7764. An act to relieve restricted Indians whose lands have been taxed or have been lost by failure to pay taxes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8028. An act for the relief of the Great Northern Railway Co.;

H. R. 8200. An act for the relief of the seamen of the steamship *Santa Ana*;

H. R. 8671. An act for the relief of R. H. Quynn, lieutenant, United States Navy;

H. R. 9926. An act for the relief of Robert B. Barker;

H. R. 10435. An act for the relief of Emma Hastings;

H. R. 10677. An act for the relief of Cora Fulghum and Ben Peterson;

H. R. 10916. An act for the relief of Carl Hardin, Orville Richardson, and W. E. Payne;

H. R. 11103. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La.;

H. R. 11203. An act for the relief of Andrew Smith;

H. R. 11218. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds now on deposit, or later placed to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of the estate of N. G. Harper and Amos Phillips;

H. R. 11522. An act to amend the charter of the National Union Insurance Co. of Washington in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11614. An act to amend the Judicial Code to divide the middle district of Georgia into seven divisions by adding a new division to the middle district, and providing for terms of said court to be held at Thomasville, Ga.;

H. R. 11690. An act relating to the admissibility in evidence of certain writings and records made in the regular course of business;

H. R. 11915. An act to amend the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935;

H. R. 12006. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Kennebec River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12073. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in New Mexico as an addition to the school reserve of the Jicarilla Indian Reservation;

H. R. 12202. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of Six Mile Creek in Logan County, Ark., with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement;

H. R. 12240. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the tributaries, sources, and headwaters of the Allegheny and Susquehanna Rivers in the State of Pennsylvania, where no examination and survey has heretofore been made, with a view to the control of their floods and the regulation and conservation of their waters;

H. R. 12311. An act for the relief of the P. L. Andrews Corporation;

H. R. 12419. An act to apply laws covering steam vessels to seagoing vessels of 300 gross tons and over propelled by internal-combustion engines;

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present the Navy Cross to J. Harold Arnold;

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation with respect to agricultural income and the financial and economic condition of agricultural producers generally", approved August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 522. Joint resolution for the relief of William W. Brunswick; and

H. J. Res. 583. Joint resolution authorizing the Veterans' Administration to prepare and publish a compilation of all Federal laws relating to veterans of wars of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the final meeting of the Seventy-fourth Congress and the time when most of us must go before the electorate to be judged on the record we have made as Members of this body.

Perhaps some of us in public life are too fond of thinking that what we have accomplished is memorable and that sympathetic historians are waiting in eagerness to inscribe the records of our achievements on imperishable parchment. Yet I feel that on this occasion we may properly use the word memorable without being accused of exaggeration or

lack of modesty. Certainly even those who disagree with what has been done are careful to point out that the work of this Congress may have an important bearing on sociological, economic, and political conditions in this country for generations to come. At least no one may honestly use that phrase of bygone years, so often a term of derision and contempt, that another do-nothing Congress is limping to a close.

The work of the Seventy-fourth Congress has been significant and far reaching and in my humble judgment every Member of this House who has played a part in its deliberations should have a feeling of just pride and satisfaction in what has been accomplished. We have enacted measures that will live for decades as pioneering landmarks on the trail of wise social and cultural legislation. In normal times the work of the Seventy-fourth Congress would stand by itself but because of the extraordinary conditions and the extreme emergency existing when this present administration came into power, I am going to review the work of the Seventy-third Congress and the Seventy-fourth Congress as one. The great majority of you participated in the deliberations of both Congresses, the program we attempted fits into one great pattern, and the results are traceable to the success of the general policy rather than to specific legislative enactments.

With your kind indulgence I am going to take the time of the House to review the state of the Union as we know it now, and to gage what has been done here in the light of what we endeavored to accomplish and against the background of conditions as we knew them 4 years ago.

It is not my purpose to weary you at this time by a long recital of the dreadful and terrifying conditions which prevailed when the Roosevelt administration was given the duty and obligation of revitalizing and rebuilding a Nation, caught helpless and suffering in the grip of a devastating economic depression. The picture of business and banking, commerce and agriculture, lying prone and inert, has been painted too often to need retouching by me. Yes; your own realization of the grave responsibility entrusted to your care is, I am certain, still fresh and vivid in your memory.

What I should like to have you recall is the state of mind experienced by you and the state of mind apparent in the Nation in those stirring days when we were at grips first-hand with the problem of restoring the economic life-blood of the Nation. We know that the eyes of every individual in this country and, to a large extent, the eyes of the world were turned here to see if in a democracy a President and a Congress would work harmoniously and swiftly for the public good. Cynics said it was impossible; millions of others hoped for the best but were painfully conscious that in the past cooperation had too often crumbled away on the rocks of dissension, factionalism, and partisanship.

I say it is essential to recall the public state of mind which existed when the New Deal program was undertaken in order to arrive at a just appraisal of the measures we attempted and difficulties we confronted. The economic well-being of the people has taken giant strides forward in the last few years, the ship of state is now lying in comparatively quiet and calm waters, and, as usual, under such circumstances a great many critics are finding fault with the President and Congress for attempting too much. That attitude of mind has been sharpened considerably by the fact that the courts have seen fit to rule against many of the measures which we enacted in the great job of combating the depression and which did play a notable part in aiding the march back to better and more prosperous times.

I am not going to divert myself from the subject at hand to enter into a lengthy discussion of the constitutional question involved in the various legislative enactments of the New Deal. But I say without fear and contradiction that if Congress was wrong in assuming that it had the power to cope with these great economic problems on a national scale, then every man, woman, and child in this country was wrong, because, without exception, they were looking to Washington in March 1933 for a solution of their trials and difficulties.

The newspapers which today are excoriating the Roosevelt administration for what they profess to believe were illegal acts were crying back in 1933 for the enactment of the very measures which they now condemn. They urged Federal spending; they urged public works; they clamored for an end to the disastrous practice of price cutting; they appealed for a restoration of the price level—in short, they implored Congress to do just what Congress did. And I say further that even if some of those measures exceeded the precise powers of Congress as interpreted by the Supreme Court, there is no question that while they were on the statute books they aided greatly in restoring a balanced economic life in this country.

I say again that in the early days of 1933 there was a universal appeal from all the people of this country for the President and Congress to undertake a program, national in scope and swift in execution, for the alleviation of distress and the restoration of business and agriculture. And I say to you Members of Congress that when you hear yourselves criticized because in patriotic fashion you voted for these measures in the great emergency, just reflect on the fact that if Congress had failed to enact those measures, if Congress had continued to let things drift, every single one of us would have been swept out of office by an aroused public, and we would have been replaced by men and women pledged to do what the American people wanted done. And you have the further consolation of knowing that those who profited most by the measures you advocated are now leading members in the chorus of condemnation.

In all my memory of years in Congress I never recall a time when the Members of both Senate and House were more realistic or more courageous in grappling with the complex questions of economics and politics than they have been in the 4-year period just ending. The legislation enacted has touched virtually every field of human endeavor, it has been marked by a sincere effort to cure old wrongs and old injustices, and to establish a new reign of economic well-being for the great mass of American citizens under the age-old processes of democracy.

We are entitled to be judged on results and results alone, just as every other Congress and every other body of men is judged. The record is plain and incontrovertible. In a little over 3 years, under the wise policy of cooperation between the President and Congress, this country has been lifted from a condition of industrial and economic prostration to a high plane of prosperity, well-being, and contentment. Tranquillity and good feeling prevail in domestic relations, while in the field of foreign affairs the United States is the envy of all the world. Those are the facts, and it is a record of which every Member of this body may well be proud.

There is a disposition on the part of some people, who either don't know the facts or who like to ignore them, to cry down the work of this administration and to repeat the fallacy that our present measure of prosperity has been attained without the aid of the New Deal program. In reply to such short-sighted criticism it is my intention to review swiftly some of the outstanding measures written into law, and to reveal the part they played in the great work of restoring normal business and commercial conditions.

The matter of banking legislation naturally comes first in reviewing the achievements of the Roosevelt administration. The country still remembers the dramatic swiftness with which President Roosevelt and the Congress acted in unison to reestablish confidence and to bolster up the banking system, which had been literally falling apart until at last the process of disintegration culminated in a wave of State-wide banking holidays. The job of stabilizing the banking structure, of protecting the outflow of gold, and of restoring confidence was accomplished in swift and vigorous fashion, and the whole country applauded.

But what most people fail to realize is that since that time, in the normal working of Congress, we have written into law banking reforms that have strengthened the whole structure, that will guard against future disastrous occurrences of the same kind, and that without such banking reforms the res-

toration of business we are now experiencing would have been absolutely impossible. The business of this country cannot go on without a stable banking system in which the people have complete confidence.

We wrote into law the epoch-making provision providing for the insurance of deposits up to \$5,000. The benefits flowing from that provision are already in evidence. Bank deposits are now in excess of \$24,000,000,000, more than two billions above what they were in the boom period of 1929. The number of depositors is also about 2,000,000 above what it was in the boom days. That is a record of which we may well be proud and it is a direct and convincing proof of the way in which the measures we adopted helped bring recovery.

In addition to that, the Glass-Steagall bill provided for many needed reforms in banking practices. It likewise provided a number of checks and restraints that will enable the Federal Reserve System to act more surely and swiftly in the future in the event unhealthy financial factors appear likely to upset the normal flow of business and commerce.

But these measures alone do not constitute the full quota of what was done by Congress in the great work of rebuilding and stabilizing the banking system of the country. One of the great contributing factors was the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which assisted literally hundreds of banks over a difficult time by providing them with quick liquid assets in exchange for assets temporarily frozen because of the stagnation in the real-estate market. In other words, the long-term risk was simply transferred to Uncle Sam with results that were profitable for the home owners, for the banks, and for the country generally.

The Farm Credit Administration likewise did a tremendous amount of good along the same line. We all know that the small banks in the agricultural areas were among the heaviest sufferers as a result of the severe depression. They had assets that were fundamentally sound, but with farm prices down and cash scare, it was absolutely imperative for them to have temporary help. They got that help from the Farm Credit Administration.

The establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission was another landmark in the task undertaken by Congress to make certain that the people of the country are protected against another such speculative debauch as that which preceded the market crash and the beginnings of the depression in 1929. The purchaser of securities now has a greater protection than he ever had before, and in the light of experience it is my belief that the work of the Commission will become of greater value as time goes on. Taken together, the various acts written into law for the stabilization of the banking system form a united whole, upon the basis of which we are now building up the finest and safest banking system the country ever had.

I think it is now generally agreed that the loss of purchasing power on the part of the agricultural population of this country was the greatest single factor in bringing on the depression. When the great majority lack money to buy, quite naturally the whole country suffers. The present administration and Congress lost no time in enacting a whole series of laws to restore the farmers' purchasing power. Those enactments have been successful in the highest degree.

They have increased the buying power of the farmers' by an aggregate amount of several billions. Before it was declared unconstitutional, the A. A. A. had achieved the basic purpose of helping to restore a balance between production and consumption. I am hopeful that the Soil Conservation Act, enacted to replace the A. A. A., will prove equally effective, and that it will perform the vitally necessary task of putting submarginal lands out of production and conserving good lands from erosion and destruction.

There have been a number of other acts which have been of great assistance to the farmers, including the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act, the Bankhead cotton-control bill, the Tobacco Inspection Act, and the Farm Research Act.

The Farm Credit Administration was also enacted into law. It has been efficiently managed and, through its wise provisions, more than 500,000 farmers have been saved from dispossession. I think this measure has had as much to do

as any single measure in restoring the faith of the planters and growers in the desire of the Government to help them through their financial difficulties.

But apart from specific enactments, the great fact is that the entire United States is now convinced, as a result of the experience of the past few years, that we must continue to ensure the population of this country a decent income because, without it, neither they nor the country can prosper.

What this Congress has done to restore industry and manufacturing is best illustrated by the figures and statistics showing how production and profits have grown by leaps and bounds from the low point of the depression to the high levels of today. The automobile industry and many other industries are enjoying the most prosperous times in their history.

The restoration of the banking system was the first step needed to revive industry. The expansion of the R. F. C. and the widening of its loaning power was another tremendous factor in the industrial gain. Through that agency literally billions of dollars were poured out to help the railroads, insurance companies, and other establishments over a temporary financial crisis. The money was wisely loaned and it has proved a good policy for all concerned.

Perhaps the greatest benefit conferred upon industry was the quick steps taken to halt the downward deflationary movement of prices which had been taking place at an alarming rate before this administration came into power. By devaluating the gold content of the dollar, the downward spiral of price levels was turned into an upward curve. Although the N. R. A. was later banned by the courts, we should remember that it was enacted into law with the urgent encouragement of both business and labor leaders, and that it performed its primary purpose of starting the rise in both wages and prices.

The reciprocal-trade program, authorized to cut a hole in the tariff barriers thrown around this and other countries, has been successful in the initial work of restoring the flow of international trade. The agreements signed with other countries are winning the approval of both manufacturing and farming interests in this country. As time goes on this program will become increasingly important.

The spectacle of 15,000,000 or more employable people in this country without funds, without work, and without a chance to earn a livelihood was one of the grave problems to confront this country a few years ago. It was no time to preach musty dogmas about the responsibility of local taxing units and private charity to care for these unfortunate people. The only agency in the country big enough to meet the emergency and do the job was the Federal Government, and we proceeded to the task without shirking.

Under this administration, Congress has enacted a whole series of measures to help the destitute and the unemployed, but, of course, the outstanding measure was the \$4,800,000,000 relief bill. The purpose of that great measure was to end the dole, to end the practice of handing grocery slips to men and women who wanted work, and to make certain that in return for funds expended the country got a construction program of needed public works. The policy embraced in the Work Relief Act is now the subject of spirited controversy, and it is not my purpose to explore at this time the reasons which impelled us to adopt the policy which we did.

But there are two outstanding things for us to remember about the Work Relief Act. The first is that it provided employment for millions of men and women in the great cities and centers of population where they needed work. I think it is to the lasting credit of the President and Congress that we got through the greatest depression in the Nation's history with a minimum of civil disorders and industrial disturbances. The spirit of the country was on a high plane because men and women were given something to do. There were no idle mobs of men and women congregating in city squares and on street corners to brood over their fate and to give the needed spark for those unfortunate street riots and disorders which have happened all too frequently in the past.

The work-relief program has also helped hundreds of municipalities and towns from going into bankruptcy. It has helped them carry on needed improvements and necessary civic work at a time when the cities were unable to perform such work for themselves. No one who knows the record need be ashamed of what the work program has accomplished, and in this connection it is well to remember that it was unanimously approved by the United States conference of mayors.

Another great factor in promoting recovery has been the fine program of public works authorized by Congress for the country as a whole. As we go about the country we are impressed by the fact that the stimulation of building and construction is due entirely to the prudent use of Federal money for needed projects. Public buildings, public roads, schoolhouses, dams, and other types of construction are providing work for large numbers of the unemployed. The effect this money has had in stimulating buying is almost incalculable.

One of the earliest acts of the Seventy-third Congress was to put through a bill legalizing light wines and beers, which brought large sums of sorely needed revenue into the Treasury. Congress also hastened the amendment by which the States were enabled to repeal the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution. The result has been to increase revenues while at the same time putting a check upon lawless elements that were reaping a harvest through violations of the law.

The bill providing for cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates was also written into law, and before long the checks should be going out to veterans everywhere, thus paying off a debt of honor owed by the Government and at the same time adding purchasing power to the country generally. A number of other measures were passed insuring generous treatment for the veterans of the World War and Spanish-American War in connection with war-service disabilities.

One of the worst and most disastrous effects of the prolonged depression was the wholesale manner in which home owners were being dispossessed because they were unable to keep up payments on their property. There is no more demoralizing happening than for a family to lose its home. Congress took cognizance of that situation.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was established, and through its operations more than a million home owners were able to save themselves from the distressing penalty of dispossession. In addition to that, Congress passed the Federal Housing Act, through which a much-needed stimulus has been given to home building and repair.

In the rural areas the Resettlement Administration has been assisting hard-pressed farmers on submarginal lands to find a new location on fertile soil where these farm men and women will be able to win a living out of their back-breaking toil. That policy was designed not only to help these farm families over the depression but to keep them off the relief rolls permanently.

Unlike certain other elements, the laboring men of this country are not ungrateful to the President and Congress when measures are adopted for the protection of their fundamental rights and to promote their welfare. There has been more legislation passed to help the workingmen during the last 3 years than during any comparable period in the history of the country. The N. R. A. was a magnificent attempt to root out child labor, sweat-shop working conditions, and insensibly long hours at pittance wages. The Guffey Coal Act was another attempt to do justice to the workingmen in one of the country's basic industries. While it was held unconstitutional by a majority of the Supreme Court, there is no denying the fact that it was a powerful factor in keeping peace in the industry during its life on the statute books. The Wagner Labor Relations Act is another in the long series designed to protect and safeguard the laboring people of this country.

There is one law placed upon the statute books by this Congress that is assured of a place in the permanent policies of this Government. I refer to the Social Security Act, the basic principle of which is now favored by an overwhelming

majority of the people of this country. It is a frank recognition upon the part of the Federal Government that we owe a measure of care and protection to the sick, the aged, and the infirm—that it is our duty to make certain, by all the means within our power, that the weak and unfortunate are not again subjected to the rigors of economic depression without the slightest effort being made to alleviate their condition. If this Congress had done nothing else, it would have won the undying gratitude of generations to come by the enactment of the Social Security Act.

During the last 4 years we have written a new policy on water power onto the Federal statute books, and in my judgment it constitutes another landmark along the pathway of wise and humane legislation. Congress has seen to it that the great natural power sites shall remain in the hands of the people for all time to come and that the power itself shall be developed for the use of those who need it. Muscle Shoals, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other tremendous projects are the visible signs of that intelligent policy. At the same time we have enacted legislation to curb the monopolistic tendencies of holding companies and other large combines within the power industry itself. While a few people representing selfish interests like to cry out that they have been hurt by these policies, the fact is that power consumption in the United States today is greater than it ever was before.

This present Congress and the Seventy-third Congress have done an extremely important work in providing for the upbuilding of the defense of this country on land, on the sea, and in the air. The science of military and naval warfare moves forward rapidly and the fact is that our defenses had been neglected in hazardous and perilous fashion for a great many years. We had no adequate replacement program for ships and airplanes. Our land defenses had been neglected. The program adopted by this Congress and the preceding Congress will build up our defenses as they should be built up without in any way constituting a threat to the peace of any other nation. The fact is that if a well-balanced replacement program had been placed in effect long before this the present expenditures would be greatly less than they are.

The most noteworthy development in the field of foreign affairs was the passage of the Neutrality Act, which gave assurance to this country that in the event of war in Europe or Africa this country intended to remain out of it. By the early adoption of that act we gave notice to the world that we intended to remain apart from the quarrels of other nations and at the same time we lifted any uneasiness that may have existed in this country. It was a policy founded on foresight and common sense, and the fact that we have been enabled to steer clear of the present unrest in international affairs is the surest testimony of its effectiveness.

I have covered in the briefest manner possible the legislative program adopted by this Congress and the preceding Congress and the humane and far-seeing policies which promoted the enactment of this program into law.

Once again I repeat that as legislators we are entitled to be judged upon the record of accomplishments we have made. The state of the Union, yes, the fate of the Nation was placed in the hands of the President and Congress in that dramatic hour 3 years ago, and I say to every carping critic that you have more than justified the faith which the country placed in you. The proud and prosperous United States, which today stands out in all its vigor among the nations of the world, was brought to that preeminent position as a result of the fruitful and beneficial policies enacted by this Congress. It is significant indeed that the class of people who today sneer at Congress for what has been done is the same class that back in 1933 was sighing aloud for a dictatorship to take over the reins of government.

This work of this Congress has been memorable and historic, and it is my honest conviction that in the years to come the Members of this body may look back with keen satisfaction upon the fact that they were Members of the Congress which helped to vindicate the processes of democratic government in this country.

THE NINETEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the session is nearly over. Approximately 435 Members of Congress will soon return home to their constituents. Some Members from the cities and more populous sections will return to districts no larger in area than many of our west Texas farms. I will return to a newly created district of about 23,000 square miles, a district of 25 counties and 254,000 people, a district larger in area than any one of the following States of the Union: Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maryland.

Since this is a new district and I have the honor of being its first Representative, I think it appropriate that I very briefly call to the attention of the Congress its resources, its people, and its relationship to this Democratic administration.

The Bureau of the Census reports show a growth in population of the 25 counties of my district from 110,127 in 1920 to 254,367 in 1930, an increase of 130.9 percent. I have prepared a table which I will include in the RECORD which shows the name and area of each county, its population in 1920 and in 1930, the population figure per square mile, and the percentage of increase of the 1930 population figure over that of 1920. This table shows an astounding growth for certain of these counties, particularly Hockley, Cochran, and Lamb. Every county experienced a material increase in population and a consequent growth in wealth in the form of homes, business houses, schools, roads, farming equipment, and production.

In this section we produce cotton and feedstuffs with much less labor and cost per acre than in any other section in America. Hence, the natural advantages of the area for farming coupled with the availability of land at fair prices has, no doubt, accounted in large part for the growth of this section.

The United States Department of Agriculture reports the value of all farms in the Nineteenth District of Texas in 1935 to be \$231,603,519. We have approximately 30,000 farms in the district.

No less significant in the growth of this area is the type of people who have been responsible for this development. This area is within what is truly the last great American frontier. Its people are in every sense of the word pioneers. They have carved out of the heart of the old cattle kingdom an agricultural empire. The development of this section has been wrought by the strong determination and perseverance of a people with one purpose in their hearts—to build a new home for themselves. In this task they have not been unmindful of those community projects which are so vitally important to the individual home. In a short space of years hundreds of churches have been erected, hundreds of schools have been built, hundreds of miles of good roads have been constructed, Texas Technological College at Lubbock has been born and is rapidly achieving national recognition.

It is true that the climatic characteristics of this area have brought droughts with their hardships, disappointments, and financial reverses. Yet the people have always been sustained by a faith that has endured through the severest losses and have written their record of progress in an economic and social order, the stability of which is no longer questioned. The predominance of real American stock and the solidarity of the people are not surpassed in any other section of the United States. To represent in Congress such a great people would challenge the fidelity and effort of any man.

The relationship of my district to the National Government has perhaps been more strongly emphasized in the minds of the people during this Democratic administration than ever before in its history. To my mind the real test of the success of any governmental program lies in the local fulfillment of its purposes.

As a Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress and as a Democrat, I have worked in harmony with this administration whenever I reasonably could, after considering the needs and wishes of my own district. I have sought to as-

sist in the passage of all worthy legislation and in securing every possible benefit for our new district.

A table which I will include shows the large number of farms in my district which have been saved from foreclosure by the Federal land bank at the lowest rate of interest ever known to the farmer. Another table which I am inserting will show A. A. A. benefits which have come to the farmer in each county of my district. The program worked considerable hardship in my district, but it was not without benefit to us.

More than 25,000 emergency feed-seed, drought, and crop-production loans have been made to the farmers of my district through the Farm Credit Administration during 1933, 1934, and 1935 for the total sum of approximately \$5,163,700. Most of this money has been promptly repaid to the Government by the farmers and stockmen.

A works program and the administration of relief is a difficult problem to handle, yet under this program the needy have been saved from starvation. Mistakes on the side of mercy are somewhat excusable. Considerable good work has been done in my district. Highways have been improved, numerous school buildings constructed, fine dormitories at Texas Technological College have been built. Most every county in my district with a serious relief problem can point to some worth-while accomplishment in the form of better roads, parks, schools, and so forth. We all know that some of the work has not been worth while, and that in some cases unemployment and indifferences have been encouraged rather than discouraged. We are endeavoring to eliminate the evils that grew up, and much progress is being made.

We of this Congress have brought about the payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates. Veterans of my district will secure approximately \$4,000,000.

I am proud to have been a Member of the Congress that has pioneered in old-age-pension and general social-security legislation. The Republicans, though long in power, had shown no interest in old-age pensions and social security. We have started a national program of old-age pensions which we must continue to improve and make more liberal in order that this great problem may be adequately met. Complete success in a big program of this kind involving a great Nation and millions of people cannot be achieved instantaneously. None of our great problems have ever been solved without sacrifice and much patience and effort.

This administration has endeavored to be a "home saving" administration. To bring the Government home to the people is a worthy thing indeed. When one American home is foreclosed upon and lost, the ill effects do not end there. Had it not been for the Federal land bank and its new policy during this administration, hundreds of west Texas farmers who are now doing quite well would be totally ruined financially. But I have called attention to the Farm Credit Administration work in behalf of the farmers. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has saved from foreclosure in America about 1,000,000 urban homes, which includes about 1,400 in my district, which is not an urban district.

I do not recall any bank failures in my district during this Democratic administration. These have been only 5 national bank failures in the United States within the last 2 years, whereas there were more than an average of 900 State and National bank failures per year from 1921 through 1933. There were more than 6,000 such failures during the Hoover administration. The improvement in the condition of the banks and in the state of mind of the depositors during this administration will never be forgotten by a thoughtful and grateful electorate.

This administration has spent much money in my district and billions in the Nation. Too much money, no doubt, has been spent. However, a nation that is worth having is worth saving, even at great expense.

Including the payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates, our national debt is now about \$34,000,000,000. Our annual interest payments on this debt will amount to

about \$7 per capita. This administration has refinanced the national debt at a lower rate of interest, and the per-capita carrying charge on the debt now is not greater than on our national debt just after the World War or at the conclusion of President Hoover's administration. In comparing the per-capita carrying charge on our national debt I have, of course, taken into consideration our increase in population since the war. Our national wealth is well over \$350,-000,000,000. So our Government owes less than 10 percent of the wealth of our Nation. A business that is as sound as that is as solid as the everlasting hills. We are not facing bankruptcy. Our Government spending has temporarily increased somewhat, but it must be remembered that our national income in 1935 exceeded by more than 38 percent our national income in 1932.

The following tables which I have prepared will show some interesting facts.

TABLE 1.—Population and area of Nineteenth Congressional District, by counties

County	Area in square miles	Population			
		1930		1920	Percent increase 1920-30
		Total	Per square mile		
Andrews.....	1,565	736	0.5	350	110.3
Bailey.....	1,030	5,186	5.0	517	903.1
Borden.....	895	1,505	1.7	965	66.0
Cochran.....	869	1,963	2.3	67	2,829.9
Crosby.....	870	11,023	12.7	6,084	81.2
Dawson.....	903	13,573	15.0	4,309	215.0
Dickens.....	881	8,601	9.8	5,876	46.4
Floyd.....	1,011	12,409	12.3	9,758	27.2
Gaines.....	1,540	2,800	1.8	1,018	175.0
Garza.....	870	5,586	6.4	4,253	31.3
Hale.....	1,036	20,189	19.5	10,104	99.8
Haskell.....	923	16,669	18.1	14,193	17.4
Hockley.....	867	9,298	10.7	137	6,684.9
Howard.....	891	22,888	25.7	6,962	228.8
Kent.....	875	3,851	4.4	3,355	15.5
King.....	867	1,193	1.4	655	82.1
Lamb.....	1,022	17,452	17.1	1,175	1,385.3
Lubbock.....	868	39,104	45.1	11,096	252.4
Lynn.....	864	12,372	14.3	4,751	160.4
Martin.....	904	5,785	6.4	1,146	404.8
Mitchell.....	885	14,183	16.0	7,257	88.4
Scurry.....	887	12,188	13.7	9,003	35.4
Stonewall.....	852	5,667	6.7	4,086	38.7
Terry.....	870	8,883	10.2	2,236	297.3
Yoakum.....	879	1,263	1.4	504	150.6
Total.....	23,924	254,367	10.6	110,127	130.9

TABLE 2.—Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans outstanding, by counties, in the Nineteenth Congressional District of Texas for the period May 1, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935

County	Federal land bank		Land Bank Commissioner		Total (bank and Commissioner)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Andrews.....	3	\$11,900	3	\$5,100	6	\$17,000
Bailey.....	58	171,100	104	174,850	162	345,950
Corden.....	41	215,400	54	81,450	95	296,850
Cochran.....	41	135,300	70	115,800	111	251,100
Crosby.....	217	817,400	218	400,950	435	1,218,350
Dawson.....	223	605,000	272	328,800	495	933,800
Dickens.....	87	300,400	178	259,700	265	560,100
Floyd.....	258	936,300	327	623,750	585	1,560,050
Gaines.....	7	19,200	30	55,900	37	75,100
Garza.....	90	321,600	163	189,500	193	511,100
Hale.....	349	1,426,400	391	803,450	740	2,229,850
Haskell.....	196	598,600	224	353,050	420	951,650
Hockley.....	395	1,159,600	453	766,150	848	1,925,750
Howard.....	93	391,600	166	269,300	259	660,900
Kent.....	36	250,700	85	172,850	121	423,550
King.....	6	88,900	8	17,500	14	106,400
Lamb.....	536	1,481,900	682	1,090,050	1,218	2,571,950
Lubbock.....	450	1,547,100	491	819,800	941	2,366,900
Lynn.....	314	998,300	365	664,500	679	1,662,800
Martin.....	97	433,500	204	317,300	301	750,800
Mitchell.....	167	514,800	258	407,050	425	921,850
Scurry.....	102	350,000	159	259,750	261	609,750
Stonewall.....	50	218,200	142	256,100	192	474,300
Terry.....	102	272,400	193	300,250	295	572,650
Yoakum.....	2	10,900	17	23,800	19	34,700
Total.....	3,920	13,276,500	5,197	8,736,700	9,117	22,013,200

TABLE 3.—Rental and benefit payments and profits on cotton options made in connection with the commodity program from the beginning of those programs through Feb. 29, 1936, for the Nineteenth Congressional District, Texas, by counties

County	Cotton	Profits on cotton options	Wheat	Corn-hog	Rice	Peanuts	Total
Andrews.....	\$9,544.06			\$3,430.61			\$12,974.67
Bailey.....	565,908.69	\$107,114.06	\$20,430.64	34,558.74			728,012.43
Borden.....	114,517.77	29,067.38		4,126.45			147,711.60
Cochran.....	173,333.71	24,634.30		18,276.01			216,244.02
Crosby.....	1,048,240.28	318,874.11		83,053.90			1,492,839.12
Dawson.....	752,982.24	59,091.96		49,793.43			861,867.63
Dickens.....	585,128.11	146,330.55		15,710.13			765,271.33
Floyd.....	427,280.92	119,467.03	510,936.09	48,381.16			1,106,065.20
Gaines.....	100,613.33	23,351.98		42,533.04			166,518.35
Garza.....	393,080.60	89,138.42		18,686.07		\$244.20	601,749.29
Hale.....	726,309.83	150,736.96	721,549.50	89,255.78			1,687,852.07
Haskell.....	1,191,086.68	192,083.85		21,770.77			1,404,941.30
Hockley.....	1,284,393.18	113,817.07	2,658.33	34,642.95			1,435,511.53
Howard.....	593,720.17	127,258.19		3,080.26			724,058.62
Kent.....	255,914.49	75,065.76		4,848.86			335,829.11
King.....	103,133.54	20,211.67		2,384.65			125,729.86
Lamb.....	2,173,026.00	206,760.64	107,329.22	72,054.97			2,559,170.83
Lubbock.....	1,953,797.45	259,274.38	46,156.98	76,859.26		223.80	2,336,311.87
Lynn.....	1,254,162.84	329,089.52	1,365.48	56,859.06			1,651,476.90
Martin.....	307,913.60	18,311.80		5,964.89			332,190.29
Mitchell.....	775,965.88	100,463.46	418.87	700.00			877,548.21
Scurry.....	585,300.61	170,302.36		12,031.53			767,634.50
Stonewall.....	401,461.49	107,940.96		5,564.61			514,967.06
Terry.....	574,043.55	134,908.27		163,887.59			872,839.41
Yoakum.....	67,567.09	8,514.20		41,969.65			118,050.94
District total.....	16,429,026.41	2,931,808.88	1,512,001.63	870,061.30		468.00	21,743,366.22
State total.....	110,183,659.30	20,212,705.92	14,394,637.61	6,333,144.79	\$1,845,153.11	335,838.37	153,325,139.10

FAILURE OF THE RECOVERY PROGRAM OF THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on April 14 over a national broadcasting network:

On February 22 last, the Honorable James A. Farley, presumably in his joint capacity as a member of the President's Cabinet and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, spoke before the Kansas Democratic Club at Topeka, Kans. Mr. Farley appeared to be in a very optimistic mood, and devoted most of his address to pointing out the present prosperous condition of the country. Among other things he said, "It is a pleasure to come back here to Kansas and find abundant evidence of prosperity after the lean years through which you passed under Republican rule. The same picture of contentment presents itself in every section of the country." A little further, Mr. Farley said, "On next March 4, my friends, Franklin D. Roosevelt will observe his third anniversary in the White House. In that period, we have advanced from economic confusion and paralysis under Mr. Hoover to economic prosperity." And continuing he said, "The Old Guard apparently has abandoned the elephant for its emblem and substituted the ostrich, and believe me, the Republican ostrich has good reason to hide its head in the sand, because everywhere it goes it sees nothing but Roosevelt prosperity."

At the very moment Mr. Farley was making his speech on Roosevelt prosperity there were in this country, according to the figures of the American Federation of Labor, approximately 12,600,000 unemployed. On March 18, less than a month after Mr. Farley had given his glowing account of the prosperous condition of the country, the President of the United States sent a message to Congress requesting appropriations for relief for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1936. In his message the President stated that at that time there were approximately 5,300,000 families and unattached persons in the country who were in need of some form of public assistance. At an average of four persons to a family that means that there are more than 20,000,000 people still dependent on relief. In the course of his message the President stated that the cost of relief actually paid out of the Treasury this year will amount to approximately \$3,500,000.

The President asks that Congress appropriate \$1,500,000,000, which, added to the \$1,000,000,000 from prior appropriations still available and \$600,000,000 in prior appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps and various public works, will make a total of \$3,100,000,000 available for relief expenditures during the next fiscal year. The President makes it clear, however, that unless there is a material increase in private employment it will be necessary to appropriate additional funds during the fiscal year for relief purposes.

During the 3 years since this administration came into power, the Federal Government has spent approximately \$10,000,000,000 for the relief of unemployment. The sad part of it is that notwithstanding these enormous expenditures, the country is no nearer solving the unemployment problem than it was 3 years ago. It is true that there have been some gains, the figures of the American Federation of Labor showing a reduction of about 19 percent from the peak of unemployment to January 1936. The figures of the National Industrial Conference Board show a slightly greater reduction. No nation, however, which, after 3 years of effort and the expenditure of \$10,000,000,000, still has over twelve and a half million unemployed is justified in feeling very happy over the situation. Mr. Farley may think that this is prosperity but I doubt if many thoughtful Americans so regard it.

The failure of our efforts to reduce unemployment is all the more discouraging when we consider what other countries have done. For instance, while we decreased unemployment approximately 19 percent, Great Britain, in the same 3-year period, decreased it 24 percent; Belgium, 27 percent; Sweden, 36 percent; and Canada, 42 percent. As a further comparison of our success in reducing unemployment, let me call your attention to the quarterly report just issued by the international labor office of the League of Nations at Geneva. This report shows that the number of unemployed in the United States is 3,000,000 more than for all of Europe, although Europe has four times the population of the United States.

Of course, when he made his statements regarding prosperity, Mr. Farley may have overlooked the problems of unemployment and relief. Perhaps he was thinking only of the stock market and of the profits which some of the large corporations have been making. If one were to judge by stock-market reports, we might think that prosperity was here. In the financial section of the New York Times for Sunday, April 5, it is stated that in rising for 12 consecutive months the stock market has broken a 25-year record for a sustained upward movement. The present rise began on March 18, 1935, at which time the New York Times index of 50 average stocks stood at 77.92; whereas, on Saturday, April 4, the index stood at 124.86, or an increase of 60 percent.

But this stock-market prosperity does not extend to any other front. During the same period in which the price of common stocks on the New York Stock Exchange increased 60 percent, the value of farm land and buildings in this country, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, increased 3 percent; and the gross farm income of the country, including rental and benefit payments under the A. A. A., increased 12 percent. When it is considered that the country suffered its greatest drought in 1934 and that farm production and income were severely curtailed on that account, a 12-percent increase in gross income during 1935 is no increase at all.

The National City Bank record for February shows that the profits of 895 representative industrial corporations increased 47 percent from 1934 to 1935. On the other hand, the average real wage of the employed worker, according to the American Federation of Labor, was no higher in 1935 than 1934, because a 5½-percent increase in living costs canceled the 5½-percent rise in wages.

The 1935 report of Sears, Roebuck shows net profits of \$21,500,000, an increase of 43 percent over 1934. Montgomery Ward for 1935 showed profits of \$13,527,000, a gain of 47 percent over the previous year. How many small-town independent merchants can report increases of 43 and 47 percent in net profits?

It thus appears that while numerous large corporations and the brokers on the stock market are doing a flourishing business and while the holders of industrial stocks have made great profits, that relatively the farmer, the small-business man, and the laboring man have been standing still and the situation of the unemployed and those on relief has not improved. Such is the great Roosevelt prosperity so loudly acclaimed by the Postmaster General.

What is the reason the Roosevelt program after 3 years has failed to bring recovery except to the stock market and big business? What is the reason this country with its resources is lagging behind less favored nations in this matter? Why is it that our greatest increase in employment took place prior to July 1933, before the N. R. A. and other New Deal legislation?

I would be the last to deny the good intentions of this administration, but good intentions do not take the place of common sense or good judgment. The present administration has failed because it has not had the ability to meet our present-day business

and economic problems. The only field in which it has been successful has been that of politics. Had it been able to find economic or administrative leaders who possessed the ability in those lines comparable to the ability of Mr. Farley in the field of politics, or if the President possessed the genius for administration which he has for politics, the result might have been different. The trouble is that no one has been able to tell in what direction we are going. There has been talk of planned economy but to date there has been nothing which could be called constructive planning and certainly nothing resembling economy, no matter in what sense you may use the word. This does not mean that there have been no attempts at planning, but the trouble has been that the planners do not get together and the direction in which we have been headed at any particular moment has depended entirely upon which planner had last gotten the ear of the President.

The constant uncertainty in which the country is kept by the sudden moves of the President to the right and to the left, as seem dictated by political expediency, has a most unsettling effect upon business and industry. It has prevented a normal, natural expansion. It has not prevented a certain measure of industrial prosperity. It has not prevented the stock-market boom which we have had during the past year, because, after all, business and industry are able after a fashion to adjust themselves to whatever conditions may be imposed. As long, however, as there is uncertainty, there will be no inclination to explore new fields, to experiment, and to develop. That is what the country needs more than anything else today.

The most serious criticism of the New Deal is that it is static. It assumes that things will always be as they have been, that we will produce the same things in exactly the same quantity and in exactly the same way, and that what is done must be on that basis. In other words, we must freeze production in business and industry but divide it up in a different way than in the past. Such a policy is not liberal and progressive as New Dealers would have you believe. It is essentially reactionary. As an emergency step it might be justified, but as a permanent policy never.

I do not mean by what I have said to criticize everything which has been done. No one could oppose all of the New Deal and possibly be consistent. There were some things which needed to be done and which would have been done by any administration in power during the last 3 years. The President, shrewd politician that he is, now realizes the change in the temper of the American people. He is again beginning to talk about economy. He has suggested that he is going to give the country a breathing spell.

Who knows, however, how long this new policy will last? Is there any way we can judge what another 4 years under the present administration would bring forth except by considering what has happened in the past? Can we depend upon what may be contained in the Democratic platform this year when we consider that most of the 1932 platform has been thrown overboard? Can we count on the utterances of the Democratic nominee for President in 1936 when we know that he has repudiated the promises which he made in 1932 on economy, on governmental bureaucracy, on the money question, on agricultural tariffs, on taxation, on enforcement of the antitrust laws, on the relationship of the State and the Federal Governments, and many other subjects of acute public interest?

The people of this country realize that times have changed; they realize that we have many new problems and that government must make progress just as any other institution. They want to go forward toward a solution of the country's problems, but they want to know that they are going forward instead of in a half dozen different directions at once. They doubt if these problems can be settled by leaving them entirely to politics and governmental bureaucracy, as President Roosevelt and his advisers want to do. They are coming more and more to believe that the efforts of this administration have failed and that the only way we can secure real prosperity instead of the Roosevelt prosperity so roundly praised by Mr. Farley is to make a change next November.

JO BYRNS—THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE LONG, LONG TRAIL

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, although I have served only four terms in the House of Representatives, it has been my privilege to know personally eight Speakers—Joseph G. Cannon, Champ Clark, Frederick C. Gillette, Nicholas Longworth, John N. Garner, Henry T. Rainey, Joseph W. Byrns, and the present Speaker, Hon. William B. Bankhead. I did not serve under three of them, but served with them—Mr. Gillette, Mr. Longworth, and Mr. Garner.

Of these Speakers, it chanced that my most intimate contact was with Jo BYRNS. It is perhaps rare that after a long lapse of years we can recall exactly the time and place of our first meeting, but this meeting between Jo BYRNS and me was under circumstances which indelibly fixed it in both our minds. As he has often related this incident to Members

since my return to Congress, I deem it worthy of preservation in the RECORD.

It was on March 4, 1909, the day of the Taft inaugural, a day that is said to have been the worst in the history of the Capital City, buried under snow and strewn with the wreckage of trees.

As a result of these conditions the outdoor inaugural ceremonies had to be abandoned, and Mr. Taft was inaugurated in the Senate Chamber. There I saw Theodore Roosevelt and Taft exchange their last friendly handclasp as the outgoing President, after the administering of the oath of office to his successor, hurried up to the incoming President, impulsively threw his left arm over his shoulder, vigorously shook his hand, turned, and hastened from the Chamber. Who then could have visioned the campaign of 1912?

After the inaugural I made my way out to the abandoned bleachers in front of the Capitol Building, threaded my way far down on them, and stood there pensively surveying the dismal scene. Then I felt a touch on my arm and looked around to see a tall, lean figure with cavernous glowing eyes, heavy black brows, looking at me with a sympathy-seeking expression, which found a ready response. We exchanged introductions, and he said, "I saw you standing here looking lonesome, and I thought I would come down and get acquainted, and I wonder if you are thinking what I am." "What are you thinking?" I asked. And he replied, "I am wondering what the devil my people sent me up here for. I feel that if I were back in my law office in Nashville I would stay there." I replied to him in kind.

Time has answered the question what Jo BYRNS' people sent him up here for. They sent him where character, ability, and long and faithful service raised him to the seat of power in the House of Representatives, to a place in history among the great men of the Nation who have occupied that seat.

For 20 long years I never saw him but the instinctive friendship of that first meeting persisted, and the highest compliment I could pay our late beloved Speaker was that, sitting in the chair, he was the same Jo BYRNS, kindly, considerate, unspoiled. At the end of his famous lecture, Elbert Hubbard used to close with the words, "And be kind, and be kind." Jo BYRNS was kind. The qualities which drew men to him and held them could not have been assumed. They were an emanation of the man. They were natural. It is no exaggeration to say, and no one will feel jealous of the statement, that he was the best-liked Member of Congress. He had the quality of never making Members feel a personal sting from his rulings in the chair, nor from his opposition on the floor. He was peculiarly qualified to preserve harmony among a top-heavy majority.

As I saw him on his first day in the House of Representatives, so I saw him on his last. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1936, page 9014, recording the adjournment of the House for a deceased Member:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn."

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1936, at 11 o'clock a. m.

And thus, on June 3, 1936, at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., Jo BYRNS, the beloved Speaker of the House, laid down his gavel and descended from the Speaker's station for the last time. On the next day the House adjourned out of respect to him.

Then I saw the end of the long, long trail awinding. I saw his flag-draped casket carried into the vault in beautiful Mount Olivet Cemetery in his home city. He is back again in Nashville.

REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION ON BEHALF OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and spoken concerning the emergency agricultural legislation enacted during the past 3 years, some of which has been declared unconstitutional and some of which has been repealed, that there may be a tendency to overlook the constructive and permanent legislation enacted for agriculture by Republican administrations during the period from March 4, 1921, to March 4, 1933. As a matter of fact, more constructive and worth-while agricultural legislation was enacted during this period than during any similar period in our country's history. This legislation covered the entire field of agriculture and while it would be impossible within the compass of these remarks to list all the legislation beneficial to agriculture passed during the 12-year period preceding the New Deal, it may be of interest to point out specifically some of the more important enactments.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

In view of the utter neglect shown dairying by the present administration, it is of interest to review some of the more important legislation on behalf of that industry which was enacted between 1921 and 1933:

(1) Public, 519, Sixty-seventh Congress, enacted March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to define butter and to provide a standard therefor." This act provides that butter shall contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat.

(2) Public, 513, Sixty-seventh Congress, enacted March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to prohibit the shipment of filled milk in interstate or foreign commerce." This act did away with the filled-milk business; that is, the manufacture and sale of milk mixed with coconut oil or similar nonbutter fats.

(3) Public, 156, Sixty-eighth Congress, enacted May 29, 1924, an act to establish a dairy bureau in the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes. This act recognized the dairy interests of the country as of sufficient importance to justify a separate bureau in the Department of Agriculture.

(4) Public, 625, Sixty-ninth Congress, enacted February 15, 1927, an act to regulate the importation of milk and cream in the United States for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry of the United States and protecting the public health. This act required that milk and cream imported in the United States meet prescribed sanitary standards; in other words, that dairymen in countries which do not have the same sanitary requirements as our own shall not have an advantage over dairymen in the United States, and that such foreign dairy products be barred unless they meet the requirements imposed upon our own dairymen. The Republican Party platform for 1936 proposes to extend this requirement so as to include all imported livestock, dairy, and other farm products from countries which do not impose health and sanitary regulations fully equal to those imposed upon our own producers.

(5) Public, 540, Seventy-first Congress, enacted July 10, 1930, an act to amend the definition of oleomargarine contained in the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine", approved August 2, 1886, as amended.

This act imposed a tax of 10 cents per pound in the case of oleomargarine which is yellow in color, irrespective of whether the color is natural or artificial and effectively stopped the sale of oleomargarine under the guise of cooking compounds, and so forth.

(6) Public 867, Seventy-first Congress, enacted March 4, 1931. "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine', approved August 2, 1886, as amended, and for other purposes."

In addition to the above legislation which specifically relates to the dairy industry, that industry has been benefited greatly by legislation dealing with cooperative marketing.

It seems proper at this place also to call attention to the protection which has been given the dairy industry under the various Republican tariff acts, including the Farmers

Emergency Tariff Act of 1921, the General Tariff Act of 1922, and the Tariff Act of 1930. Under the last Democratic tariff act, the duty on butter was 2½ cents per pound, on cheese it was 20 percent ad valorem. On milk and cream there was no tariff whatever. There was, of course, nothing unusual about this because all farm products under that tariff act were either on the free list or carried a rate of duty which afforded no protection whatever.

Under the Republican Tariff Act of 1930 the rate on butter is 14 cents per pound, the rate on cheese is 7 cents per pound, the rate on whole milk is 6½ cents per gallon and on cream 56.6 cents per gallon. Under the recent Democratic reciprocal-trade agreement with Canada, however, the rate on cheese has been reduced to 5 cents per pound, and the rate on cream has been reduced to 35 cents per gallon for the first 1,500,000 gallons. Following the reduction in the tariff on cheese, a tremendous increase in imports has taken place. The dairymen of this country regard tariff protection as absolutely essential and, based upon both its past and present records, no help in that regard can be expected from the Democratic Party.

COOPERATIVE MARKETING

The great growth of the farm cooperative movement in recent years has been made possible very largely because of legislation enacted by Republican administrations. The first of these acts was Public, No. 146, Sixty-seventh Congress, passed on February 18, 1922, entitled "An act to authorize associations of producers of agricultural products." This is popularly known as the Capper-Volstead Act. It is designed to exempt farmers' cooperative associations from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust laws, provided the associations comply with certain specified conditions. Practically all agricultural cooperatives are now organized so as to come under the provisions of this act. It is no exaggeration whatever to say that without this act the splendid progress made in cooperative marketing in recent years would have been impossible.

Another very important piece of legislation relative to cooperative marketing is Public, No. 450, Sixty-ninth Congress, enacted July 2, 1926. The purpose and scope of this act is indicated by the title, reading "An act to create a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture; to provide for the acquisition and dissemination of information pertaining to cooperation; to promote the knowledge of cooperative principles and practices; to provide for calling advisers to counsel with the Secretary of Agriculture on cooperative activities; to authorize cooperative associations to acquire, interpret, and disseminate crop and market information, and for other purposes." Later this division became a part of the Farm Board set-up and is actively functioning today as a division of the Farm Credit Administration.

The Agricultural Marketing Act, Public, No. 10, Seventy-first Congress, which was passed on June 15, 1929, and which created the Federal Farm Board is a further step in the way of governmental assistance in cooperative marketing. Whatever criticism may be made of the stabilization activities of the Farm Board, its efforts along the line of cooperative marketing were helpful and successful and have done much toward assisting cooperative organizations to finance themselves properly.

Another important act affecting cooperative organizations is that of March 4, 1927—Public, No. 802, Sixty-ninth Congress—entitled "An act to prevent discrimination against farmers' cooperative associations by boards of trade and similar organizations, and for other purposes." This act is designed to compel boards of trade and produce exchanges to admit farmers' cooperative associations to membership on the same basis as other members.

The present administration, so I am informed by numerous leaders of cooperative organizations, has manifested little interest in agricultural cooperation and little legislation relating to the subject has been enacted.

LIVESTOCK

The Republican Congress in 1921 passed what is known as the Packers and Stockyards Act. This act became a law on

August 15, 1921, and is known as Public, No. 51, Sixty-seventh Congress. It placed the operation of packers and stockyards under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. This legislation had the support of all the major farm organizations of the country and operated to correct and cure many very serious discriminations and abuses which had grown up in the packing industry. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation ever enacted on behalf of agriculture.

The act of March 2, 1931—Public, No. 776, Seventy-first Congress—which set up a 10-year cooperative program under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture for the eradication, suppression, and bringing under control of predatory and other wild animals injurious to agriculture, animal husbandry, and other interests, has been of great assistance to livestock producers, particularly in the West.

The protection which has been given livestock under Republican tariff acts, including the Tariff Act of 1921, the 1922 Tariff Act, and the act of 1930, is in striking contrast with the lack of protection afforded the livestock industry under the last Democratic tariff act, that of October 3, 1913. It is also in contrast with the policy of the present administration in reducing tariff rates upon livestock and livestock products under the reciprocal-trade agreements. Under the last Democratic tariff act practically all animal products were on the free list. Under the Republican Tariff Act of 1930, as well as under previous Republican acts, all of this has been changed. Beef and veal carry a rate of 6 cents per pound; mutton, 5 cents per pound; lamb, 7 cents per pound; pork, 2½ cents per pound; lard, 3 cents per pound; other meats, 6 cents per pound; live cattle, under 700 pounds, 2½ cents per pound, over 700 pounds, 3 cents per pound; hogs, 2 cents per pound; sheep, lambs, goats, \$3 per head; and so I might go on enumerating specifically various livestock products which are now adequately protected, but which had no protection whatever under the Democratic tariff laws. The reduction in the rates of duty under the Canadian trade agreement have resulted in a great increase in importations. Anticipated reductions in connection with trade treaties with Mexico and Argentina will—if carried out, of course—work further injury to American livestock producers.

Even with the high rates now in effect, the Democratic policies have brought about greatly increased imports of livestock and livestock products during recent months. It is fearful to contemplate how much greater these importations might be if a Democratic tariff law were in effect.

AGRICULTURAL FINANCE AND CROP LOANS

The Republican Party has enacted numerous legislative measures designed to assist in the financing of agriculture. It has strengthened and developed the Federal land-bank system, and under the Federal Intermediate Credit Act of 1923, Public, No. 503, Sixty-seventh Congress, there was set up a system of intermediate credit banks which since that time have been a great boon in enabling farmers to obtain loans at low rates of interest.

The act creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Public, No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, passed on January 2, 1932, included financial relief for agriculture as one of its objectives. Not only did it provide for assistance to the Federal land-bank system but it authorized the establishment of 12 regional agricultural-credit corporations, 1 in each Federal land-bank district. These institutions rendered a splendid service in making capital available to farmers and livestock producers at low rates of interest. They did much to assist livestock producers, particularly in financing themselves during a period when other capital was not readily available. In the opinion of many producers, these banks were more satisfactory than the present system of making loans through production-credit corporations, and in any event they met an emergency in a most satisfactory and effective manner.

Droughts, floods, and other disasters have made it necessary in recent years that some relief be afforded agricultural producers in the way of loans for crop production. During the period from 1921 to 1933 Republican administrations

enacted all adequate and necessary legislation for this purpose. During that period there were nine legislative measures passed making provision for crop and production loans. To enumerate them specifically, the acts in question are as follows:

Public, No. 177, Sixty-seventh Congress, enacted March 20, 1922.

Public Resolution No. 13, Sixty-eighth Congress, enacted April 26, 1924.

Public, No. 651, Sixty-ninth Congress, enacted February 25, 1927.

Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, enacted February 25, 1929.

Public, No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, enacted March 3, 1930.

Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-first Congress, enacted December 20, 1930.

Public Resolution No. 114, Seventy-first Congress, enacted January 15, 1931.

Public, No. 666, Seventy-first Congress, enacted February 14, 1931.

Public, No. 327, Seventy-second Congress, enacted February 4, 1933.

The general character of these measures is indicated by the title of the one last above mentioned, as follows: "To provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1933, and for other purposes." The amount authorized for loans under these various resolutions varied from \$1,000,000 authorized in Public Resolution No. 13, Sixty-eighth Congress, to \$90,000,000 authorized in Public, No. 327, Seventy-second Congress, passed February 4, 1933.

In contrast with the helpful and adequate policy of Republican administrations in connection with crop loans, is the action of President Roosevelt in vetoing the Crop Loan Act passed during the present session of Congress which authorized the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for production loans. This measure (S. 3612) made the same general provisions for crop loans as contained in previous acts of Congress. Due to long and continued droughts there was an urgent need for this legislation in many parts of the country. Despite the protests of many Members of Congress, representatives of farm organizations, and others interested in the welfare of the farmer and, so I am informed, over the protests of some of his own advisers, the President vetoed this legislation. It is true that the President immediately made available certain relief funds to be used for crop loans, but in connection therewith imposed such unreasonable restrictions that it was absolutely impossible for many western farmers to obtain any relief in this regard. These regulations were evidently drawn for the purpose of aiding the southern farmer and I understand they met his situation very well. In their original form, however, they made it impossible for most midwestern farmers to qualify for loans. Later, after many protests, the regulations were modified somewhat but by that time it was too late for many farmers to secure the benefits which would have been possible had the loans been made at the proper time for seeding. Even as modified, the regulations are still unsatisfactory and the provisions made are entirely inadequate to meet the situation.

COMMODITY EXCHANGES

A very important piece of legislation from the standpoint of the producers of grain was the Grain Futures Act (Public, No. 331, 67th Cong.), enacted September 21, 1922. This act was one which farmers and farm organizations throughout the country had been urging for many years. It provided for regulation and supervision of the grain exchanges by the Department of Agriculture, and has done much to prevent manipulations of prices and unfair practices on the grain exchanges.

Public, No. 802, Sixty-ninth Congress, passed March 4, 1927, and previously referred to, has been very helpful in preventing discrimination against farm cooperatives by boards of trade and commodity exchanges.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

The production of fruits and vegetables constitutes one of the most important branches of agriculture in this country. Much important legislation on behalf of this branch of agriculture was enacted during the Republican administrations preceding 1933. Among the more important measures along this line might be listed the following:

The Act of March 3, 1927 (Public, No. 712, 69th Cong.), the title of which reads as follows:

An act to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others, and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them.

This act was designed to prevent the willful destruction of goods with a view of withholding from market or for the purpose of defrauding the shipper. It is interesting to compare the Government's recent action in the wasteful slaughter of pigs, in the light of this legislation.

Public, 462, Seventieth Congress, passed on May 21, 1928, entitled as follows: "An act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes."

The act of June 10, 1930, Public, No. 325, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "An act to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce."

This act is known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act and established in the Department of Agriculture a division charged with the duty of preventing fraudulent practices in the sale of perishable farm products. This act was passed in response to a great demand for protection for the producers of fresh fruits and vegetables. I am informed that since its enactment the unfair and fraudulent practices which it was designed to prevent have almost entirely disappeared.

Public, No. 538, Seventy-first Congress, passed on July 8, 1930, and entitled "An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled 'An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1906, as amended."

This act permits the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and to enforce standards with respect to canned foods and is of especial interest to the producers of fruits and vegetables for canning and preserving purposes.

Also under language included in various appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture during the period from 1921 to 1933 provision has been made for an inspection service for fruits and vegetables, which has been of great assistance to the producers of quality products.

In addition to the above specified acts, the legislation enacted during the Republican administrations relating to cooperative marketing has been very helpful to the producers of fresh fruits and vegetables. Furthermore, the protection given by the 1930 and other Republican tariff acts to the fruit and vegetable industry has prevented ruinous competition from other countries. This protection, however, has, to a considerable extent, been taken away by the Cuban reciprocal-trade agreement. It is feared by many producers that the contemplated agreement with Mexico will result in further destructive competition.

DISEASE AND INSECT PESTS

During the period in question every effort was made by Republican administrations to protect agricultural producers from the effects of livestock and plant diseases and insect pests. Some of the more important legislation along this line is as follows:

Public Resolution No. 14, Sixty-eighth Congress, passed April 26, 1924, and entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1924 and 1925."

This provided for an appropriation of \$1,500,000 to be used in the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

The act of April 13, 1926, Public Resolution 14, Sixty-ninth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution for the amendment of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, to allow the States to quarantine against the shipment therein or through of plants, plant products, and other articles found to be diseased or infested when not covered by a quarantine established by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes."

Public, No. 151, Sixty-ninth Congress, passed April 26, 1926, entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate foreign commerce by prohibiting the admission into the United States of certain adulterated grain and seeds unfit for seeding purposes', approved August 24, 1912, as amended, and for other purposes."

The act of February 9, 1927, Public, 594, Sixty-ninth Congress, the title of which was "An act to provide for the eradication or control of the European corn borer."

This act authorized the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for this purpose. Subsequently several additional appropriations were made for this purpose.

Public Resolution No. 1, Seventy-first Congress, passed May 2, 1929, entitled "Joint resolution to provide funds for the eradication, control, and prevention of the spread of the Mediterranean fruit fly." This timely act saved the fruit industry of this country from an impending catastrophe.

FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION

Much legislation relating to forestry and conservation was enacted during the Republican administrations from March 4, 1921, to March 4, 1933. Many of these measures were special acts, which will not be enumerated here. Some of the measures of more general importance along that line include:

The act of June 7, 1924, Public, No. 270, Sixty-eighth Congress, the title of which reads as follows:

An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor.

Public, No. 565, Sixty-eighth Congress, passed March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act of June 7, 1924 (Public, No. 270), entitled 'An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor.'"

Public, No. 575, Sixty-eighth Congress, passed March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and to promote reforestation."

The act of March 3, 1925, Public, No. 591, Sixty-eighth Congress, entitled "An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled 'An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers', approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961)."

Public, No. 466, Seventieth Congress, passed May 22, 1928, the title of which reads as follows:

An act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics, and related subjects, and for other purposes.

The act of June 9, 1930 (Public, 319, 71st Cong.), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to enlarge tree-planting operations in national forests, and for other purposes."

The act of January 31 (Public, 589, 71st Cong.), entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service."

The act of February 18, 1921 (Public, 770, 70th Cong.), known as the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

This act provided for the creation of a migratory bird commission and annual appropriations to be used for the purchase of migratory bird refuges.

In addition to the general legislation on forestry and conservation mentioned above, there were enacted during this period a number of measures of a local character providing for additions to the national forests and the creation of game and migratory bird refuges.

DISPOSITION OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

The following acts were passed by the Seventy-second Congress relative to the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities owned by the Government or its agencies:

Public Resolution No. 12, Seventy-second Congress, passed March 7, 1932, authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

Public Resolution No. 33, Seventy-second Congress, passed July 5, 1932, authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American Red Cross and other organizations for the relief of distress.

Public Resolution No. 43, Seventy-second Congress, passed July 22, 1932, making appropriations to enable the Federal Farm Board to distribute Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

Public, 329, Seventy-second Congress, passed February 8, 1933, to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

Public Resolution 51, Seventy-second Congress, passed February 11, 1933, entitled "An act to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled 'An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress', approved February 8, 1933."

In conformity with the above-mentioned joint resolutions dealing with the distribution of Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American National Red Cross, Farm Board wheat and cotton to the value of \$197,000,000 were distributed.

AGRICULTURAL TARIFFS

Mention has already been made of the lack of tariff protection for agricultural products as contained in Democratic tariff bills and the full measure of protection on those products in Republican tariff acts. It is not my intention at this time to discuss the matter at any length, but it might be of some interest to contrast briefly, in a general way, the differences in rates on important agricultural commodities between the last Democratic tariff bill and the last Republican tariff bill.

Under the act of October 3, 1913, the last Democratic bill, most important agricultural products were on the free list. Among other things were included broomcorn; buckwheat; corn; eggs; fruits or berries; grease; fats; vegetable tallow and oil; hides; lard; lard compounds and all substitutes; fresh beef; veal; mutton; lamb and pork; bacon and hams; meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved; milk and cream, including milk or cream preserved or condensed or sterilized by heating or other processes, and sugar of milk; vegetable oils; oil cake; oleostearin; potatoes; rye and rye flour; swine; cattle; sheep; tallow; wheat; and wool.

The few agricultural commodities which were dutiable carried such a low rate as to afford little protection to the American farmer. Among them might be enumerated:

Barley.....	per bushel.....	\$0.15
Oats.....	do.....	.06
Fruits.....	per pound.....	.02½
Frozen eggs.....	do.....	.02
Dried eggs.....	do.....	.10
Live poultry.....	do.....	.01
Dead poultry.....	do.....	.02

As contrasted with the provisions of the Democratic tariff bill, the last Republican bill, the act of 1930, provided the following rates on important agricultural products:

Cattle:		
Less than 700 pounds.....	per pound.....	\$0.02½
Over 700 pounds.....	do.....	.03
Beef.....	do.....	.06
Hogs.....	do.....	.02
Pork.....	do.....	.02½-.03¼
Lard.....	do.....	.03
Lard substitutes.....	do.....	.05
Milk.....	per gallon.....	.06½
Cream.....	do.....	.56¼
Butter and butter substitutes.....	per pound.....	.14
Cheese.....	do.....	.07
Eggs.....	per dozen.....	.10
Frozen eggs.....	per pound.....	.11
Dried eggs.....	do.....	.18
Live poultry.....	do.....	.08
Dead or dressed poultry.....	do.....	.10
Barley.....	per bushel.....	.20
Buckwheat.....	per hundredweight.....	.25
Corn.....	per bushel.....	.25
Oats.....	do.....	.16
Rye.....	do.....	.15
Wheat.....	do.....	.42

The 1930 act also contained higher rates of duty on practically all fruits and vegetables and many other farm products which are too numerous to mention in what is intended to be a brief reference.

What has been said, however, clearly shows the difference in the protection afforded farm products by the Republican and Democratic administrations. The present Democratic administration, through its reciprocal-trade-agreements program, is already doing much to break down the protection which Republican tariff laws have given agriculture.

The Republican Party had its origin among the farmers of the Middle West. One of its first legislative achievements was the passage of the Homestead Act. From that time until the present its policies have been such as merit the support of the rural population of the country, which has indeed been its great source of strength. The foregoing resumé of legislation for agriculture during the last three Republican administrations clearly shows the concern of that party for the welfare and prosperity of the farmer and indicates the purpose and desire of the party to meet the great problems of agriculture as far as it can be done in a legislative way.

The provisions relating to agriculture in the Republican Party platform of 1936 are the broadest and most liberal ever contained in any party platform. The Republican candidates for President and Vice President come from the great farm area of the country and are thoroughly familiar with its problems and are sympathetic toward governmental policies which will bring about not only temporary but permanent well-being and prosperity for agriculture as an industry. Surely every Republican and every independent-minded voter who is interested in the well-being of agriculture can enthusiastically support such a platform and such a ticket.

OUR PATRIOTIC TEACHERS WILL RESPOND

Mr. KNIFFIN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, without wishing to give special consideration to any class of American citizens, there is one group that surely deserves the respect and consideration of all citizens for its contributions to the welfare of mankind. Additional duties and greater responsibilities have been added from time to time upon this profession without proportionate increase in compensation. While this is regrettable, yet it is becoming more apparent, day by day, that, in order to deal effectively with another serious condition now confronting this Nation and all its individual citizens, we must again enlist the patriotic efforts of this body, which has already given so generously of both time and energy. I refer to the school teachers, who are a distinct asset to our country.

While we have many major problems confronting us for which a solution must be found, the one to find effectual

means to check the awful and needless waste of human life and limb occurring from the improper and reckless operation of automobiles certainly comes very close to the daily life of each of us.

Along with the church and home, our teachers deal with the youth of America, the generation in immediate prospect. This contact is during the impressionable period of life. Most of the time the young mind is actually at work the teacher is directing the thought.

As indicated before, the average pay of teachers is not commensurate with the service rendered, and so it is with a feeling of reluctance that I suggest the imposition of an additional responsibility upon them. However, a death rate of one person every 15 minutes throughout the year and the maiming of other countless thousands is so appalling that action upon the part of the Government and its political subdivisions is surely called for. The only way to cope with it is to carry it into the minds of all those who are about to become drivers of automobiles.

The one group of our citizens who can carry out such a campaign of education on a systematic basis is our teachers, who dedicate their lives to the intellectual development, health, and safety of all of the young people of the land. They will respond to this new call of duty that means so much to society. Forty-eight great States and a great Nation with vast resources should see to it that they are adequately compensated, and that the retirement laws be justly revised for their benefit and protection. No better investment could be made.

THE EFFECT OF OUR NATIONAL DEBT ON THE BANKS

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today there is a national income with which to pay the national debt. Confidence has replaced fear in "3 short years."

You would not change horses in midstream, much less change horses when the faithful horse is found drawing the load out on solid ground. Likewise, thinking Americans will not be so unmindful of their own and the country's welfare to unseat President Roosevelt when he and his administration and the Congress is surely, certainly, and with unflinching step bringing this Nation to a safe, sound landing on solid ground. No more peeking around the corner for prosperity, for it is here.

My remarks are for comparison, and notice how favorable the comparison of general conditions since the beginning of 1933. According to the National Industrial Conference Board, the entire national wealth in 1932 amounted to \$247,000,000,000. The Federal debt was then \$21,500,000,000, which was \$5,000,000,000 more than it was when Mr. Hoover went into office. By the end of 1935 the national wealth had risen to—carrying out the National Industrial Conference Board figures—approximately \$310,000,000,000, an increase of \$63,000,000,000. Further estimates show still more increase in national wealth in the year 1936. During that period of "3 short years", while the national wealth has increased \$63,000,000,000, the national debt has increased \$10,000,000,000, making a total of \$31,000,000,000. Accordingly, while the national debt is large, nevertheless the increased national wealth overshadows it and has increased six times what the national debt has increased during these "3 short years." Take one example of the increased national wealth—the New York Stock Exchange. On April 1, 1933, all stocks listed on that exchange amounted to \$20,000,000,000. April 1, 1936, the stocks listed amounted to \$51,500,000,000, an increase of \$31,500,000,000. In this same period the listed bonds increased in value \$11,000,000,000. On these items alone is an increase in the wealth of the Nation of \$42,500,000,000. When you add to this the increased wealth of all homes, farms, factories, banks, life insurance, savings accounts, many say the increased wealth is ultraconservative at \$63,000,000,000 and many believe it to be nearer \$100,000,000,000 increase. But, you ask, do increased values alone aid in paying the national debt? My answer is that other vital features also inject themselves into the picture. For instance: The total income of the Nation in 1932 was \$37,000,000,000. In 1935 it was

\$62,000,000,000, or a gain of \$25,000,000,000 in 1 year. Accordingly the Nation had \$25,000,000,000 more to spend in 1935 than it did in 1932, or \$208.33 more money for each man, woman, and child in the United States.

You hear, and will continue to hear, many wild, unfounded statements of how England is getting under way. She is striving manfully and will succeed. But let us compare facts: Our debt in the spring of 1936 was \$31,000,000,000, while that of England was \$39,000,000,000. Our per capita debt was \$241—England's \$876. Further comparing the over-all debt of both nations, ours was \$51,000,000,000, while England's was \$46,000,000,000. Our over-all per capita debt \$397, while England's \$1,024. By over-all debt is meant an addition to Federal debt, the county, State, and municipal obligations. These figures are based upon the population of England—the United Kingdom—of 33,790,000 people to the United States 130,000,000.

A further comparison is encouraging. Our over-all debt is 17 percent of our national wealth. England's over-all debt is 52 percent of their national wealth. Our debt is 85 percent of our income of 1935. England's debt is 251 percent of their income of 1935. My purpose is not to encourage debt, but is to show the bright side by facts which can be verified to the satisfaction of the fair-minded.

While the Federal debt has increased, the houses, the farms, the factories of America have left the position of scarcely no value, to real value. The hungry have been fed, clothed, and warmed. The idle have been provided jobs. A million homes have been saved through the H. O. L. C. A million farms have been saved from foreclosure. Hundreds of thousands of youths have been taken from the streets and given useful occupation. Your bank and savings accounts have been guaranteed up to \$5,000, and banks are on a sound footing.

Today there is a national income with which to pay the national debt. Confidence has replaced fear in "3 short years."

THE EFFECT OF OUR NATIONAL DEBT ON THE BANKS

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1932, when he was campaigning for the Presidency, Candidate Roosevelt repeatedly stressed the absolute necessity of reducing governmental expenditures until Government outgo was brought down to the level of Government income. He devoted an entire speech at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932, to this all-important subject—the financial problem of making both ends meet.

At that time he explained that our national finances are no different from the finances involved in the family budget. He showed how the United States was paying 33 cents out of every dollar of its national income for the "luxury of being governed", which he characterized as "an impossible economic condition." He went on to show how the cost of government is paid out of taxes and that taxes in turn "are paid in the sweat of every man who labors."

In another part of this Pittsburgh speech the President called particular attention to another phase of the danger of an unbalanced national budget which compels a government to borrow continually to meet its bills. This phase is the danger to the whole credit structure caused by what Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 referred to as "the unorthodox Federal financing made necessary by the unprecedented magnitude of these (Government) deficits." The explanation of the risks involved in such financing, as given by Mr. Roosevelt, can hardly be improved. He spoke as follows:

You know as well as I do that this administration's (Hoover) claims that it has provided credit for industry and agriculture by pouring credit into banks are not frank.

Commercial credit has continuously contracted and is contracting now. Most of this new Government-created credit has been taken to finance the Government's continuing deficits.

The truth is that our banks are financing these stupendous deficits and that the burden is absorbing their resources.

All this is highly undesirable and wholly unnecessary * * *

The record since that time is illuminating. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt complained that in the previous year "the amount of Government obligations held by our banks increased by a little more than \$1,000,000,000." But from June 30, 1933,

to June 30, 1935, or during the first two full fiscal years of the Roosevelt administration, the banks increased their holdings of United States Government obligations, direct and fully guaranteed, by \$6,488,000,000, or at more than three times the rate which Mr. Roosevelt thought dangerous when he was seeking the people's votes in 1932.

The following figures are official, as taken from the reports of the Comptroller of the Currency:

All active banks, selected items from reports of conditions
[In thousands of dollars]

June 30—	Total loans and investments	Direct United States obligations	Obligations fully guaranteed by United States	Capital stock and surplus
1931.....	55,270,653	5,717,642	-----	8,462,849
1932.....	46,313,094	6,455,583	-----	7,375,934
1933.....	40,318,481	7,795,999	-----	6,270,862
1934.....	42,720,647	10,995,673	667,594	6,733,477
1935.....	44,636,415	12,201,560	2,082,492	6,699,005

In 1932 Candidate Roosevelt complained that the commercial credit extended by banks to businessmen and farmers was contracting and he clearly intimated that in his opinion the reason for this was because the resources of banks were being absorbed for the financing of Government deficits.

During the Roosevelt administration, however, there has been a continued contraction of commercial bank credit—a contraction, from June 30, 1933, to June 30, 1935, of 8.8 per cent, or from \$22,388,000,000 to \$20,419,000,000.

The danger of this method of financing was again brought to the country's attention on February 21, 1935, on the floor of the Senate by none other than Democratic Senator GLASS, of Virginia, Secretary of the Treasury under President Wilson and coauthor of the Federal Reserve Act. At that time he said:

The existing outstanding indebtedness of the United States is approximately \$28,000,000,000. Listen, Senators: Of that amount \$15,364,000,000 is piled up in the banking institutions of the country. Some of the banks have as much as 60 percent of their entire assets invested in Government securities. They are prohibited, were there the demand, from coming to the aid of business activity. They hold 55 percent of Government securities in the banks of the United States as against but 11 percent of Great Britain's indebtedness held in the banks of Great Britain—55 percent as against 11 percent.

The banks have been brought to a state in which they are literally obliged to take Treasury issues whether they want them or not.

They are compelled to take them in order to maintain the bond market of the United States, because it has been represented to me by competent authorities that a depreciation of 10 percent in Government bonds would render insolvent 90 percent of the banks of this country.

It is difficult to specify definitely the number of banks which would become insolvent by reason of a 10-percent drop in Government bonds, because some banks hold a larger proportion of such investments than do others. It must be remembered, however, that a decline in the Government bond market would be accompanied by a slump in other bonds, so that a depreciation in practically all of the banks' investments would occur under the condition mentioned by Senator GLASS.

On December 31, 1935, the investment in bonds and notes of 14,123 insured banks was \$18,305,000,000. A decline of 10 percent in the value of these assets would result in losses by depreciation of \$1,830,500,000. This amounts to almost one-third of the total capital account of the insured banks as a group.

It can be stated with certainty that any substantial decline in the price of Government bonds would impose heavy losses on the banks of the country, loaded as they are with Federal bond and note investments.

As to the possibility of a decline in the Government bond market, it may be pointed out that Liberty bonds declined more than 10 percent below par in 1920. In fact, a decline in the Government bond market to the 1920 levels would

average about 20 percent and would be disastrous to a large proportion of our banks.

The new chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, who was appointed by President Roosevelt, is not worried about the situation. He is quoted by the New York Times of April 18, 1936, as having said:

The banks have the privilege of discounting Government bonds at the Reserve banks and obtain 100 cents on the dollar. I don't think there is any problem there.

But the facts are that on March 4, 1936, the member banks of the Federal Reserve System held \$11,117,000,000 of United States obligations. On the same date the 12 Federal Reserve banks, whose capital was \$336,799,000, held \$2,430,000,000 of United States Government securities. If the member banks should discount as much as \$1,000,000,000 of their Government obligations with the Federal Reserve banks, a 10-percent decline in the price of "Governments" would technically wipe out the capital account of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

The word "technical" is used advisedly because no doubt the true insolvency which would result from such a situation would be disguised by some governmental expediency such as those which have been used by other nations which have attempted to dodge the facts by following the path of inflation.

These facts are being called to your attention, not with any desire to cause unnecessary alarm, but to point out the very grave danger in the financing of continuing budgetary deficits through the sale of Government obligations to the banks. The one sure cure is the cessation of wasteful expenditure and the early balancing of the Budget.

THE TONRY BILL TO AID HOME OWNERS, SPEED THE WHEELS OF INDUSTRY, AND TO PROVIDE A GREATER PURCHASING POWER TO CREATE MORE REAL JOBS

Mr. TONRY. Mr. Speaker, representing the largest congressional district in the United States, wherein resides every type of American citizen of every race, creed, and religion, and which numbers in its constituency a fair-sized group from every walk in life, I feel qualified from the existing situation in my district to speak for the country at large.

I have introduced a bill—H. R. 12718—which permits the home owner who has a contract with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to amortize his principal and interest in 25 years instead of the existing 15. This will, in effect, give each of these home owners an additional sum of money each month with which he and his family may live a happier and more complete life in keeping with the American ideal. It will provide that "greater purchasing power" that President Roosevelt referred to but a few short weeks ago at the annual Jefferson Day dinner in New York City. It will give Mr. and Mrs. America who have home loans the opportunity to take the family on that extra Sunday outing, to get that new living-room set, and put that new roof on the house. These extra moneys will flow into the neighborhood store and into every industry, to increase production and establish real jobs for a period of at least 25 years. This measure supplies real money and creates real jobs. It adds no burden to the taxpayer and causes no inflation of the currency. It enables the Government and the home owner to change its contract to equal that now offered by those private banking institutions, who a few years ago were too timid to offer the home owner assistance.

ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House of Representatives, June 15, 1936, was a memorable day in the history and procedure of this House, for on that day the last signature was attached to a discharge petition on my antilynching bill (H. R. 5). A majority of the membership of this House signified thereby its wish that this legislation receive consideration of the House; namely, debate and passage. That day began an epoch in the annals of the Congress of the United States, because, for the first time in history, a Democratic House of Representa-

tives initiated and brought to a successful conclusion a discharge petition relating to this type of legislation. I am very proud of the part I contributed to the success of the petition, and I wish to express to every Member who placed his signature thereon my thanks and appreciation.

The success of this petition confirms in my mind the belief that, slowly but surely, the people of these United States are coming to the firm resolve that government by law must prevail; that courts of justice are established primarily to protect the weak and punish the guilty; that the rule of reason by law must be maintained; that justice, as enunciated by the courts, must be the established domestic policy; and, finally, that mob rule and "Judge Lynch" must be forever banished from the proud history of our country.

"Thou shalt not kill" has come down to us from Mount Sinai; the clear import of its meaning has been known and understood through all the centuries of man's travail on this earth; in every civilization known to man where reason and justice ruled this commandment was the pinnacle upon which rested peace and order, justice and civilization. It binds the Christian, the Mohammedan, the Jew, the Turk, the white man and the yellow man, the black man and the red man. Its purport and meaning is applicable to all; no man or race of men is excepted from its binding force; it is a divine commandment, as binding today as when first uttered, binding individually and collectively.

Since history's dawn mankind has sought in one form or another to approximate justice in order thereby to protect the weak from the strong, to establish peace and order, and to provide for the general welfare. To this end and for this purpose mankind throughout the ages instituted tribunals of one sort or another where truth and justice were sought to be established. Ultimately there evolved legal tribunals known to us as courts and bodies of rules and principles, at times called "codes", "rules", "constitutions", "laws." The ultimate object and purpose was ever the establishment of justice, equal justice, justice applicable equally to all. Mankind instinctively knew and understood that without a general system of laws applicable to all and tribunals for the application of these laws to all, civilization could not exist. Mankind knew and understood that individuals should not and must not be permitted to declare for themselves the law or rule of justice and should not and must not be permitted to execute for themselves the law or rule of justice. Mankind knew that the individual pronouncement of the law and the individual execution thereof meant anarchy, not government; meant barbarism, not civilization; meant chaos, not order.

Investigating mankind's endeavor to approximate justice, we find underlying all tribunals of justice and permeating all systems of organic laws the eternal principles enunciated in the decalog. These principles are as binding as when on that great day they were divinely proclaimed for the guidance of men.

The Constitution of these United States, in my opinion, has as its main purpose the fruition of these great principles of human action in government—man's responsibility to man, man's obligation to man, and the rights of man in collective society. "The individual is indisputably the original, the first fact of liberty" (Woodrow Wilson).

Believing as I do, it is with grief and regret that candor compels me to admit that in our great Nation, dedicated to the freedom of mankind, there exists among us the spirit of mob rule and mob violence. No true American can but grieve because of this terrible scourge of injustice. To strive to eradicate it, seems to me a noble endeavor. Without malice or bitterness, and with no concern save the honor of our country, I appeal to my colleagues of this House to give thought to the great endeavor to remove from our midst this blight. This movement has been gaining momentum through the years; the voice of righteousness is becoming more clear, more insistent; the people of these United States are becoming more conscious of the justice and righteousness of the cause and will, I have no doubt, demand legis-

lation to punish and prevent this heinous crime. For in the words of the great Burke—

Every generation sets before itself some favorite object which it pursues as the very substance of its liberty and happiness.

Truth and justice must prevail. Mankind's struggle to attain it may be arduous; the road to light may be hard and thorny, but eventually God's justice shall prevail—righteousness will triumph and law and order become established. Sooner or later "Judge Lynch" must be dethroned and in his place the goddess of justice enthroned.

To all of you I appeal for justice under law; equal justice to all men—white men, black men, yellow men, red men. Convinced of the soundness and justice of this cause, I happily dedicate my life and my little talents to its accomplishment. It matters not the road be rough and stormy, if the heart be pure and the cause just, there will be found joy and consolation. In conclusion, permit me to rekindle your zeal with the noble spirit of the immortal Lincoln: " * * * With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on * * *."

THE ROOSEVELT NEW DEAL HAS HELPED MILLIONS OF AMERICANS IN ALL WALKS OF LIFE

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comparisons between conditions in 1932, under the preceding administration, and conditions today. The majority of the people in the United States are much better off today than they were in 1932, and their improved condition is in a great part due to the constructive efforts of the Congress and the President.

ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION HAS SAVED OVER A MILLION HOMES FROM FORECLOSURE

In the dark days of 1932, foreclosures on homes and farms reached new peaks. People who had seen their jobs, their savings, and their dreams of the future swept away in the depression, now suffered the even more heartbreaking loss of their homes. To alleviate this distress, to keep the American family in its traditional homes, to maintain the self-respect of more than a million home owners, the Republican administration did nothing.

Through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the New Deal has saved over a million homes by lending over \$3,000,000,000. Over 70 percent of the payments due on these mortgages are paid on time. In addition to this, through the agencies of the Federal savings and loan associations and the home-loan bank, funds are made available to banks and building-and-loan associations for home lending. The Federal Housing Administration, by insuring mortgages for the construction of new homes, and by insuring notes covering repair loans, has revived building-construction industries throughout the Nation, and has given our people an opportunity to establish themselves in decent homes.

THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION HAS PROVIDED THE NECESSITIES OF LIFE TO OVER 5,000,000 NEEDY FAMILIES

The immediate need when Roosevelt took office was to give direct relief to feed millions who were starving from Republican prosperity. I do not believe in mixing politics with relief, but I cannot mince words over this contemptible disregard for our own people while Hoover was making every effort to help Europe by granting debt moratoriums.

Twelve years of undisputed political power in government, and still unwilling to feed the hungry. Why? Because a few selfish people had control, through the power of their money, over our national affairs in Washington. Are the Republicans proud of that record?

We are employing skilled mechanics and laborers. We are providing for bookkeepers, chemists, store clerks, and factory hands, and people of every occupational training. These people are being given a chance to earn money, to the best of their ability, with which to keep their homes together, with which to keep their children fed, clothed, and in school.

None of you like relief in any form, and those who accept it do so only because of their need. This administration

appreciates this, and the relief rolls are being cut down rapidly. As the New Deal program swings ahead, private employment has increased about 5,000,000. It will increase further.

ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION SAVED AND REHABILITATED A TOTTERING BANKING SYSTEM TO MAKE THE SAVINGS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS SAFE

Let us look at the banking situation facing this country before this administration took office. I am going to talk about national banks, because these are directly responsible to the Comptroller of the Currency and are subject, under their contracts with the Government, to Federal regulation and inspection.

During the four and a half years of Coolidge "prosperity", 533 national banks closed their doors and caused losses to depositors. During Hoover's 4 years, 1,035 banks failed. By March 4, 1933, when Roosevelt took office, the whole banking situation was so ominous that had he not declared a bank holiday a Nation-wide bank panic would have resulted and business losses of unthinkable extent would have followed. President Roosevelt closed all the banks long enough to determine their strength and needs in order that they could reopen and stay open. Of the thousands of banks closed during this holiday, 207 national banks remained closed. These failures can be charged to the Hoover administration, because they had been under the supervision of that administration up to the day they were closed. Their failure to reopen was attributable to the Hoover administration which failed to require a more conservative policy than was practiced.

Twelve years in the saddle seemed insufficient time for a Republican regime to plan and execute a system of bank regulation that would protect the depositors in the banks. Yet the Roosevelt administration accomplished this in less than 2 years. The Bank Acts of 1933 and of 1935, including the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation provisions, have effectively eliminated many of the unwise practices of "old deal" banking. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation since January 1, 1934, has insured deposits in national banks and in others which chose to agree to the terms of such contracts up to \$5,000 per depositor.

You realize the importance of bank security to our economic welfare. You can therefore appreciate the fact that since the bank holiday, during the 3 years of this administration, only eight national banks have failed, and in them no deposits up to \$5,000 per depositor were lost.

This is protection given you by the present administration. This is action of the type which comes closest to you, insuring your economic welfare in a tangible way. This is action where before there was only inaction. In this manner was fear replaced by confidence and security. These steps taken by this administration are by themselves sufficient recommendation for its continuance in office.

ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION HAS PROVED ITSELF THE FRIEND OF LABOR

One of the great problems which has always faced government is that of the relationship between the employers of men and the men employed. It naturally follows that seasonal demand for goods will be reflected in seasonal peaks of employment and seasonal depressions of unemployment. It is a problem of modern living. It affects the whole Nation. It is truly a problem of the National Government. Yet 12 years' experience in government in modern times evidently failed to impress those three Republican administrations with either the extent of the problem or the need of cooperation between industry and government to solve that problem.

A famous expert on corporate law and on the problem of labor relations, Professor Ripley, of Harvard University, has frequently stated that the antitrust laws, forbidding industrial association along certain lines, have stood in the way of a solution of these problems. The same belief has been expressed by outstanding industrialists. They believed that certain clauses of these laws would have to be suspended, and that a cooperation between industry, labor, and government would result in an eventual solution.

Twelve years of opportunity failed to bring this cooperation from the Republican administrations. The National Recov-

ery Act was passed by this Democratic administration in 1933, and provided this opportunity for cooperation. Many phases of it were experimental, many phases unpolished, but it did bring about reemployment, the establishment of fair wages for many workers; it stabilized many industries. Under its banner considerable seasonal operations in industry were supplanted by a planned program of year-round production. The Supreme Court did not believe that its powers were granted by the Constitution and the act was nullified, but great strides toward industrial cooperation, planned, steady production schedules, wage schedules that provided a relatively decent minimum wage, and other benefits still endure.

Many millions of workers who had never had the protection of organization for common good received this merited protection. Industry acknowledged the right of its workers to present their problems as a body. Wage scales were in many cases permanently raised, purchasing power of the workers improved, and net profits of industry increased as the entire picture became more wholesome.

The Supreme Court decision did not discredit the motives or the purposes behind this act, but criticized merely the instrument. That a decided forward step in labor relations was taken through this act is acknowledged by industry and labor alike.

ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION HAS PROVIDED FOR THE FUTURE WELFARE OF THE UNDERPRIVILEGED CHILDREN, THE AGED, AND INFIRM

In 1932 we find aged people made destitute by the depression, entirely dependent upon local assistance, which was poorly organized and in many cases short of funds. The blind were entirely dependent upon their relatives or forced to become beggars in the streets. Poverty-stricken mothers watched their underprivileged children crying for food, decent clothing, and medical attention. Workers held precariously to jobs, without security for the future, or they were without employment. To aid them or to protect labor from involuntary unemployment the Republican administration did nothing!

This Democratic administration has passed a social security act, through which the Federal Government cooperates with the States in providing systems of old-age pensions which I hope will be increased, unemployment insurance, aid to the blind, and to poor mothers, underprivileged and crippled children. The States are also assisted in their public-health activities. It is a humane and sensible plan in operation now in many of its phases. It gives help where there was no help; security where there was always insecurity. It is a notable achievement, and I am proud to have had a part in it!

FRANKLY, ARE YOU NOT BETTER OFF TODAY THAN YOU WERE 4 YEARS AGO?

As we review these events of the past 15 years—as we contrast the inaction and the tolerance of improper practices by three Republican administrations; as we contrast this with the beneficial, forceful, courageous action of the Roosevelt administration—no orator is required, no bands needed, no great hurrah is necessary to justify the record of the Democratic Party. It stands squarely on its own feet. This truly great administration will go down in history as the most forward-looking, most humane, most progressive administration in the history of our Nation.

Great work has been done in Washington in the past 3 years. But many of the programs initiated by the administration require time for development. The Republican Party frankly opposes the New Deal and threatens to throw into discard the great achievements which we have attained.

The American people cannot afford to go back to the gloom and misery of 1929-32. They do not want to go back. They do not want a reactionary government to wreck and discard the progress which has been made.

My friends, we know what the American people want, and we are going to see that they get it. This Nation must continue to go ahead with Roosevelt. The American people are going to continue to enjoy the blessings which have been given to them by this administration, and they are going to give Roosevelt a Democratic Congress to support him; the tremendous strides of progress toward economic and social security made during these past few years will not be lost.

WASTE—TAXES—DEBTS

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the constant and rapid increase of the national debt, together with the useless, senseless waste and squandering of the public funds, presents the most immediate and the most vital problem before the American people. It is a problem that calls for the intelligent and prompt attention and action of the citizens of this country if this is to continue to be the land of opportunity for the youth of today and the oncoming generations.

Altogether too little attention has been given to the almost criminal extravagance and waste of the taxpayers' money by the present administration. Every dollar spent unnecessarily by Hopkins, by Tugwell, and by the other 30 or 40 agencies now spending relief funds means one additional dollar of debt unnecessarily heaped upon the American people. Public debt means taxes. The larger the debt the larger the tax and the greater the burdens upon the present and future generations.

It must be clear to all thoughtful persons that the only source of revenue of this Government is the citizens thereof. There is no other. Whatever is spent in carrying on the normal or extraordinary or unnecessary activities of government must be paid by them. Let us not forget that fact for one minute. We cannot escape paying. If our income is large enough to take us into the income-tax paying class we are conscious of the fact that we do pay. If we are less fortunate and our annual income is small, we do not see the tax gatherer, but his hand reaches into our pockets nevertheless.

The thoughtless individual who stands on the street corner and argues that he is not interested in the squandering of the public substance or in the amount of the national debt and the taxes resulting therefrom because as he says, "It doesn't cost me anything; I don't have to pay it", would rise up in his wrath and smite this governmental waste if he could only be made to realize that every time he goes to the store and makes a purchase, wrapped up in the package he receives and included in the price he pays is the tax of the storekeeper, the jobber, the wholesaler, the manufacturer, in fact the tax of everyone who contributes in any way to placing the product in the hands of the ultimate consumer.

In fact, there is no individual who should scan so critically the spending of public funds as the man who does not pay a direct tax to the Federal Government, the reason being, of course, that through the indirect taxes I have mentioned, and because of his limited income, he already is taxed a far greater proportion of his income than are his more fortunate brothers. Let us not forget that the only person who pays no tax is the person who has no money to spend.

The information I am giving may startle those folks who have believed they have no particular interest in the spending and wasting of the public funds, and that it is of no concern to them.

The tax on business is as much a part of the cost of production as the wages paid, the fuel consumed, or the raw materials purchased. It is one of the costs of doing business.

Congress is placing upon the statute books, at this time, legislation which will tax corporations as high as 42 percent. Dr. Robert R. Doane, the eminent New York economist, has within the past few days testified before a committee of Congress that if business were to absorb the 2-percent transactions tax proposed by the Townsend plan it would bankrupt 60 percent of all American business within a year. If a 2-percent tax would do this, it must be clear that all taxes on a successful business are passed on to the general public, and that the American citizen does have a direct and vital interest in conserving the public finances, and in the reduction of taxes.

It must be clear also that because of the fact these taxes are concealed in the price we pay for the things we buy and which we must have in order to live and enjoy life, that whenever our taxes go up there is a corresponding lowering of the standard of living of our people. The more we pay for taxes the less we have for the necessities of life. A dollar spent for taxes cannot also be spent for bread and meat.

Government files have been filled during the past 3 years with records of the most shameless, the most shocking waste of the public funds known in all the history of civilized government.

Many millions of dollars have been spent in the various boondoggling activities for which Mr. Hopkins and his W. P. A. have become notorious. More than \$60,000,000 has been allocated to the various States to be spent for "recreation" alone.

Unquestionably the greatest waste of the people's money occurs in carrying on the "made" or "invented" work under the W. P. A. Those who are nearest to such work should be best qualified to judge of its value. Certainly one can place dependence upon the opinion of those who are known to be loyal to the President and who have had direct charge of these activities.

I call as a witness Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, former head of the N. R. A. and President Roosevelt's right-hand man for the first 2 years of his administration. He has been, and is now, for the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt. After the Supreme Court had put an end to the N. R. A., General Johnson was placed in charge of all W. P. A. activities in New York City. He carried out the orders of Mr. Hopkins, his chief. I quote from his official report to Mr. Hopkins:

Sixty percent of this invented work is a needlessly expensive and fatuous gesture.

The only argument is that it preserves pride against the humiliation of home relief, yet to go on work relief the rules require that a man first go on home relief. To get there he must submit to the equivalent of a pauper's oath and a most humiliating inquisition.

If a man on home relief finds a fugitive dollar in private employment he risks ostracism from any kind of relief.

It is as cruel as it is stupid, because the area of available relief money nowhere near covers the area of destitution and the vast waste occasioned by this ill-informed dogma subjects the whole Government to amply justified ridicule, and insistence on it not only deprives tens of thousands of people of relief, but involves the Government in more inconsistencies than loyal ingenuity can excuse.

The money should be disbursed as direct relief except for worthwhile and necessary work on a basis of cost, competitive with contemporary public construction.

More than half of all this effort is prodigal pretense justified by nothing.

The above is the deliberate and measured judgment of a man with the courage of his convictions, prompted by his inherent patriotism and his desire to save his friend, the President, from the folly to which the latter has been committed from the minute Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Tugwell were brought into this picture.

Everyone is familiar with the fantastic proposal to establish a shelterbelt of forest 100 miles wide and 1,100 miles long, running from the Canadian border south through those "typical prairie States" we have recently heard about from Mr. Farley, which would cost many hundreds of millions of dollars. No thought was given to the fact that trees never have grown in this section and that authorities agree they never will.

Everyone should be by this time familiar also with at least some of the useless, senseless activities of Professor Tugwell, with his 17,000 faithful on the pay roll, drawing salaries in the amount of \$2,000,000 per month. Most of us have heard of his Matanuska Valley project in Alaska, where he settled 200 families from the Lake States upon 40 acres of land each at a cost of \$18,000 per family. The philosophy pursued seems to be that by shifting people around from where they are to where Dr. Tugwell thinks they ought to be, somehow in the process the subjects of his experimentation will realize the "more abundant life."

Congress has never approved the Passamaquoddy project nor the Florida ship canal. These were established by Executive order. The first, if and when completed, will cost the people of this country a hundred million dollars before it is paid for. The second, if and when completed, will cost taxpayers many times this sum before it is paid for. There is no economic justification for either.

Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and a dozen other great irrigation works were begun without congressional approval. They

are being constructed in the arid West with money allocated for that purpose by the President of the United States. These projects will bring into production millions of acres of land in competition with and add to the troubles of our already established and harassed farmers, who can now supply all necessary food for our people. They will cost many hundreds of millions of dollars, all of which our already overburdened farmers must help to pay.

Adding to the troubles of these harassed citizens is the administration's policy of reciprocal-trade agreements, under which our tariffs are being reduced and the importation of foodstuffs encouraged. These imports are rapidly increasing. The American farmer is finding his domestic market disappearing and the price for his products either reduced or held at a level which will not give him cost of production.

During the year 1935 there were imported into this country one and three-quarter billions of dollars' worth of farm and forest products, every pound of which could be produced on American farms. Give to the American farmer the privilege and opportunity to produce these things and our farm problem disappears overnight.

I have reviewed briefly only a few of the many useless and unnecessary activities, the cost of which is piling upon us a burden of debt we will find difficult to discharge.

Congress has just passed the last appropriation bill of this session, bringing the total amount appropriated for the fiscal year of 1937 up to the huge sum of \$10,069,710,521.58. The total appropriated for the 4 years under Roosevelt is more than \$36,000,000,000, a sum so colossal as to stagger the imagination. One can better appreciate its magnitude when he knows that it is \$10,000,000,000 more than it cost us to prosecute a war across the seas and at the same time pay all other costs of government. Yes, he can better appreciate its magnitude when he knows it is \$11,752,000,000 more than it cost to pay all the expenses of running this country from Washington to Wilson, a period of 124 years, during which time we paid in part the expense of the Revolutionary War, we paid in full for the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Indian wars, the Spanish War, and paid every other expense of government.

According to the best information available, our national debt will within a few weeks reach a grand total of \$36,000,000,000, fifteen billions greater than it was when Mr. Roosevelt became President, less than 3½ years ago. He has asked for and Congress has authorized increasing the national debt to \$45,000,000,000. If he did not expect the debt to reach this figure, why did he ask for this legislation?

A public debt in reality constitutes a mortgage on the farms, the homes, all physical property, together with the productive capacity of our people. The people actually living on the 6,288,648 farms of the country, as disclosed by the 1930 census, constitute 25 percent of the total population. Consequently 25 percent of this Federal debt can be charged to the more than 6,000,000 farms. It constitutes a debt; in fact, a mortgage—although the owner of the farm did not sign that mortgage—of \$1,420, on the average, on each of those farms. Six hundred dollars of that mortgage has accumulated since March 4, 1933, the day President Roosevelt was inaugurated, less than 3 years and 4 months ago.

What I have said about the situation the farmer finds himself in is equally true of every other citizen. They, their talents, their homes, their productive capacity, all are mortgaged, and that mortgage cannot be discharged until the last cent of that rapidly growing national debt is paid.

Don't you good folks out there believe with me that we should stop, take the time to examine our affairs, find out where we are going, and then do the one thing that can put an end to the present administration's squandering and waste that is rapidly placing upon our shoulders and the shoulders of those who follow us a burden of tax greater than any human being should be asked to bear? My friends, think this over and act before it is too late.

A MILLION MEN THROWN OUT OF EMPLOYMENT BY ONE NEW DEAL MEASURE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the above is not a charge made by some disgruntled Republican, by some political critic, by an anti-New Dealer, by a chronic faultfinder. It

is a statement of fact found in a New Deal governmental report.

True, it took a lot of digging to find it. It was there all the time, but the doors guarding it were securely locked, and the key was in the hand of the administration.

Under this New Deal there are endless Government reports made by experts appointed by the Government. Most of these reports are highly colored so as to favor everything the New Deal does, but every once in a while the truth comes to the top.

A group of Government experts were assigned to investigate the facts and to report on some of the results following the enactment of the A. A. A. In September of 1935 their report was made. It was signed by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace himself and put away in the file. Evidently the Secretary did not read it, or, if he did, he recognized the danger and did what he could to bury it securely, for Senators and Congressmen asking for it were told that the original was "not available."

A resolution in the Senate brought it to light and a Senator was permitted to read the original, which was then returned to Mr. Wallace's office. Later a revised report more acceptable to the administration was issued. But the original report still exists. It contains this paragraph:

A permanent drastic restriction in domestic cotton acreage would cause serious problems of finding alternative opportunities for the labor and production resources normally used in cotton production. Rough approximations indicate that 27,000,000 acres in cotton harvested in the United States in 1934 utilized the services of almost 1,000,000 fewer man-equivalents than were used during the 5-year period 1928-32, when an average of 40,550,000 acres in cotton were harvested annually.

So here you have one New Deal measure, the operation of which took out of employment one million men in this one industry.

Let me repeat—these are the figures of the Government's own experts. They are as favorable at least as any honest investigation would disclose.

With this record in this one industry, are you wondering how many men were thrown out of employment by all the New Deal activities?

ROY E. AYERS—A FRIEND FROM THE WEST RETIRING FROM CONGRESS

Mr. WERNER. Mr. Speaker, we of the West feel the impulse of real friends and we measure friends not by the yardstick of what they do for us or by the measurement of how we can use them to advance our own personal or selfish interest. Rather the yardstick gives us the trueness of their character, the realness of their fiber, and the worth of their word, once given. When these attributes are displayed by a man who hails from the great open spaces—in the country out where the West begins—you may count one who calls you a friend a regular fellow—a man who thinks of you as a friend when all is well and rosy, and one who remains a friend when things go wrong and the going gets rough. There always comes the time in the West when true friendship is put to the acid test and rarely is one disappointed by a friend from the West.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana, Mr. Roy E. AYERS, has announced his retirement from the House with the close of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Roy AYERS was a friend from the West. He grew up on the range. As a lad he rode the range in the open spaces and was at home on the round-up. Until he was 18 he was a cow hand with the Two Bar outfit. At work one day on the round-up his horse fell and Roy suffered a badly shattered leg. Unable to carry on with the work, his foreman of the outfit took Roy to Chicago on a cattle train and talked him into going to college to get an education. Roy listened and followed his foreman's advice. With money raised by the cow hands of his outfit Roy's expenses for his first year at Valparaiso were assured. During the summer vacations the boss-owner, Oscar Stephens, of the Two Bar outfit employed him on his old job, even providing transportation from Valparaiso to Lewistown and return each year. Finally, with an LL. B. degree, Roy returned to Lewistown, and again the Two Bar boss and the cowboys took him "under their wing." Stephens urged Roy to become a candidate for county attorney and placed every saddle pony at his order to use in the campaign.

Roy was a Democrat, and the prospects looked none too good to him. In Fergus County there were 1,500 votes, 1,200 of which were Republican. Not very encouraging for a Democrat, to say the least. But Roy ran, and with the help of his friends—the men who rode the range, mostly Republicans—when the votes were counted he was elected by a majority of 333. He filled the office of county attorney for two terms and declined to run for another term in spite of almost unanimous demand on the part of the people there that he do so. He did the job well, he did his full duty always and made many new friends, and, what is more, he never sacrificed his old friends to gain new ones.

Then, after several years of private practice, he was elected district judge, where he served for 10 years. He was elected to the supreme bench in Montana, but after 1 year's service he found the work too confining and not exactly to his liking. He resigned and returned to private law practice, where he was engaged until his election to Congress in 1932. It was here that I met him, and from the first day Roy measured up to the traditions of the West and has been my friend. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of his decision to leave his work here. Men like ROY AYERS are needed in Congress. He was an untiring worker; he was always on the job. His task was a difficult one. For almost 4 years I served with him on three of the important committees of the House. I say "important committees" advisedly. The Irrigation and Reclamation, the Indian Affairs, and the Public Lands Committees of the House are the ones which deal with legislative matters vitally affecting the interests of such districts as are represented by Mr. AYERS and me. The Montana district he represents and the South Dakota district I represent have common interests. Alike largely in topography, soil, population, and diversity in resource, each with farming, mining, cattle and sheep raising, forests, parks, arid and irrigated sections, Indian population and problems, public lands, sugar-beet growing, small industrial activity, with labor problems to some extent, I feel that I am in a position, to a pardonable degree at least, to evaluate the service ROY AYERS has rendered to his own district and State as well as to the Nation during his service while a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, of that splendid effort on his part I take the privilege to speak. ROY AYERS was not only alert to the needs of his district but he was ever helpful to his colleagues. On the range he rode as a boy he gained the enlarged vision of helpfulness. He did not limit his vision to a small circle but he held to the broader view he gained as the man on the horse when he rode to the top of the hill to gaze about. I have observed his service to the people of Montana, his first concern, and also his service to the Northwest and to the Nation. His wise and able counsel was a constant source of helpfulness and came in good stead as legislation was being studied and formulated in committee. He and I had the pleasure of serving on two committee groups of the House—perhaps the only two Members of the House who hold such honor. He and I are members of the Rocky Mountain group and also of the prairie group. Our districts are such that both groups deal with problems affecting our constituents. Here again I was able to observe the worth of this man's service in Congress.

ROY AYERS was a leader in the enactment of all progressive legislation during the sessions of the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses. His membership on the Rocky Mountain group brought him into action on mining, public lands, parks, forests, labor, and irrigation legislation; and as a member of the prairie group he rendered valuable service to the agricultural interests in general. On special committees, such as the ones formed to continue C. C. C. camps, to promote the bonus payment and veterans' legislation, to secure recognition for sugar-beet growers, and national parks, roads, land use, and so forth, he was always active, always alert, and always wise and able counsel, and truly helpful.

Mr. Speaker, ROY AYERS was a fighter, an aggressive fighter but never offensive. He hit hard but he never hit

below the belt. His service in the House was worth while. He was loyal to the leadership. He never deceived anyone. He was loyal to the President and a supporter of the New Deal. While he did not vote for every offering, he gave his support in large measure and only voted otherwise when he was forced to square his vote with a promise to his people or with his own conscience. A look at the record shows a service well performed. Everywhere in his district he leaves lasting reminders of his untiring efforts. On the record here he leaves his mark.

Mr. Speaker, ROY AYERS came from pioneer stock. His father was a pioneer in Montana and helped make much of Montana's early history. The son is a leader in his State where his efforts, counsel, and helpfulness is molding later history in the great State of Montana. He always stood foursquare. As private citizen, county attorney, district judge, supreme court justice, and as a Member of Congress, he measured up to the worth of a man from the West. His leaving is a distinct loss to this body. I am sure I express the wish of all of his colleagues when I repeat what the late Speaker Joe Byrns said to me while we were visiting a few days before he passed away. "This House can ill afford to lose such men as our friend ROY AYERS", said Joe Byrns to me. "I wish he would change his mind and come back to the House." And the beloved late Speaker meant every word he uttered, for he loved the House and he admired ROY AYERS for the sterling qualities he possessed.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I bespeak for ROY AYERS and his family every success and God's blessing in the field of his endeavor for many years to come.

ACTIVITIES OF THE PRAIRIE STATES FARM GROUP

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be incomplete unless some report is made to Members and to our constituents on the work done during the two sessions of the Seventy-fourth Congress by members of that organization known as the Prairie States farm group.

This organization had its inception in Sioux City, Iowa, just before the opening of the first session of this Congress. When we arrived in Washington we organized on a non-partisan basis, with the sole thought to give united study and support to legislative proposals of particular interest and value to the people of the 10 States comprising the prairie group. We have held many meetings. We have exchanged many ideas and we have fostered legislation which we believe has resulted in untold benefit to the farmers and the constituents we represent. Much of the legislation we sponsored was successful in being passed in this Congress. In all of our work we were guided by our chairman, the Honorable GUY GILLETTE of Iowa, who, among others, worked throughout both sessions and guided this legislation until its final passage. With Mr. GILLETTE as our chairman we were able to keep our activities out of party politics, with the result that our constituents were given unusual service and representation. I was honored by Mr. GILLETTE in being made chairman of the subcommittee which worked for the protection of cereal grains, and became a member of the committee which successfully protected the market for American fats and oils. Under Mr. GILLETTE's chairmanship we were divided into various committees which rendered real service to the people of our districts and to the Nation. For information of Members I give a partial list of the things we were able to do through our affiliation with the Prairie States group.

By sustained and unceasing efforts we succeeded in securing, first, an interest cut on all Federal land bank farm mortgages to 3½ percent for 1935 and 4 percent for 1936 and 1937. Within the past week we have succeeded in securing House action approving an extension of this rate of 3½ percent for the coming year. In addition we have never ceased in our efforts to bring the Frazier-Lemke farm refinancing plan to the floor of the House for action.

We have fought and continue to fight to secure such reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration as will insure

the large measure of borrower control that was contemplated in the original act.

By sending committees to the President we were able to secure the large sum of money for emergency feed and seed loans last year to meet conditions of hardship resulting from the drought.

Through persistent efforts we were enabled to secure adequate action in making money available for the control of the terrible chinch-bug menace, which assistance met the severest threat of this kind of which we have record.

With the weed problem becoming a national menace we have secured national cooperation by the Bureau of Plant Industry with the various State organizations and an appropriation for the work which we hope will ultimately enable us to cope nationally with bindweed, thistle, and other noxious weeds which take toll of our crops, and in some cases destroy the farm itself.

We have introduced, are supporting, and still advocating various measures for enlarged domestic and foreign markets for our farm production. Corn-alcohol fuel blends, corn sugar, slash-pine paper, and building materials from corn stalks, straw, and waste material are some of the fields we have investigated.

We have been fully alive to the question of the importation of farm products that might be in permanent competition with our own production, and subcommittees have been working on the problem and have been in constant touch with the agricultural and State departments, with important results.

We caused to be introduced and now have pending a legislative proposal to save a market for 15,000,000 bushels of corn in the production of grain alcohol.

We have conducted numerous hearings and have had subcommittees working constantly in support of legislative proposals for cost of production to the farmer.

We directed Nation-wide attention to the trade agreements in connection with the production of hog serum, and secured farm representation at the hearings to prevent a move toward unnecessary increases in the price of serum to the farmer.

One of our best achievements was the prevention of the diversion of funds for highway improvement to main-trunk highways and away from our farm-to-market roads. Our work in this field was particularly successful in securing the earmarking of large funds for the improvement of the secondary roads, and the enlargement of the secondary-road program for 1935 and 1936 is almost wholly due to our organized insistence.

We were in touch constantly with the conditions resultant from the unprecedented drought of 1934 and 1935, and had committees working at all times with relief agencies, keeping the needs of the affected communities always in the fore. We sent delegations to the White House with this end in view.

We have had subcommittees whose special duty it was to assist in developing the field of rural electrification for the betterment of living conditions for our farm families, and we are confident that within the next 2 years the beneficial results of this program in our rural sections will be of almost incalculable value.

Having in mind the beneficial results of the corn-loan program, we have had subcommittees making a special study of the possibility of the use of Government credit for warehousing on the farm of farm products that can be kept without appreciable deterioration, and loaning to the farmer a sum sufficient to enable him to hold the warehoused product for the best market of the crop year.

While this is but a partial list, it gives some idea of the scope of our study and efforts. On my personal behalf, I wish to thank Chairman GILLETTE and other members of the Prairie States farm group for their assistance to me and to our group. I hope that future Members of Congress from these Prairie States will continue this organization in order to be helpful to those people they represent.

WHAT THE ROOSEVELT PROGRAM HAS MEANT TO MY DISTRICT

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve the people of the First District of Alabama since August 12, 1935, during the unexpired term of my able and universally esteemed predecessor, Hon. John McDuffie, who has been appointed to the bench of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Alabama. It has been my good fortune to represent my district during the administration of one who, in my opinion, will rank in the pages of history with Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson, and who will be classed by historians as the most humanitarian Chief Executive in our Nation's history.

Our great President initiated a program at the time of a real national crisis which many other leaders would have lacked the courage to present for fear of the merciless reprisal of powerful groups who were more interested in a perpetuation of the old rule by privileged self-seekers than the welfare of the great masses of our distressed people.

The President stated at the beginning of his administration that he would not "bat a thousand" but would make some mistakes. In a program so vast and far reaching some mistakes were inevitable, but they have been negligible in comparison with the countless benefits showered upon our people of all classes. Despair and utter hopelessness were changed to hope, a new lease on life was given to millions of our people, and even those who now would crucify our President, and who during the darkest days of the depression crawled away to shelter from the storm and had not even one constructive word to offer, have seen the values of their securities, commodities, and real property holdings return from the vanishing point to sound, reasonable levels.

Several months ago I was invited to attend a meeting of the second oldest farm club in the United States at Ashton, Md. The members of this club are all producers of commodities, including wheat, corn, apples, cattle, hogs, and so forth, and during the course of the meeting the existing market price of each commodity was read into the minutes. I asked the secretary to compare these figures with those in the latter part of 1932, and I myself was amazed at what the President's program had done for these farmers by returning to them a price for their products which will enable them to make a profit, keep their farms and orchards and dairies in A-1 condition, and buy modern machinery and equipment. There were many men there who were not members of the Democratic Party, but they were fair men, who readily admitted that the President's program had helped them.

In my district we were fortunate in having as manager of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation office a man who was thoroughly familiar with real estate values in that area, and who, while a watchdog insuring the soundness of all loans, also personified the spirit of the act creating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I point with great pride to the record of this corporation in my district, the hundreds of homes saved, the many thousands of dollars spent in repairs, payment of back taxes and paving assessments, the restoration of the morale of home owners, and the liquefying of assets for the mortgage holders.

Another new Federal agency affecting our home owners is the Federal Housing Administration, which through May 31, 1936, insured 1,176 modernization notes in my district, totaling nearly a half million dollars, and accepted for insurance through April 30, 1936, 62 mortgages totaling over \$200,000.

The President's program has benefited our agricultural population more than has any previous attempt to do so in our history. There is no question in my mind but that our farmers are the very backbone of our Nation, but heretofore they have been accorded but little real recognition. True, there have been promises galore, with only a small degree of fulfillment. In my district, through February 29, 1936, rental and benefit payments on cotton totaled \$1,913,612, profits on cotton options totaled \$447,478, payments under the corn-hog program totaled \$17,235, or a grand total of \$2,378,325.

Loans to farmers in my district through the Federal land bank from May 1, 1933, through December 31, 1935, numbered 164 and totaled \$428,500; loans through the Land Bank Commissioner during the same period numbered 792 and totaled \$773,750; loans through production credit associations from the date of organization through May 31, 1936, numbered 1,130 and totaled \$475,743; and emergency crop loans from January 1, 1933, through September 30, 1935, numbered 7,918 and totaled \$419,579; or a grand total of loans through the Farm Credit Administration numbering 10,004 and amounting to \$2,097,572.

The Resettlement Administration has also been of great benefit in relieving distressing conditions in the rural sections of my district.

Another boon to farmers is the Rural Electrification program, under which there was recently authorized an investment of \$65,000 in Clarke and Washington Counties in my district. There will be built 58.4 miles of electric distribution lines in previously unserved parts of these counties. These lines will take electric energy to 267 farm homes in that area.

Although the Tennessee Valley Authority does not directly affect my district, its program is of great benefit to my State and is, in my opinion, the beginning of a vast development, which will eventually build an industrial empire in the South.

The Public Works Administration has engaged in a program of sound and self-liquidating projects in my district, including waterworks and sewer systems, schools, and a huge cold-storage plant, totaling over \$1,200,000 in Federal funds. On the approved list of P. W. A. projects in my district awaiting allocation of funds are self-liquidating projects totaling nearly \$2,000,000.

The program of the Works Progress Administration has been well carried out in my district and scores of projects involving permanent improvements, such as community centers, schools, airports, armories, paved highways, oyster planting, and so forth, have already been completed and have given decent and honorable employment to many thousands of willing workers. Through June 17, 1936, 165 projects costing \$2,017,487 were either completed or in operation. Prior to the organization of the Works Progress Administration, the Alabama Relief Administration expended over \$5,000,000 in my district. The Civil Works Administration expended nearly \$1,700,000.

The Social Security Board has just recently commenced to function and is one of the most meritorious of the President's agencies. The sums expended for aid to dependent children and old-age assistance in my district during February, March, and April of this year by the Board approximate \$10,000. This amount is, of course, supplemented by the State of Alabama, and the total payments for the 3 months amount to nearly \$25,000.

Another program which has meant so much to our youth who were striving for an education is the national youth program. This has functioned well in my district and has helped many young men and women since the date of its inception. Expenditures in my district to June 1, 1936, under this program, amounted to \$32,469.

I have always been a firm believer of conservation of our natural resources, and in my district the Civilian Conservation Corps has accomplished more for our badly depleted forests than has been done in 50 years previous to its organization. Fire has been the nemesis of reforestation, and with the building of observation towers, fire lines, truck trails, telephone lines, and so forth, the control of fire has been simplified.

Our section is one of the greatest timber-producing areas in the United States, and if the C. C. C. program could be continued and extended, within a decade the cost of the program would be more than paid for. In addition to the benefits accruing to our forest resources, the C. C. C. has provided employment for hundreds of thousands of young men, many of whom would otherwise be roaming the highways of the Nation aimlessly, and possibly through necessity becoming

entangled with the law on account of petty misdemeanors or possibly serious crimes. This program is building strong bodies for these boys, as it is building strong bodies for the trees in our forests. I had the satisfaction of helping in the fight to retain this program, which I consider one of the best presented by the administration.

There is another agency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which, incidentally, is the result of the efforts of my esteemed colleague from Alabama, the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, which probably did more to reestablish the confidence of our people in our banking system than anything else. The loss of confidence in our banks by our citizens precipitated the critical condition which prevailed when our great President took the oath of office, and had it not been for his heroic and courageous and instant action in this crisis, it is difficult to even imagine the chaos which might have resulted. The F. D. I. C. cemented the confidence which gradually returned when our President took over the reins of Government.

I cannot review these various Federal agencies without mentioning the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which, under the able chairmanship of Hon. Jesse Jones, and through its subsidiaries, has been of great assistance to banks, business, and industry. Only recently a loan of \$30,000 was granted to an industry in my district which will mean the employment of scores of men and the development of one of our natural resources. The loan is absolutely sound and was made only after a most thorough investigation. The Commodity Credit Corporation helped the naval stores industry and cotton farmers in my district last year by holding the price of these commodities at a level at which the producers could make a fair return on their investment, and I believe by orderly marketing of their stocks no loss will be sustained by the Government.

Several million dollars have just been poured into my district in the form of adjusted compensation certificate payments, and over a period of years veterans' compensation payments and insurance will total more millions. Our veterans have been assured a new Veterans' Administration Facility in Alabama, with sufficient space for 250 general medical and surgical beds and regional offices accommodations. The present facility at Tuscaloosa is to be converted to a neuro-psychiatric facility of approximately 350 beds. This program will eventually mean an expenditure in our State of \$1,500,000. The welfare of our disabled veterans has been given prime consideration by our President.

The deficiency bill just approved by both Houses carries an amendment to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which will assure to the naval stores farmers benefits proportionate to those received by producers of cotton, tobacco, and other farm crops. There are millions of pine trees being farmed in my district. This industry gives employment to many thousands of workers. The provisions of this amendment will directly affect a large percentage of my constituency.

There are many other ways in which this administration has helped my district, such as through large expenditures on river and harbor improvements, inland waterways, and so forth.

Alabama has every reason to be proud of our great Democratic President. He has cooperated wholeheartedly with our Governor, our two Senators, and my fellow Representatives from Alabama in promoting Alabama's best interests. Alabama is proud—and, yes, grateful—for the elevation of one of her native sons, and one of her greatest statesmen, to the Speakership of this great House, and our President is assured the sympathetic understanding of this great Alabamian in continuing his humanitarian program.

Alabama will cast her 22 votes for Franklin D. Roosevelt at the Democratic national convention next week and will give him one of the most sweeping votes of confidence at the polls in November that has ever been accorded a Presidential candidate.

HOW CAN WE EMPLOY THE UNEMPLOYED?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the number of unemployed is increasing daily in spite of the appropriations we have made for the purpose of creating employment. The number today of those out of employment who want and cannot get employment is 12,840,000, the highest in the Nation's history. I may add another startling fact in this connection, and that is if we pursue the policy of the present administration or return to the policy incorporated in the Republican platform recently adopted at Cleveland this number will increase instead of diminish.

In order to know what to do about putting these people back to work, we should make some inquiry into the source from whence they have come. What did this vast army of people do in the past when they had work? Why are they not working at their regular trade or occupation now?

To begin with, the average number of unemployed people in this country for the last 25 years have been approximately 1,500,000. In what may be said to be normal times we have about that number always unemployed. We can, therefore, properly deduct this number from the 12,840,000. This deduction leaves 11,340,000 out of work in excess of the normal amount.

The Republican platform asserts that if industry is freed from unnecessary Government restrictions that the unemployed would find work.

In other words, they rely upon industry to solve the unemployment situation. We may, in this argument, assume that industry is freed from every restriction that retards its business. What would happen? Would there be jobs for the 11,340,000 jobless? Not at all. If private industry were thriving as it did in the balmy business days of 1929, no more than 2,000,000 people could possibly find employment. In fixing this number at 2,000,000 we must also assume that industry now would use the same manpower as it did in 1929; and, of course, scientific invention has moved right along since 1929. It is, therefore, certain that industry, taken at its own word, cannot solve the unemployment situation, and it is sheer bunk to say that private industry can do the job.

Inventions are constantly displacing labor. Machines operated by 1 man can and do turn out the output formerly requiring 6 to 12 men. In many cases the displacement ratio is greater than this. It is impossible to stop invention and scientific improvement. We should not want to stop it. Labor-saving devices free the worker from slavish toil and, on the other hand, should produce goods more cheaply and make it easier for the people to purchase and consume them. But it is inexorable that many thousands of laborers, displaced annually by scientific inventions, must find some other employment.

Regardless of the depression, there is no question but what a good portion of the unemployed arrived where they are now because of the displacement of manpower by machinery. The first question now to be asked and answered in this connection is: Should we discard the machines and return to the days when manual labor did what the machines do today? No; that would not settle the question, because our great number of unemployed today did not come from the factories that displaced manpower by the installation of new machines. Some of them did come from that field, but probably not over 500,000 out of the 11,340,000.

Where did the others come from? Where will they have to go before they can make an independent living? The largest percentage of the unemployed are there today because they were either driven out of their farm homes by foreclosures and dispossessions, or were displaced by those who have been so foreclosed and dispossessed. Since 1920, 2,000,000 farm homes have been foreclosed and today 2,000,000 more are on their way to foreclosure. There is no Government agency as now set up that is able, under the rules adopted and the law enacted, to make loans to relieve those in distress. The inevitable result will be foreclosure. The

farm people will be put out and when that is done they will have to drift toward the villages and cities. This adds more to the list of unemployed and there will be no end to this situation until the farm homes are saved.

There must be a plan of action devised that will save the remaining farm homes and make it possible for the idle millions to acquire a home on the soil. There are only two moves which can be made which will put the unemployed back to work:

First. We must pay the farmer and the laborer more money, and in order to do that we shall have to take this money from someone else who is getting too much. For illustration, let us take a dollar spent today for fabricated merchandise. Here is that dollar dissected:

You will notice that labor gets only 16 percent of the dollar; the farmer gets 12 percent; interest takes 33 percent; taxes, 20 percent; excessive profits, 9 percent; salaries, overhead, and so forth, 10 percent. It should also be remembered that the 20-percent taxes mentioned here is not the taxes of the laborer or farmer, but the taxes of business passed on to the consumer. The item of 33-percent interest stands in the same class—it is not the farmers interest or the laborers interest. If they have any such to pay, and surely the farmer has, they must pay that individual interest themselves.

Now, if we are to reestablish purchasing power and start the wheels of industry, we must give labor more than 16 percent and the farmer more than 12 percent of this dollar. Where shall we take it from in this diagram? It will be at once apparent that the item of interest, amounting to 33 percent of the whole, is the place to start first. Dissect this section and spread it over to labor and the farmer and the question of purchasing power would be on the road to adjustment. Take some out of the tax section and we would be almost normal. Take a little more out of excess-profits section and the whole job would be complete. When completed the wheel would look about as follows:

Labor, 43 percent; farmer, 30 percent; salaries and overhead, 25 percent; replacement, 2 percent.

Second. Permit the millions who want a home on the soil to get it under a Government plan of finance that shall insure them a chance to gain a home with honest labor, and in the meantime permit them to sustain themselves without being forced on a Government dole.

I know of no other way by which we can ever expect to put the many unemployed millions back to self-sustaining positions. The longer we delay this program the more the number of the unemployed will be increased. To rely on industry to do this job, even though every restraint imposed by law were removed, is to overlook all facts so obviously before us.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the America's Wage Earner's Protective Conference, an organization composed entirely of representatives of American union labor organizations, through its president, Matthew Woll, called attention to the following philosophy set forth by President Roosevelt in his New York speech:

Higher wages for workers, more income for farmers, means more goods produced, more and better food eaten, fewer unemployed, and lower taxes. That is my economic philosophy, and, incidentally, my political philosophy as well. I believe from the bottom of my heart that it is the philosophy of the 1936 America.

After calling attention to the rapidly increasing imports of both industrial and agricultural products, Mr. Woll stated:

America's workers cannot secure employment, let alone secure higher wages, when products comparable to what they produce, produced in foreign countries, are delivered into American markets at delivered prices which are less than American costs of production of comparable goods.

America's farmers cannot secure higher prices for their products when products of foreign nations are delivered into American markets at prices which are less than our costs of production, which prices of foreign products govern the prices our American farmers must accept for their products.

Mr. Woll called attention to a typical example of the difficulties which American industries face at the present time from industrial imports from foreign countries. He called attention to a report of the Tariff Commission which stated that some 30 percent of all chinaware yearly purchased in the United States is made in Japan, where the workers receive less than \$4 per week for 60 hours of labor; that in the production of pottery at least 50 percent of the wholesale selling price represents what is paid to the workers; and that American workers receive an average of \$18.50 per week of 40 hours. It must be perfectly apparent that American potters cannot hope to secure more wages or shorter hours as long as the Japanese continue to land their wares in this country at a price which will absolutely control the American market.

Another typical example to which Mr. Woll referred was the one presented by imports of butter from the distant shores of New Zealand, and the effect these imports had on the American market.

In January 1935, 92-score butter at Chicago was 34.17 cents per pound. Danish butter in London the same month was 20.26 cents per pound. New Zealand butter in London the same month was 17.77 cents per pound. These quotations, with slight variations, are indicative of the butter situation throughout the entire year of 1935.

In New York City, 92-score butter in December 1935 was 34 cents per pound. When considering these quotations, it must not be forgotten that freight rates from Western Europe, New Zealand, or Japan to the New York consuming area are from one-fifth to one-half the costs of transporting comparable American goods by American railroads to these same coastal cities. The result is that thousands of American railroad workers suffer the loss of employment, and American industrial workers and American farmers surrender, in part at least, our consuming markets to the more advantageously situated and lower-wage-paying foreign producers.

Mr. Woll requested that the revenue bill now before the Senate be amended by inserting the following amendment:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to collect an excise tax on the entry into the United States on all goods, articles, or commodities, which goods, articles, or commodities are dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930, or upon which an excise tax was imposed. The tax herein assessed and levied shall represent the difference, less 8 percent, allowed for profits and handling charges, between landed costs of foreign goods, articles, and commodities and the American wholesale selling price or cost of production, whichever is higher, of similar or competitive goods, articles, or commodities the products of American workers or farmers. Such tax shall be assessed and collected notwithstanding any other provision of law.

This amendment was not written into the law, but had it been it would, of course, have given the domestic producer at least a fair chance in the markets of our seaboard consuming centers.

One can understand the importance of this question when he knows that under the reciprocal trade agreement treaties we are constantly lowering our tariff wall, instead of increasing it. Certainly the objectives of the President, as expressed by him in New York, can be reached only if and when he or the next administration does a complete right about face and gives to the American farmer and American worker their fundamental rights to the American market.

It must be apparent that if the present policy continues the results, instead of being what the President is seeking, will be: Lower wages for workers, less income for farmers, less and poorer food eaten, fewer employed, and higher taxes.

The Presidential objectives are admirable, but he cannot reach those objectives and continue the road he now travels. It would seem that the present condition of American agriculture and the 12,184,000 unemployed American citizens walking the streets looking for jobs would cause the gentleman in the White House to stop, look, and listen.

THE CASE OF CONGRESSMAN HOEPEL, OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT WARRANTS THE PASSAGE OF MY BILL, H. R. 9970, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill to remove criminal proceedings against Congressmen from the District of Columbia to some other Federal court, when so requested by the defendant, where the offense charged is of a serious or criminal nature.

It is generally recognized that there is a distinct prejudice in the courts, among the police and the population generally here in Washington, against Members of Congress, which prejudice would not operate against an accused Member of Congress in the event he were permitted a change of venue from the District of Columbia to some other jurisdiction, as might be authorized in the event he were accused of crime in any State.

It is only natural, in a sense, that prejudice should exist here against national legislators because they do not always respond to the demands made for more pay and other emoluments for the residents of the District, of whom over a hundred thousand are on the Federal pay roll. Practically everyone here in Washington wants more salary or fees, and their claims are constantly being brought before Congress, where they are generally turned down.

As higher salaries and other considerations never come fast enough to satisfy them, the blame for all their troubles is usually laid on the independent Members of Congress who oppose such inroads on the Treasury. They thank the administration which appoints them and condemn the Congressmen who fix their pay or limit their prerogatives. In this connection, it might be said that the officials here draw more pay than the average individual in the Nation. It so happens that the people in the District of Columbia cannot vote against the Congressmen, so if they can stigmatize a Congressman, by fair or foul means, they are usually quick to grasp the opportunity. In such an atmosphere of resentment and animosity toward congressional legislators, the difficulty of securing for a Member of Congress an impartial jury trial must be obvious.

I have introduced H. R. 9970, in order to give Members of Congress a fair trial away from this unfair and unfriendly atmosphere. In most States, if a defendant is brought to trial where the judge or jury, or both, are against him, or where the public sentiment is overwhelmingly against him for some reason, he moves for a change of venue to a new court where neither judge nor jury will be prejudiced to him because of local sentiment. That is all this bill, which I have introduced, seeks to provide, viz, a chance for a Congressman to get a change of venue to a place where the air is not surcharged against him.

Another point which I consider of great importance is that public officials in Washington get their appointments directly or indirectly from the administration; and too often the administration uses its forces to convict an independent Congressman when it wishes to run the steam roller over him. It may be well to mention here that the Huey Long supporters who were indicted while Huey Long was fighting the administration now find the indictments quashed since the Long machine has made peace with the administration.

In the case of Congressman JOHN H. HOEPEL, of Arcadia, Calif., I am confident that could he have been tried in an ordinary court under ordinary circumstances and conditions the case would not have been considered for an hour by the prosecutor, and no jury would have convicted for the simple reason that there was not one sentence of conclusive evidence presented against the Congressman.

The facts in the case appear to be that Congressman HOEPEL is not a "rubber stamp" or a "yes man"—that he votes in the interest of his constituents, and not as the big bosses tell him to vote. The Congressman was warned by "Big Boy" Farley to travel with the administration and not oppose it. The Congressman would not accept Farley's advice, and, apparently for this reason, Mr. Farley decided

he should be punished. As a result his patronage was taken away from him and given to the junior Senator from California. The Congressman remained true to his convictions and voted as his good judgment dictated.

Briefly, what are the high points in the case against Congressman HOEPEL? The Congressman had nominated his son to West Point. The young man failed the examination. Two high Army officers, whom the Congressman knew when he was in the Army service, recommended a young athlete, James W. Ives, of Baltimore, Md., to the Congressman. Congressman HOEPEL nominated their choice—this young athlete—to West Point. Ives had never seen the Congressman up until the time he resigned, which was 5 days after the Congressman had nominated him, although he could have seen him any day by getting on the bus and coming to Washington at a cost of only 50 cents. It must be remembered that Ives wanted to go to West Point, but after he had the nomination he suddenly did not want to go and resigned the nomination.

Ives claims that just before the appointment was made Charles Hoeppel, son of Congressman HOEPEL, using the name of "Charles Alexander", approached him and offered to see that Ives secured the appointment for \$1,000.

Ives claimed he gave a note for \$1,000 payable to "Charles Alexander", but no note nor any evidence to corroborate Ives' statement was presented, nor did Ives himself claim to have referred in any way to such a note in his only conversation with Congressman HOEPEL which took place 5 days after he was nominated. At that time, he stated, according to Congressman HOEPEL, that he wished to resign for personal and other reasons, which explanation the Congressman accepted in good faith, and Ives himself subscribed to in his written resignation. Moreover, shortly thereafter, Ives married, which made him definitely ineligible for West Point inasmuch as married men cannot be admitted to the academy.

The only "evidence" even tending to implicate the Congressman was the contradictory, uncorroborated testimony of Ives, which was impeached by the testimony of Congressman HOEPEL, his older son—not in any way involved in the case—who was present at the time Ives resigned, and two of the Government's own witnesses. To me it is an alarming indictment of justice that a jury, and court officials appointed by this administration, should accept 100 percent the uncorroborated, contradictory testimony of a confessed conspirator—if there was a conspiracy—and reject the corroborated, positive testimony of Congressman HOEPEL and that of two of the Government's own witnesses. It is my belief that no jury outside of the District of Columbia would have convicted the Congressman. As an experienced member of the bar, I am astounded at the ease with which convictions are obtained in Washington, D. C., especially when the individual is one of national prominence, and, as in this case, where he was publicly known as an independent representative who could not and would not be coerced by the administration.

If the athlete Ives had sworn he gave Congressman HOEPEL \$1,000 in cash, his story would appear more plausible; but that his story that he gave a nonnegotiable note, payable to a fictitious name, should have been unquestionably accepted, shows, in my opinion, a determination to convict at all costs. No intelligent person would accept a note, such as was alleged to have been given Congressman HOEPEL's son, and certainly a criminal would have demanded cash. Yet the G-men, the prosecutor, the jury, and judges accepted the story of the note. Had I been on the Hoeppel jury and thought Congressman HOEPEL had accepted that note, I would not have thought him a criminal but an idiot, for no sane man would take a bribe in the form of a fictitious note. Of course the Supreme Court of the United States will reverse the decision of the lower courts.

Fighting Congressman HOEPEL could be convicted of making the first speech on the floor of the House for the Townsend old-age-pension plan; of voting against most of

the unconstitutional bills urged by the administration; of opposing the enactment of the officers' promotion bill, sponsored by the War Department, which permits able-bodied Army officers to retire at 37 years of age at \$150, and more, per month; of voting uncompromisingly in the interest of the veterans, enlisted men, and Government workers; of championing the interest of the poor people at all times; of opposing gag rule; and chumming with the progressives of the House.

In the face of organized administration opposition, Congressman HOEPEL supported the Frazier-Lemke bill to lend money to farmers, and also the Sadowski bill to lend money to all real-estate owners at cost of money. That would mean that farmers, workers, and merchants would be placed on the same basis as the Federal Reserve bank—it borrows \$1,000 from the United States Government for 30 red cents, the cost of the bills.

Congressman HOEPEL believes the great masses of common people in this Nation are as good as the banks and votes accordingly. As a result, the "Big Boys" are persecuting him. The people of the Twelfth Congressional District of California should rally to such a champion as Congressman JOHN HENRY HOEPEL and give him a bigger vote of confidence than ever before. In my opinion, common justice will acquit him in the eyes of all intelligent, fair-minded persons, and it is common justice only, denied in the District of Columbia, in this case, that I am seeking to insure in the future for Members of Congress through the enactment of my bill, H. R. 9970.

THE VITAL ISSUES OF 1936

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to enact the last scene of the last act. It is only proper, therefore, that we pause and take inventory. The question which the American people will ask themselves is, Just what has Congress done to solve the most vital problems facing our Nation?

Many theories are advanced as to just what these problems are. No matter what is said and done, no matter how powerful the smoke screen of political propaganda may become from now until election day, no matter how spell-binding the political oratory may be, the most important issue before the people is to put the unemployed back to work at a living wage. Despite the fact that financial and industrial recovery has practically reached the status of 1928, we still have the problem of unemployment. In the past, with the end of the financial and industrial crisis, we had few unemployed left during the period of so-called recovery. Today the residue of unemployed is so large that despite the so-called recovery, the unemployed remain our most important problem. Despite the importance of this problem no step has been taken by Congress toward its solution. The only proposal has been killed in committee.

In the meantime, until this problem is solved, the most important immediate issue before the American people is that of caring for the unemployed. The welfare of the American people depends on the standard of living of the unemployed. Lower that standard of living and we imperil the welfare of the entire Nation. Contrary to the false optimism emanating from the Department of Labor and other governmental statistical bureaus, we still have 12,626,000 unemployed. This figure is conservative. It was compiled by the conservative leadership of the American Federation of Labor and released by it on March 2, 1936. It also stated that the month of January 1936 showed an increase in unemployment of 1,324,000—the largest since 1931. Its comment was, "To lose ground to such an extent at this time is nothing short of tragic." Therefore, the "recovery is here" ideology upon which the appropriations of only \$1,425,000,000 for unemployment relief is based is unrealistic. The dismissal of 700,000 workers from W. P. A. is based on the same artificial and wishful premise. The money-saving, cruel, chiseling devices employed by the local relief bureaus, such as in New York City, at the expense of its staff and clients, is in accord with

this false policy. The New Deal relief program today is not much different from that of Herbert Hoover in 1930. Mr. Hoover attempted to solve the problem by waiting for lady prosperity to come from around the corner. The New Deal is trying it by proclaiming loudly and smilingly that she had kept her date and is now promenading with the president of the chamber of commerce along Main Street.

Mr. Hoover then contended that very little should be expended for unemployment relief. The New Deal is rapidly approaching the same position. The New Deal on December 1 discontinued contributions for direct relief and relegated unemployables to local charity, which is admittedly grossly inadequate. While it professes its desire to care for the employable unemployed, it nevertheless now refuses to continue to provide for the 700,000 of them who will have been discharged by the end of this month—42,000 of them from New York City alone—and many more after June 30, 1936. It has also refused to provide for those who have become in need of W. P. A. employment since November 1, 1935. Those who will remain on W. P. A. will continue to be recipients of an un-American security wage. So that despite the fact that an appropriation of \$4,800,000,000 was found to be entirely inadequate to cope with the problem of caring for 12,000,000 unemployed during the fiscal year of 1935-36, we have now appropriated only \$1,425,000,000 to deal with the same number of unemployed for the fiscal year of 1936-37.

What is to become of the 700,000 W. P. A. workers who will have been discharged by June 30? The argument is advanced by the "prosperity is here" spokesmen that it is assumed that private industry will absorb a large number of these unemployed. Whether or not private industry will absorb these remains to be seen. Whether or not the problem is as simple as that also remains to be seen. Technological displacements and other economic factors cannot be left unconsidered if we want to solve this problem. In the event that private industry does absorb a large number of these W. P. A. workers who will have been discharged by the end of June 30, these workers will be employed at substandard wages. We are forcing them to choose between starvation budgets from relief bureaus or work at substandard wages. The inevitable choice, forced especially by the cooperation of the local relief bureaus with exploiting employers, will be the acceptance of work at starvation wages. Once we force employment at substandard or starvation wages we will have destroyed the much-vaunted American wage structure. Tear down the American wage structure and we increase instead of decrease the number of unemployed.

So that, despite the obvious and urgent necessity for adequate relief appropriations sufficient to guarantee unemployables on relief life in health and decency, and unemployed on W. P. A. a living wage, the Congress of the United States has retreated and has cut down appropriations to such an extent that it has become necessary to discontinue Federal contributions for direct relief and to deprive over 700,000 W. P. A. workers of even the starvation pittance which they are receiving as wages on W. P. A. projects. The sum appropriated by the Congress of the United States of \$1,425,000,000 is, as a matter of fact, \$75,000,000 less than the sum recommended by the reactionary National Economy League. The relief passed by the Seventy-fourth Congress in its second session constitutes a sweet victory for the Liberty League over the unemployed. The American Tories have cause to rejoice, since their views on relief, recommending cuts in relief appropriations, have now been adopted by the New Deal Congress. It seems to me that the New Deal Congress has been fighting the Liberty League by making faces at it and has been using only words. In deeds it has surrendered.

Hence, as for the unemployed the New Deal has substituted in place and stead of the Hoover fantastic myth of two chickens in every pot the stark reality of two wolves at every door. In the face of this appalling situation and drastic reductions in relief appropriations, we are confronted with 22,000,000 persons still dependent on public charity in some form or another. They are dependent either on starvation direct relief budgets or on starvation security W. P. A.

wages. Congress has failed miserably to provide for these people.

I introduced a bill known as the Marcantonio Relief and Work Projects Standards Act. This bill contained the recommendations of the unemployed, social-welfare organizations, charity workers, and trade unions. It is based on the following six principles:

First, the unemployed are victims of an unjust economic and social system which has failed, and they are without work due to no fault of their own, and the general welfare of the American people depends on the welfare of the unemployed; second, therefore they should not be treated as objects of charity but as a matter of right should be given work at a living wage during their period of unemployment, and as a matter of right the unemployables should be furnished relief on the basis of a minimum necessary to maintain life in decency and health; third, the burden for accomplishing this should be borne by those who have profited from a system which creates unemployment; fourth, the unemployed are to participate in the administration of work and direct relief; fifth, something should be done toward a permanent solution, such as reopening and operating shutdown factories by and for the benefit of the unemployed; sixth, State and local funds are inadequate, and Congress therefore should make adequate appropriations.

Accordingly my relief bill provides for an appropriation of \$6,000,000,000—\$2,000,000,000 in grants to States for direct relief; \$2,000,000,000 in grants to States for State and local work projects and for projects required for operation by States or municipalities of abandoned factories, mines, and other enterprises for the purpose of providing employment and producing goods for use—none of these funds are to be used for financing privately owned enterprises—\$2,000,000,000 for the continuance of W. P. A. The \$6,000,000,000 shall be expended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937.

The bill also provides for certain standards. The relief standards guarantee sufficient and nourishing food; decent housing; appropriate clothing as to season and comfort; medical and dental care; replacement and renewal of essential household goods; carrying charges on homes owned by relief clients, provided such charges are not in excess of rent allowance; the maintenance of relief clients' membership affiliations in his religious, fraternal, political, or social organization; necessary transportation and communication expenses. All those who do not receive an income from any source equal to the minimum standard established in his locality as necessary to maintain life in health and decency for himself and dependents would be eligible for relief. Those who receive an income less than such minimum would receive the difference. All payments are to be in cash. No such person shall be disqualified because of sex, race, color, creed, citizenship, residence requirements, political or labor affiliations, refusal to work at occupation for which he is not fitted, refusal to work because of a strike or lock-out, refusal to work at substandard conditions of hours and wages, or refusal to work where he is required to scab or join a company union.

It also provides for standards on work projects, such as prevailing wages, but in no case shall weekly compensation be less than the minimum necessary to maintain life in health and decency for the worker and his dependents, 30-hour week, collective bargaining, workmen's compensation, work at one's own trade and according to his skill, and no discrimination. Preference would be given to those projects which would be of a permanent and useful nature.

All persons unemployed and capable of work would be eligible for work on these projects.

The relief and work projects would be administered by a commission of 15—5 to be unemployed, appointed by the President from panels of names submitted by organizations of unemployed, 5 from panels of names submitted by social workers, and 5 from panels of names submitted by the Works Progress Administration.

No State would be given grants unless it had adopted relief and work-project standards and plans conforming with those set up in the bill. The commission would pass on the plans of

the various States before allocation of funds were made to them. The States, in addition, in order to qualify, must set up State and local boards giving the workers and relief clients one-third representation. The local committees shall fix minimum standards for the locality, and a dissatisfied worker or relief client may appeal to the local committees and may make a final appeal to the State committees.

The administering of the Federal work projects would be in the hands of regional and local committees giving the workers one-third representation. The local committees would fix minimum standards. Again, dissatisfied workers may appeal to the local committees and may make final appeal to the regional committee.

The usual question will now be asked, Where are we going to get the money? Many sources exist. Reduce to a minimum the more than a billion dollars appropriation made for war purposes. Apply the British tax rate on all individual and corporate incomes, inheritances, and gifts over \$5,000 a year. This source will be more than ample.

While legislation such as this, which means life in health and decency for the unemployed, has been killed in various committees on the ground of economy, the Seventy-fourth Congress has not hesitated to appropriate over a billion dollars for war. While 700,000 W. P. A. workers will have received their discharge slips—the dreaded pink slips, as they call them—by the end of June this Congress will have appropriated over \$1,000,000,000 for war purposes. Over a billion for death and inadequate funds for the unemployed. All under the guise of national defense! National defense, as I understand it, is the defense of our shores against invasion. I am not a fanatical pacifist; I believe in defending the United States. If the time should ever come I would not hesitate to do my share in fighting in defense of our homes. But why spend over a billion dollars when we cannot even identify the enemy that will invade the United States? Do we need over a billion dollars for defense against an invading foe? If we are not preparing against an invasion, what are we preparing for? Are we preparing for another imperialistic war? Are we preparing, perhaps, for another war to end all wars and for another war to make the world safe for democracy? Why are we appropriating over a billion dollars for destruction? Whom are we going to fight? Where is the enemy? Can anyone mention the enemy? I have repeatedly from the well of the House challenged Members to reveal to us the name of the enemy, and no one as yet has even given us an inkling as to his identity.

We are preparing for war, and when we prepare for war we will have war and not peace. We are preparing for a war not in defense of our homes but an imperialist war, a war to insure financial and imperialistic interests. The American people want peace; they do not want to send overseas the flower of American manhood to guarantee and insure financial and imperialistic interests of various groups in the United States. The American people do not want to see the forgotten man buried under the keels of battleships.

Thus we see that while a tidal wave of militarism has swept over the Congress of the United States, while it has indulged in an orgy of steel-helmeted extravaganzas, insane expenditures for death, a cavalcade of madness, billions sacrificed on the altar of war, the unemployed have been relegated by the same Congress to the rugged individualism of starvation and misery.

The second most important issue before the American people is: Is industrial and agricultural democracy constitutional? The Supreme Court of the United States has declared industrial and agricultural democracy unconstitutional. In the decision of the *N. R. A.* and on the *Guffey Coal Act* the Supreme Court has decreed that the regulation of wages and hours, the relationship between employer and employee, are purely local matters, and that the representatives of the people in Congress have no right to regulate industry for the general welfare of our people.

In the *A. A. A.* decision the Supreme Court of the United States decreed that agriculture was likewise a local problem and that the representatives of the American people assem-

bled in Congress could not so regulate agriculture for the general welfare of the people. While the Supreme Court in the *N. R. A.* and *Guffey* cases held that hours and wages were local problems, in the minimum-wage law case the other day it held that the States, in dealing with these problems locally, had no power to regulate hours and wages. It declared the exploiter of women and children immune from any legislation. It canonized the exploiter of labor and draped around him the Constitution of the United States. Was it ever intended by the founding fathers that the Constitution of the United States was to be used as a protective cloak for those who would exploit women and children in industry? The Supreme Court of the United States has interpreted the Constitution contrary to the spirit of those who wrote it. It has violated the letter and the spirit of that document.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln in discussing another infamous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States—the *Dred Scott* decision—which was wiped out only by bloody civil war—

The Supreme Court has got the doctrine of popular sovereignty down as thin as homeopathic soup that was made by boiling the shadow of a pigeon that had starved to death.

The Supreme Court has interpreted the Constitution of the United States in terms of an ox-cart economy of 1787, and has closed its majestic portals to the light of the present-day airplane age of machine and mass production.

What has the Congress of the United States done to deal with this problem? Amendments have been offered, suggestions have been made, but the leadership of the Seventy-fourth Congress has killed in committee every single proposal that dealt with the Supreme Court or with the Constitution of the United States. It is obvious to every person who is in the slightest degree realistic that industry and agriculture are today national in character and therefore must be dealt with on a national scale and by the national Government. It therefore has become necessary to amend the Constitution to give the representatives of the American people assembled in Congress this power.

However, an amendment to the Constitution requires two-thirds of both Houses and ratification by 36 States. When we consider that the problems are immediate, and that the amending of the Constitution would take too long, and when we also bear in mind that there has never been an amendment to the Constitution affecting property rights except after a violent struggle, all other amendments having been amendments only as to form, and when we consider the lagging progress of the child-labor amendment, then it becomes necessary to find a more immediate and speedier remedy.

Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States do we find any authority vested in the Supreme Court to declare null and void the enactments of the representatives of the American people assembled in Congress. The proceedings of the Constitutional Convention record that on two separate and distinct occasions the founding fathers voted down resolutions giving the Supreme Court the power to veto laws enacted by Congress. For 50 years, from the decision of *Marbury v. Madison* to the *Dred Scott* decision, the Supreme Court never dared declare a law passed by Congress unconstitutional. The reason is apparent to all, for during those 50 years there still lived in our country those same patriots who made the American Revolution possible and who were fully acquainted with the meaning and intent of the Constitution of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson said, with reference to the Supreme Court:

It has long been my opinion that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the Federal judiciary—an irresponsible body working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step, like a thief over the field of jurisdiction.

Then again Jefferson said, with reference to the Supreme Court:

The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot and unalarming advance, gaining ground step by step, and holding what it gains, is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them.

How prophetic were these words of Jefferson! We can certainly see how much territory the Supreme Court has usurped from the days of Jefferson to the minimum-wage law decision. But Jefferson defined the powers of the Court. He said:

It is a very dangerous doctrine to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions. It is one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy * * *.

And again he said:

The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments coequal and cosovereign within themselves.

A group in Congress today adheres to the same views outlined by Jefferson. Rather than wait for a constitutional amendment and a catastrophe which may take place before the adoption of such an amendment, we believe that by simple legislation the power of the Court should be curbed. We can legislate to the effect that the Supreme Court and all of the other inferior courts shall have no power to pass on any question involving the constitutionality of any law. The American people must defy the Supreme Court through their Representatives in Congress. This defiance can take place in the form of legislation depriving the Court of its tyrannical power.

While the Seventy-fourth Congress has done nothing on this issue, I am confident the people of the United States will make themselves heard on this issue this year. We must restore the Government of the United States back to the American people. Government by the judiciary cannot be permitted to replace government by the people. Industrial and agricultural democracy must be made constitutional. The basic democratic principles of our Nation must be preserved against the onslaughts of the reactionaries in Congress and out of Congress. Our basic democratic institutions must be saved from the Supreme Court of the United States, the last bulwark of reaction in America, by the American people themselves.

THE CHILD-LABOR AMENDMENT

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, for a hundred years we have been trying to abolish child labor. The child-labor amendment—endorsed by the finest and most sincere champions of humanitarian legislation from Mrs. Roosevelt down—has been assailed by those who want to perpetuate exploitation of the young and the helpless. It has been defended by the noblest and the best of our citizenship, regardless of party lines.

Our President declared:

One of the accomplishments under the National Recovery Act which has given me the greatest gratification is the outlawing of child labor. It shows how simple a long-desired reform, which no individual or State could accomplish alone, may be brought about when people work together. It is my desire that the advances attained through the National Recovery Act be made permanent. In the child-labor field the obvious method of maintaining the present gains is through ratification of the child-labor amendment. I hope this may be achieved.

I heard an illuminating address by the able attorney, Arthur Garfield Hays, over broadcasting station WEVD, in which, discussing this child-labor amendment, he said:

At the beginnings of the factory system we heard of the God-given right even of babies to work. We heard of the God-given right of parents to use their children to add to the family income. Yet everyone knows that this God-given right is a curse of poverty. It is wrong to designate a necessity as a right. Sometimes the right of the child to work is a correlative of the right of the adult to starve.

Without going into the intricate legalism that generally accompanies objections to humane and decent laws, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that more and more the combat over new statutes resolves itself into a question as to whether these statutes would benefit the average man and woman or not. If the ordinary person would benefit, the letters and telegrams in commendation usually come from farmers, workers, and small businessmen who are on the edge of bankruptcy. If the legislation is of profit to the exploiting class, plenty of communications,

typed on expensive bond paper and handsomely gotten up, reach the Members of the National Legislature. I have received thousands of communications of this character. I have always tried to answer them and to extend the proper courtesy to those who wrote me, regardless of their motives or their status in life. But I have never been deceived as to their background, interests, and motives.

Repeatedly I have emphasized that the Democratic Party, if it is to adhere to the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, must stand for a government maintained in the interest of those who produce. Such a government means real democracy. A party consecrated to that philosophy is a party of real democracy. If our party is to sell itself to beneficiaries of privilege, it should discard its name and call itself a party of Hamiltonian federalism of Bourbon Toryism—of Wall Street capitalism—and waste no more time in petty protestations about its progressive tendencies.

I appeal to believers in fundamental democracy to stand solidly together.

THE REAL "FORGOTTEN MAN"—THE FARMER

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, in many respects the farmer has been the real "forgotten man"—was in that classification until the present administration came into power. Even yet there is much "remembering" that must be done for his benefit.

Workers in mills and mines have been organized to greater or lesser degree for years. While they have had bitter struggles and cruel persecution, they have gone slowly but steadily ahead. It has been very recently that the farmer has organized to an extent sufficient to be able to demand and obtain better prices for produce and fairer treatment generally.

Since the advent of the Roosevelt administration to power, an effort has been made to use the authority of Government to protect the farmer to some degree from exploitation. It is the first time in American history that this has been tried. From the days of Alexander Hamilton down to our own, we have had drummed in our ears the pleasant fiction that a high protective tariff to protect "infant industries"—and grown-up industries in particular—was essential to the preservation of the Republic. Nothing was said about a protective arrangement for the farmers. The assumption was that if we gave the plutocrats enough surplus money some of this unearned sum might drip down into the pockets of the farmers and workers. It was a doctrine of taking care of the top of the pyramid, in the naive belief that the base would then take care of itself. To our credit, let it be understood that we have graduated from the realm of such childish logic.

The A. A. A., faulty as it was, was an attempt to control production for the benefit of the agricultural class. It is common talk in Washington that the Supreme Court, when it declared the A. A. A. unconstitutional, did so, not because of what the A. A. A. had done so far, but because of the fear that when once the Government started to exercise its powers in behalf of the workers of farm and factory it would go further and really imperil the unearned profits of the capitalist class.

The A. A. A., whether you like it 100 percent or dislike it 100 percent or partly like and partly dislike it, was an effort to make agricultural production scientific and to gage it intelligently enough so that the man who tills the soil might not continually be on the edge of starvation.

M. L. Wilson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, well said in his address at the Northwest School of Agriculture, Crookston, Minn.:

Whatever you or I may think of the strength or the weakness of these programs, we can agree on two things: First, that this was the greatest cooperative movement of farmers in any country in all history; and, second, that since it was the first program of its kind, both the farmers and the administrators had to begin from scratch without experience. And since we learn largely by experience, both by successes and mistakes, in developing new programs, we should now look carefully and with unprejudiced eyes into this remarkable experience which American farmers have just gone through.

The fairness and reasonableness of Mr. Wilson's comment must appeal to all. The need for regulation of agricultural production, along with industrial production, is self-evident.

Details must be worked out in this as in any other area of official action, but the need for the regulation is none the less.

A complicated civilization requires traffic lights, safety zones, and many rules for traveling. Are not food and clothing as important as automobiling? Do we not need scientific direction dealing with them as fully as we need it with respect to flivvers and trucks and limousines? I say "Yes."

FARM WAREHOUSING—LOANS ON CORN

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation is a Government-owned institution. It was created in 1933 for the purpose of making loans upon farm commodities and is a new agency. It has been helpful to farmers, and I am glad of the fact that I am one of those who have supported and encouraged it.

Under the 1933-34 loan plan it disbursed almost \$100,000,000 in loans on cotton on a basis of from 8 cents to 10 cents per pound. It loaned almost \$283,000,000 upon the 1934-35 cotton crop on the basis of 11 cents and 12 cents per pound. The 1935-36 cotton crop is on a basis of 9 cents and 10 cents per pound. I am very glad that the farmers in the South have been able to obtain these commodity loans.

But I am more particularly interested in corn loans, because it is the staple crop of my State of Iowa. But I have another and personal reason for being interested in farm warehousing, because I was coauthor of the first farm warehousing act ever enacted in the United States, and I have been proud as I learned of the benefits which have flowed from this law. This Iowa Agricultural Warehouse Act was passed in 1923 when I was a member of the State senate, and I helped to prepare it and watched over its enactment more than 16 years ago. It is entitled "An act to provide for storage of grain in State licensed warehouses and under State supervision, and the issuance of storage certificates therefor, and providing for penalties thereunder."

This measure attracted attention at the time of its passage and its salient features were soon copied by many of the other States of this Union, so that it is now generally accepted in many places as a part of the law of the land.

The Iowa act was based upon simple and well-known business practices. It was designed to remedy a prevalent evil by which farmers were forced to dispose of their products immediately after harvest and at a time when the gamblers in the great city grain markets and exchanges were able to manipulate the market and to force down prices just when the farmer needed to sell. Because of the farmer's financial condition and because he was not on economic equality with other industries he was oftentimes required to dump his grain into and upon an already glutted market. We thought the evil could be remedied if the farmer could be financed and allowed to carry his produce over longer periods of time and not throw it at once after harvest into the elevators and warehouses. We believed that the State could supervise the storing of grain upon the farms themselves, that storage certificates could be issued under proper and safe supervision, and that these certificates could float in the market as collateral the same as other securities do, and that the producer himself was more worthy of the profit from rising markets than speculators and money changers.

For 10 years before the present Democratic administration came into power the Iowa law had proved and justified itself, and when Secretary Wallace came to Washington to enter the President's Cabinet in 1933, he brought with him an intimate acquaintance with the workings of the Iowa farm warehousing law. So, then, in October 1933 the Commodity Credit Corporation was formed, and the original capital of \$3,000,000 was made available by law. Additional capital of \$97,000,000 has been provided by an act which was passed in April 1936 by the Seventy-fourth Congress. Up to this time loans have been made only upon cotton, corn, gum turpentine, and gum rosin. Under the form of the note and the agreement the producer is not personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of the collateral if he has made no misstatements or misrepresentations and has complied with the terms of the loan.

As I have stated, the provisions of this law were very useful to farmers before the coming in of the present administration. But since October 1933 the Commodity Credit Corporation has extended and multiplied the benefit and uses of farm warehousing. All there is to it is that the commodity must be stored in safe and sound bins or cribs or warehouses; that these must be locked and sealed; that proper inspection be made as to the grade and quality of the commodity; and then certificates are issued and loans are made upon these certificates which are valid collateral for most purposes.

The very first corn loan ever made by the United States, and I think the very first use of the act itself, was made in my own home county. This was in the fall of 1933. Blank contracts and forms had been prepared and were flown from the Department in Washington to Iowa, and a farmer in my own county and near my own home was the first man in the world to make a loan under the Warehousing Act as it was put into force by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

These corn loans have proved of enormous value to farmers. Loans of 45 cents per bushel were made upon the 1933 corn crop, commencing in November 1933. As disbursed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, they covered 267,758,222 bushels of corn and aggregated \$120,491,265.41. Every dollar of them has been repaid, although the amount of the loans per bushel at the time they were made exceeded the normal price. The producer has been helped, and the Government has not suffered a single cent of loss.

In addition to this, it is estimated that loans made by banks and other lending agencies and repaid directly to such lending agencies covered about 3,000,000 bushels of corn and aggregated \$1,350,000. Farmers were enabled to carry their corn to realize benefits from advancing prices and at the same time to hold their product on the farms under seal and have it there ready in the ear for feeding requirements, if desired, whenever the loan was paid.

Under the 1934-35 corn-loan program, the amount of the loan was advanced to 55 cents per bushel on all 1933 and 1934 corn stored on the farm in accordance with State warehouse requirements. These loans as disbursed by the Commodity Credit Corporation covered 7,845,728 bushels of corn, aggregating \$4,313,743.15. These also, and every cent of them, have been paid in full. If loans made by banks and other lending agencies are included, the total loans to corn producers under the 1934 corn program aggregated \$11,042,392.08. Not a cent has been lost under the plan.

The 1935 corn-loan program was put on a basis of 45 cents per bushel. These loans mature on July 1, 1936, and have been called and will undoubtedly all be paid in full without loss to the Government. It is estimated that these loans totaled \$6,582,535.25, including those made by the Corporation and by banks and lending agencies.

Those who were responsible for the original Iowa Warehouse Act, under which this plan was first made available to the world, may well be proud of the benefits which the idea has conferred upon mankind. There have been some things in the Agricultural Administration that I have adversely criticized, but I have done it only in a constructive way and in a spirit of fairness, and I now want to confess that the Commodity Credit Corporation has benefited our farmers during dark days when they were yet under great handicap. Anything which will help to amend their condition should receive hearty endorsement of men in all professions, in all walks of life, and in all political parties.

Mr. Scott Bradford, late of Storm Lake and Des Moines, Iowa, the man who first suggested the idea of farm warehousing, has passed on into immortality. But the good that he did and the idea that he gave us will continue to benefit the farm communities through centuries yet to come, and I acknowledge my debt to his memory in being called upon with one or two others to reduce his contribution into statutory form; for it was he who gave the idea to the authors of the bill and asked them to put it into lawful form, and whatever they did regarding it is a source of satisfaction to them.

THE REVOLVING PENSION PLAN WILL SOLVE OUR ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, as I am a candidate for reelection to Congress on the Democratic ticket, and as I was the first Member ever to speak in the Halls of Congress for the revolving-pension plan, I feel justified in presenting my views, not only to my own constituents but to the citizens at large, in order that they may be informed before casting their votes for our national legislators.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I spoke 45 minutes on January 30, 1935, on the Townsend plan, and that I was continually harassed by Members of Congress because I advocated this plan, which was then termed "fantastic." I spoke again on this subject on February 6, February 28, and frequently thereafter, and worked with a special Townsend committee of Congress which was organized to bring the McGroarty bill before the Congress for consideration and passage.

In my speech of January 30 I showed conclusively how this plan could be put into operation without one single cent of increased cost to the taxpayers, and I reaffirm my statements and hope those who are interested will consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1935, in the libraries of their cities, to see for themselves the arguments I advanced in support of this plan.

Mr. Speaker, while I am a candidate for reelection, I am more interested in securing legislation which will bring about recovery than I am in my own candidacy. With this thought in mind—our own Democratic administration already being on record as violently opposed to the McGroarty bill—I proposed to leading Republicans that they incorporate in their Cleveland platform recognition of the right of the aged to a substantial old-age pension. The Republican Party, however, failed to make a direct commitment but merely generalized on this subject. Therefore the voters of America must, in order to obtain the enactment of this legislation, support only those for office who are pledged to work for the enactment of this legislation, regardless of political affiliation.

MEMBERS WHO HAVE SUPPORTED THE O. A. R. P. SHOULD BE REELECTED

Approximately 50 or more Members of Congress have shown their sympathy toward this legislation and their sincere desire to enact it into law. All of them, in my opinion, should be reelected—and certainly they deserve the steadfast loyalty of all Townsend members whose battle they have so stanchly and fearlessly fought. Unfortunately, however, it is found that in some places Townsend Clubs are supporting for Congress individuals who have nothing other than a promise to give them, while at the same time experienced Members, who have borne the brunt of the battle here in the Halls of Congress, have been ignored. I feel confident that Townsend Club members will realize that a Member of Congress who has made good, and who has demonstrated his sincerity by actually fighting for the plan in Congress, is more to be relied upon on a basis of his performance than is a candidate who has nothing but promises to offer.

We know the opposition which the administration directed against Members of Congress who have supported the Townsend plan in the past. Should the Members of Congress who opposed the administration on this subject, and who valiantly fought for this plan, now be sidetracked for voluble candidates who are now jumping on the Townsend band wagon, realizing that we are going on to victory? Napoleon, that great leader of men, honored the Old Guard and gave them just consideration and precedence over raw recruits. I feel confident that the Townsend Club members everywhere will do likewise and support for reelection those who have fought a good fight and who bear the scars of battle in their interests.

Townsend club members everywhere should bear in mind that western classic of the range entitled "Old Faithful", and they themselves should keep faith and return to Congress those who have carried the banner fearlessly in their behalf.

THE BUREAUCRATS OPPOSED THE O. A. R. P.

The scars which I bear as a champion of this plan are honorable scars, since they indicate that I have championed

the people's cause, and, Farley, McAdoo, Hopkins, and others to the contrary, my record proves this. I would rather bear the scars of conflict in a worthy cause than to be known as a "yes-man rubber-stamp" Representative, without courage to voice his convictions or advance a single progressive thought.

Townsend club members in my district have been loyal and faithful, since most of them, if not all of them, realize that my difficulties here are due to my aggressive attitude in advancing the cause of our aged citizens, in fighting for our veterans and Federal employees, in espousing legislation in the interest of the unemployed, and in championing the interests of the underprivileged at all times. With such confidence displayed toward me, I reaffirm to these groups that, if reelected, I shall continue my efforts with renewed vigor for substantial and permanent recovery through the means proposed by Dr. Townsend and the more liberal elements in the Democratic, Republican, and Union Parties.

Success can only be brought about through the election of an independent Congress, and it is for this reason that the electorate should survey the situation, judge candidates who are up for reelection by their records, and vote accordingly.

THE COURTS SHOULD NOT BE USED TO INTIMIDATE ADVOCATES OF REAL RECOVERY

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to state that I am opposed to the un-American practice of using the courts of our country to beat into submission those who advocate liberal, progressive legislation. It is my opinion, however, that the inquisitorial Townsend investigating committee, through the flagrant injustice of its methods, which every fair-minded American citizen must wholeheartedly resent, has but served to unify and strengthen our forces and contribute to the forward progress of the Townsend movement. The efforts to bring Dr. Townsend into the courts may fittingly recall that long, long ago the ruling powers sought to destroy Daniel for his independence and his defiance of their orders, but a higher power than theirs preserved him and brought him, unharmed, from the lions' den.

Townsendites and the voters of America have it in their power to bring about the reforms they desire, provided they will on election day relegate to oblivion the machine candidates and the servants of special interests, whose performances have betrayed them in the past and whose promises cannot be relied upon.

I repeat, men who have a record of performance in actual service in the Congress in behalf of the Townsend old-age-pension plan should be reelected, for they are more to be trusted than those without experience, who have nothing other than promises to offer, which past experience has proved are easily forgotten once election is attained.

For the information of the electorate who are interested in returning to Congress the various Representatives who supported the McGroarty measure, I submit the names of such individuals:

Representatives Amlie, of Wisconsin; Andresen, of Minnesota; Ayers, of Montana; Binderup, of Nebraska; Blackney, of Michigan; Buckler of Minnesota; Burdick, of North Dakota; Cannon of Wisconsin; Carter, of California; Clark of Idaho; Collins, of California; Connery, of Massachusetts; Costello, of California; Crawford, of Michigan; Crosby, of Pennsylvania; Cummings, of Colorado; Duffey of Ohio; Dunn of Pennsylvania; Englebright, of California; Gearhart, of California; Gehrman, of Wisconsin; Greenway, of Arizona; Haines, of Pennsylvania; Hildebrandt, of South Dakota; Knute Hill, of Washington; Hoepfel, of California; Houston, of Kansas; Kahn, of California; Knutson, of Minnesota; Lemke, of North Dakota; Lundeen, of Minnesota; McGrath, of California; McGroarty, of California; Main, of Michigan; Marcantonio, of New York; Martin of Colorado; Massingale, of Oklahoma; Michener, of Michigan; Monaghan, of Montana; Moritz, of Pennsylvania; Mott, of Oregon; Murdock, of Utah; O'Malley, of Wisconsin; Patterson, of Kansas; Pierce, of Oregon; Pittenger, of Minnesota; Sadowski, of Michigan; Scott, of California; Scrugham, of Nevada; Smith of Washington; Stack, of Pennsylvania; Stubbs, of California; Swee-

ney, of Ohio; Taylor of Tennessee; Tolan, of California; Wallgren, of Washington; Welch, of California; Werner, of South Dakota; White, of Idaho; Withrow, of Wisconsin.

The above list may not be 100 percent complete, but it does include those most active in the Congress with whom I was personally associated in my efforts in behalf of the plan.

INSURANCE OF BANK DEPOSITS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my recent address over N. B. C. on insurance of bank deposits, as follows:

No legislative achievement in recent years has created deeper interest than the act of Congress establishing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Its benefits have extended to all sections and to all classes. Its passage affords a conspicuous example of the change in administration accomplished by the election of 1932. No such proposal was seriously considered during the former uninterrupted regime of 12 years, notwithstanding the demand for such legislation was so accentuated as to become apparent to every intelligent citizen in the land. As a minority Member of Congress, I had introduced a number of bills over a period of 10 years, designed to bring about this great reform. When the Democrats captured the House in 1930 and following my election as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, I renewed the fight for the passage of this legislation. I introduced a bill providing for the protection of depositors in both State and National banks. This measure was reported favorably and passed by the House on the 27th day of May 1932. But at that time the Senate was under Republican control and refused to give consideration to the bill. When the new administration took office in 1933 I renewed the struggle, and the Banking Act of 1933, known as the Glass-Steagall bill, with provision for the insurance of deposits passed both Houses and was signed by President Roosevelt.

In view of the facts which are of record it is exceedingly surprising, not to say amazing, that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] should have made the statement in a recent radio address that the legislation "was inaugurated under an amendment which bears my name." It is true that the distinguished Senator offered an amendment to the bill which provided for the insurance of deposits in member banks in the Federal Reserve System up to the amount of \$2,500 for each depositor, to become effective on the 1st day of July 1933, and such insurance for nonmember banks available to them upon certification by State banking authority, to become effective on the 1st day of January 1934. The amendment fixed an annual assessment against participating banks not to exceed 1 percent, and provided that the Treasury of the United States should pay any losses accruing in excess of the funds raised by assessment.

Of course, the amendment was not adopted. Such a plan of insurance would undoubtedly have resulted in the withdrawal of deposits, entailing enormous losses upon the Treasury for the very manifest reason that depositors, with the experience of recent years, would have hastened to withdraw deposits while the Treasury was responsible for them under the law. The slightest consideration could but disclose the folly of such a scheme. The measure that was passed provided for the insurance of all deposits up to \$10,000 for individual depositors; for 75 percent insurance between \$10,000 and \$50,000; and 50 percent on amounts in excess of \$50,000, to become effective on the 1st day of July 1934.

A provision was incorporated by the conference committee establishing temporary insurance in the amount of \$2,500 for each depositor, effective beginning January 1, 1934, in the event that the President did not by proclamation put into operation the permanent plan.

It was understood at the time that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was favorable to the temporary insurance; and later, after the temporary plan had been put into effect, he introduced a bill the purpose of which was to make the temporary plan of \$2,500 insurance permanent; but before the expiration of the temporary insurance period the Congress amended the permanent act, fixing the minimum amount of insurance at \$5,000 for each depositor. On the record, then, it would appear that the Senator from Michigan preferred to limit the protection afforded to depositors to the amount of \$2,500, rather than the larger amount of \$5,000 provided for in the permanent law.

Another surprising inaccuracy in the radio address to which I have referred was a statement of the distinguished Senator from Michigan referring to the President, "He wrote a letter to the legislative conferees demanding that my amendment be stricken from the bill." The fact is no such letter was ever received, and members of the conference committee, as well as the record, will confirm my statement.

During the struggle to protect depositors in 1932, the high officials of the Republican administration from the President down opposed every proposal for bank-deposit insurance. President Hoover was importuned repeatedly by those of us engaged in the fight to lend his approval, but he and his associates in office fought us at every step. The position of President Hoover was in line with the declaration of the platform of his party adopted in 1932. That platform declared: "In contrast with the Republican policies and record, we contrast those of the Democrats as

evidenced by the action of the House of Representatives under Democratic leadership and control, which includes:

- "1. The issuance of fiat currency.
- "2. Instructions to the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury to attempt to manipulate commodity prices.
- "3. The guaranty of bank deposits."

It should be noted that in the recent Republican platform adopted at Cleveland there was no repetition of the language quoted from the platform of 1932, nor any reference to the subject of bank-deposit insurance. This action corresponds conspicuously with the action of the American Bankers Association in its Chicago convention in September 1933 and later. That convention denounced the act providing for the insurance of deposits, but a year later and in all subsequent meetings there was no reference to their former declaration, nor any mention of the subject. It would seem that the happy results following this legislation, including the cessation of bank failures, should have been a source of genuine gratification to the bankers as well as it is to the people of the Nation.

It seems only fair, with the approaching national election, to call attention to these facts, and to the position of the candidate of the Republican Party chosen by the Cleveland convention. Not only does the declaration of the Republican platform of 1932 condemning deposit insurance stand unrevoked, but the candidate chosen by the Cleveland convention has a record on the subject which all who are interested in the protection of bank deposits should understand. In a message addressed to Senator Capper when the Banking Act of 1933 was before the Senate the distinguished Governor of Kansas stated:

"Pending banking bill extremely injurious to State banks and threatens their very existence. It is essential our dual banking system be preserved in order to best serve farm and community interests of Kansas. Urge your active opposition to the guaranty section, which should be entirely eliminated from bill." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 77, pt. 6, p. 5863, 73d Cong., 1st sess.)

In this connection let me say that the Deposit Insurance Act passed by the House in 1932 contained a specific provision for the protection of depositors in State banks upon terms of equality with those in member banks of the Federal Reserve System. The same provision was incorporated in the act of 1933, and is in the law today. Those of us who led the fight for the protection of depositors have directed our efforts in the interest of State banks as well as national banks. The simple fact is, the insurance of bank deposits saved the State and community banks of the Nation. It is well known that, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, I have fought for the preservation of State banks. This I will continue to do so long as I serve in Congress.

Governor Landon, in an address read for him by the bank commissioner of Kansas, before the State bank division of the American Bankers Association held in Chicago, September 6, 1933, said in part:

"* * * There is no question in my mind but that the guaranty of bank deposits is a greater blow to the ultimate welfare of the American people than the wildest inflation of the currency could possibly be.

"In my judgment the guaranty of bank deposits, if carried out in this country to its logical conclusion, will completely destroy the entire banking system of the Nation." Evidently the bankers of Kansas followed the Governor's advice. In that State more than 300 State banks declined to secure for their depositors the benefits of deposit insurance afforded by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Under the provisions of the permanent act of 1935 State banks were permitted to withdraw from the Insurance Corporation and to be reimbursed all assessments paid by them, less their proportionate cost of the operation of the Corporation during the time of their membership. Only 32 State banks of more than 14,000 insured availed themselves of the privilege of withdrawing and they were repaid every dollar that they had paid to the Corporation. Their depositors enjoyed the benefits of deposit insurance for a period of nearly 2 years without any expense whatsoever. The State banks of Kansas that failed to join the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation missed an opportunity to secure insurance for their depositors for nearly 2 years without a dollar of cost. Such is the record and such is the fallacy of the position of the distinguished Governor of Kansas, now the nominee of the Republican Party for President.

Governor Landon prior to his nomination for President by the Cleveland convention avowed a desire to take the people of the Nation into his confidence and to give expression of his views in connection with the platform of that convention. He did not hesitate to declare his devotion to the gold standard and his desire to return to that discredited and discarded system as soon as possible without unbearable injury to agriculture and demoralization of economic conditions. In the circumstances it is only fair to accord to Governor Landon the same degree of sincerity and consistency with respect to his position on the question of bank-deposit insurance. Manifestly, Governor Landon subscribes to the views of his party as expressed in the national platform of 1932, and still adheres to his convictions disclosed in his telegram to Senator CAPPER, and in his address of September 6, 1933. I venture the opinion that the people of the United States will not look with favor upon any possibility of a return to the conditions under which they suffered prior to the passage of the act providing insurance for bank deposits.

During the last 12 years of Republican administration there were 11,457 bank failures in the United States, with deposits of five and one-half billion dollars, culminating in the complete collapse of the national banking structure at the close of President Hoover's administration in March 1933. Since that time there have been only 61 bank failures of insured institutions, with deposits of \$14,868,000. The depositors in those institutions were promptly reimbursed, each one to the amount of his deposit not in excess of \$5,000. Bank deposits have increased since the 4th of March 1933 approximately \$14,000,000,000. The public is protected. The fears of depositors have vanished, and the dread of bankers unable to sleep at night because of the danger of frenzied withdrawals of deposits no longer exists. Bankers are free to employ their resources in support of trade and commerce along normal lines and to give the fullest measure of public service. Had this measure been enacted 5 years earlier millions of depositors would have been spared immeasurable suffering and distress. Such a measure would have been enacted had not the Government been under the control of short-sighted, selfish, and incompetent leadership, who opposed this, as they did every other constructive effort in the interest of the great body of our people. The insurance of bank deposits is an indispensable step in any program of restoration and recovery. Upon this achievement we are building and we are finding our way toward the light. If the people of the Nation desire a continuance of the protection that has been afforded, they have in their hands the power to preserve it. The issue will be determined by their ballots. There is one safe method and only one by which to save the benefits of the protection now enjoyed, and that is to elect to office at Washington those who favor this protection and who are at heart in sympathy with what has been accomplished.

POLITICS, PATRONAGE, AND CIVIC DUTY

Mr. ECKERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the speech of President Roosevelt on The Philosophy of Government, in which he says:

Government includes the art of formulating a policy and using the political technique to attain so much of that policy as will receive general support—persuading, leading, sacrificing, teaching always, for the greatest duty of a statesman is to educate.

Here is indicated the way of practical politics. Attention is called to the futility of seeking reforms that are not supported by public opinion and emphasizes the importance and necessity of education.

No thoughtful person can view the present conditions of the world without feeling intuitively that profound economic changes are in process of incubation. Before our very eyes we see wealth steadily concentrating in the hands of the few—the middle class being ruthlessly swept away and the great body of workers becoming more helpless and hopeless.

These conditions demand attention. The pernicious processes must be arrested. But imperative as is the need of halting the forces that are undermining the foundations of our economic structure, the task is impossible while ignorance and indifference hold sway among the masses. There must be enlightenment, for "social reform", as has well been said—

is not secured by noise and shouting; by complaints and denunciations; by the formation of parties or the making of revolutions; but by the awakening of thought and the progress of ideas. Until there be correct thinking there cannot be right action, and when there is correct thinking right action will follow.

Without right thinking the people will lack vision, and without vision they perish.

No greater task rests upon the leaders of thought than that of enlightened guidance so that citizens and voters may face in proper perspective the real problems of politics and government.

One of the problems that stand in need of discussion and clarification is that of political patronage. In the minds of many the thought is uppermost that the sine qua non for political activity is a Government job at the hands of the victorious party. And political workers become imbued with this thought quite naturally, since it has been the custom and practice for generations on the part of those who manage party affairs and seek to get control of government to offer the spoils of office as a lure to engage in political activity.

Ex-Senator Moses, discussing the question "What is the matter with the Republican Party?" boldly and frankly declared that it is in need of three things, namely: Money, patronage, and a boss. With money and patronage and a

boss, preferably of the Mark Hanna type, declared this seasoned politician, the Republican Party could be rehabilitated so that it again would become a strong and formidable organization.

This is the ordinary but vulgar conception of politics. It is obvious that if this type of politics is given free rein, it must result in corrupting both the people and the Government. Those whose appraisal of politics rises no higher than that of ex-Senator Moses, of New Hampshire, will find fertile fields for plying their pernicious and vulgar brand of politics unless economic conditions will be reformed and improved so that opportunities to gain a livelihood at self-employment or in private industry will at least be as inviting and lucrative as that offered by political bosses. In fact, the party boss and the political jobber can only thrive under conditions of gross economic inequality.

In a country where one class is too rich to be shorn of its luxuries and another so poor that a few dollars on election day or a political job will seem more than any abstract consideration; in which the few roll in wealth and the many seethe with discontent, political power naturally passes into the hands of party bosses and political jobbers who buy and sell it as the Praetorians sold the Roman purple or into the hands of demagogues who will seize and wield it for a time only to be displaced by worse demagogues. But where there is anything like an equitable distribution of wealth, the trade of the political boss and the political jobber will be at a discount.

The antidote for the corruption and political jobbery that have found such a prominent place in American politics is in the development of a standard of civic duty that rests upon right, truth, and justice.

Civilizations in which social groups are bound together by the force of self-interest and the hope of reward from political bosses and jobbers cannot endure. Assistant Secretary of State Hon. Francis B. Sayre, in a commencement address before the Virginia Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va., June 4, 1936, said:

Only as faiths and beliefs are foundationed upon truth will they be all-embracing and enduring. A civilization which is lacking in such fundamental faiths loses its cohesiveness and its power. The great central facts of life are not the selfishness and lusts and cruelties of petty men and small minds, not the suffering and the evil which seem at times predominant, but rather the never-ending, patient bravery, the constant reaching upward toward goodness, and the fundamental nobility of human nature.

In this spirit and in this spirit alone, not only as to individual conduct but as to social behavior as well, can we hope to overcome the social evils of our time and free politics and government from selfishness, corruption, and hypocrisy.

Amplifying this thought, I include under the general permission for Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD the following letter addressed to Rev. Dr. H. Reed Sheffer, pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Rochester, Pa.:

JUNE 20, 1936.

Rev. H. REED SHEFFER,
Rochester, Pa.

MY DEAR DR. SHEFFER: Your letter in reference to local patronage received. Since you are a religious man and a minister of the gospel, I feel free to write you intimately, not only in relation to the context of your letter, but also about those deeper problems of politics and Government that are so closely related to the material and spiritual welfare of the people.

Addressing myself first to the subject matter of your letter, may I say that the selection of postmasters is really the duty of the President and the Senate. Under our system of party government, however, the practice of permitting Congressmen to recommend candidates for postmasters has ripened into a congressional prerogative, and so the opinion prevails that Members of Congress select the candidates for postmasters.

It happened that when I came to Washington I was advised by the leaders of the State Democratic organization that all Federal appointments were to be cleared through the Democratic organization; at the same time being advised that experience had proven this policy to be the most effective and practical in promoting party harmony and party solidarity. Whether for good or ill, whether we like it or not, under present political conditions party government seems inevitable. For the most part, throughout the years of our national life the party system of government prevailed and still prevails. It is conceivable that there may come a time when parties as such will have lost their hold in the affairs of government. Among a truly intelligent, just, and patriotic

people there would be no occasion for voters to separate into groups and array themselves against each other at election time, for in the last analysis their true interests are common. What is good for one is good for all, providing, of course, that no one wants any special privilege or favor.

The political struggles of the past and of the present have their root in selfishness, in greed, and in the will to want something at the expense of all the people. These may find expression in the wish for public office or public appointment, or governmental concessions such as franchises, tariffs, bounties, or other concessions of government. Whatever it may be, the thought is always uppermost to get something for little or no effort. If it shall ever come to pass that the people will learn that their highest interests will best be served by obeying the simple doctrines, "Honesty is the best policy" and "To live and let live", then political parties will disintegrate and in social and political matters act as one group. But until this happy condition comes to pass, we are bound to speak and function socially and politically through parties.

Hence it is not a theory, but a condition with which we are confronted; and, therefore, it would seem that the best policy to strengthen and solidify the party is through organization. And experience has shown that this can best be done by cooperating with and supporting the party organization, subject always, of course, to the condition that it function in the interest of all the people.

The Democratic Party is seeking to serve the people in the Nation and in the State and, in order that its work may not be interrupted, the party's commission must be renewed from time to time. We are on the eve of a very important national election. The outcome of the issues involved in the pending election is of vital concern to every man, woman, and child in the land. In the struggle impending privilege is battling for its life. No quarter will be granted. Every resource at the command of privilege will be invoked in the hope of regaining control of the Federal Government.

The New Deal program is, in essence, the battle against privilege. In its deeper meaning it has for its aim the abolition of private privilege in all its ramifications. The Democratic Party is pledged to restore to the American people economic freedom by establishing a social order based on the doctrine of equal rights to all, special privileges to none.

If every Democratic Member of Congress were to act independently and contrary to the rules and policies of the central organization, confusion and discord within the party would be inevitable. So long as the organization of the Democratic Party promotes policies and submits candidates for political appointments in which one can have confidence and faith, we ought to be happy to cooperate to the fullest extent. Patronage is of secondary importance. It occupies too large a place in the minds of the voters, and for the good of all it is well for us frequently to recur to the question, "What are parties and politics primarily concerned about?" In doing so we will regain our true balance as citizens.

Politics is the science of government and is charged with much more important matters than political patronage. Too many, I fear, harbor the notion that politics is a mere matter of political jobs, when, in truth, political positions are a mere incident to the main business in hand. Fundamentally, politics and government are concerned with the problem of human rights and human welfare. In the Declaration of Independence we are told that governments are instituted among men to secure their natural rights, and in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States we are reminded that our Federal Union was established to promote inter alia the general welfare.

Neither of these objectives has yet been achieved by the American people—in truth we seem to be farther removed from their enjoyment today than any time in our history. Today, want and misery, poverty and distress are encountered everywhere and unemployment is all but universal—all of which indicates that politics and government are not yet functioning effectively for the public good.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, in a commencement address a few years ago, asked this challenging question:

"Why it is that with all the progress which the world is making in so many directions—science, art, letters, all forms of industry, transportation, commerce—why is it that there still exists so much want, so much of all that which for the want of a better name may be summed up under the word 'poverty'?"

The poverty of which Dr. Butler speaks is not due to the niggardliness of nature or nature's God. It is not due to the unwillingness of man to labor and produce wealth. On the contrary, man's power of production is multiplying with every new invention, and his willingness to labor is evidenced by his frantic appeals for work. Yet in spite of it all poverty persists and deepens with the passage of the years. Quoting again from the address of Assistant Secretary of State Hon. Francis B. Sayre:

"Millions of human beings are walking the streets of our great industrial cities, hungry and unable to find work. The demoralization that comes from idleness and public relief is eating into youth. Those who have succeeded in laying something by against sickness or old age are harassed with vanishing values and economic uncertainties. We are forced to mortgage unborn generations to care for present want. In the midst of abundance the world is multiplying poverty."

Upon reflection it is quite apparent to everyone that the problems involved in Dr. Butler's question must be solved and solved correctly if civilization is to endure. Hence those who are in

positions of public trust and spiritual leadership are in duty bound to give these problems serious, conscientious, and intelligent consideration.

In view of this fact, is it not deplorable that so much time and thought are consumed in the consideration of comparatively inconsequential things of politics and which provoke and bring into action the baser emotions, for, after all, the subject of patronage sinks into insignificance when compared with the deeper problems of politics and government, problems which have in their keeping the rights and liberties of mankind. The millions of our fellow men that are suffering the pangs of poverty represent the problems of unemployment and the inequitable distribution of wealth. It is for us to find a rational and permanent solution of these problems. To fail in this task will only multiply the ugly conditions that now prevail in American politics and further menace the perpetuation of our free institutions. As has been well said—

"Where there is anything like an equal distribution of wealth—that is to say, where there is general patriotism, virtue, and intelligence—the more democratic the government the better it will be; but where there is gross inequality in the distribution of wealth the more democratic the government the worse it will be, for while rotten democracy may not in itself be worse than rotten autocracy, its effects upon national character will be worse. To give the suffrage to tramps, to paupers, to men to whom the chance of labor is a boon, to men who must beg, or steal, or starve, is to invoke destruction. To put political power in the hands of men embittered and degraded by poverty is to tie firebrands to foxes and turn them loose amid the standing corn; it is to put out the eyes of a Samson and to twine his arms around the pillars of national life."

Unless the benefits resulting from new inventions and material progress will be equitably diffused among the masses, the corruption of politics and government will become more and more menacing as the years go by. It is no light and trivial thing that in the richest and most self-reliant Nation of the world—a nation that boasts of its schools and universities, its churches and Christian virtues, there should be millions of unemployed and other millions on the border line of poverty, while the gulf between the House of Have and the House of Have Not widens with the passing of the years.

During the closing years of the last century students of social science were impressed with the gravity of the economic conditions and emphasized the importance of a satisfactory solution of the social problem. How much more pressing is this same problem today.

In the consideration of this perplexing problem, may I call your attention to the intimate relation between the secular and spiritual welfare of the people? The spiritual development of a people must keep pace with material progress. Quoting Assistant Secretary Sayre again:

"Further progress demands building anew upon spiritual foundations. The amazing and splendid advance in material progress of the last century must now be matched by spiritual progress and understanding. It is not that we must accept arbitrary, unreasonable, or fruitless religious dogmas or traditional moral codes. What our civilization needs is a mastery and a practical utilization of spiritual laws with as large a measure of success as our own generation's mastery and utilization of physical laws."

A thorough and intelligent analysis of the social problem reveals the fact that the moral precepts given to man for guidance of his individual conduct are applicable to his behavior as a citizen and member of society. The Golden Rule applies in the realm of civic behavior as well as to individual conduct—That we should do unto others as we would have others do unto us—that we should respect the rights of others as scrupulously as we would have our own rights respected is not a mere counsel of perfection for individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform our social institutions and national policies if we would secure the blessings of abundance and peace, is wise and sound counsel.

And Christ himself tells us "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto us."

And again we are admonished that "As God's will be done in heaven, so in earth."

Hence the solution of the problems involved in Dr. Butler's question is to be found in those deeper truths that lie at the very root of true religion and constitute the hope of democracy.

The contemplation of these truths inspire and inspire. They lift us up and beyond vulgar demagoguery and selfish politics. They impel us to center our hearts and our minds on those deeper problems of politics and government, the proper solution of which will bring about a new and fair division of the goods and right of the world, to the end that the Biblical injunction may be fulfilled:

"And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruits of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat."

Under separate cover I am mailing you a copy of *Progress and Poverty*, which has been described by an eminent American as—

"A book that rests upon a granite pedestal of truth, face up, open for the thinking world to scan—a book matchless in logic, beautiful in diction, perfect in illustration, unchallenged and unchallengeable, unanswered, and unanswerable; an everlasting monument to the intellectual and moral integrity of the man who wrote it."

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. ECKERT.

THE "RED RIDER"

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of facts regarding the Sisson bill to repeal the "red rider."

The Sisson bill (H. R. 11375) to repeal the so-called "red rider" will be the first order of District business in the Seventy-fifth Congress, providing, of course, that I shall then be chairman of the committee.

Under the rules of the House such bills can be considered only on days set aside for action upon District legislation. And circumstances beyond the control of those in charge of the repeal measure have prevented action upon it at this session, as observers who have followed the matter closely are aware.

On May 11, the first District day after the repeal bill was duly reported out as approved by the District Committee, the House leadership urgently requested that it not be brought up for action that afternoon because consideration of it probably would have run over into the following day. On the next District day, May 25, the House met, but immediately adjourned out of respect to Congressman RANDOLPH PERKINS, who had died that morning. On what would have been the subsequent District day, June 8, Congress was in recess due to the Republican national convention. By June 22, the date for the next scheduled District day, Congress will either be in recess for the Democratic national convention or will be adjourned for the year.

This repeal bill in which all the school teachers of the country have shown a very great interest because of the far-flung threat it contains to personal liberty and religious freedom may seem at first glance to be a matter chiefly concerned with the District of Columbia and its educational system. However, it has become a national issue now and is regarded as such by the National Educational Association. The Capital City of the Nation should lead in setting the standard for education for the country. Therefore this ridiculous rider to the 1936 appropriation bill is of paramount importance to every sane, liberal American citizen. The aim of every educational system in the country is to keep our schools out of politics, and the Congress of the United States should take the lead in this objective. Therefore, when legislation aimed at dictatorship in our schools in Washington is permitted, it would undoubtedly lead to a very serious break-down in our much-desired freedom from political influence.

This statement is issued to give the facts of the matter as it now stands to the hundreds of parents and teachers who are supporting us faithfully in our efforts to expunge the malodorous "red rider" from the statute books of our Nation.

THE POTTERY INDUSTRY

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, no American industry has been so handicapped by the competition of cheaply produced foreign merchandise as has the pottery industry. Nearly all the countries of Europe and Asia have invaded the American market. Japan, however, is the chief offender, and the constantly increasing imports from that country are a continuing menace to the industry. For more than 20 years the tableware manufacturers have been struggling to hold 50 percent of the home market.

The tremendous difference in production costs practically nullifies the existing tariff rates. The pirating of designs and the copying of standard types of tableware all add to the competitive burden which domestic manufacturers must carry. As a result of a greatly depreciated currency, Japan still has a material exchange advantage. Competition is further enhanced by the governmental subsidies paid to Japanese producers.

Under the permission granted in the House, I include the following letter to the Tariff Commission from the tariff counsel of the United States Potters' Association, Mr. John E. Dowsing.

THE UNITED STATES POTTERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, May 19, 1936.

THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I wish again respectfully to refer to the application of The United States Potters Association under section 336 of the

act of 1930, filed October 11, 1932, on which action by the Commission was postponed and the protest has now been pending close to 4 years, together with briefs and other data filed. In view of the Commission's letter, dated September 5, signed by the Honorable Thomas Walker Page, acting chairman, in which it is stated:

"The status of the Commission's pottery investigation has been discussed by the Commission recently, but it does not feel that any further steps in regard to the investigation should be taken at this time."

It is asked if the time is not now opportune that steps be taken and the complaint set for hearing and argument. Additional reasons to those set forth in the original complaint are:

(1) This protest was continued by the Commission to give attention to and investigation of a subsequent protest filed under the provisions of section 3 (e) of the National Industrial Recovery Act. This later protest, pending before the Commission 18 months to 2 years, was not decided or recommendations made owing to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Schecter case.

(2) The Commission, in its investigation (Report No. 102) of the complaint of the United States Potters Association under section 3 (e) National Industrial Recovery Act, found, as set forth in its conclusions on the result of its investigations:

"(a) Imports of household and kitchen pottery have been substantial throughout recent years, representing in 1933 and 1934 approximately one-third of the domestic consumption, and being equal to about one-half of the domestic production in terms of quantity."

(3) The Commission, in its Report No. 105, on Recent Developments in the Foreign Trade of Japan, gives the total imports into the United States from all countries for 8 months of 1935. The imports of pottery from Japan, according to the Commission's figures, are: Plain china and porcelain household table and kitchen articles, 83.9 percent of the total; decorated china and porcelain household table and kitchen articles, 88.1 percent of the total; plain earthenware and stoneware household table and kitchen articles, 85.5 percent of the total; decorated earthenware and stoneware household table and kitchen articles, 77.3 percent of the total.

(4) In the plain earthenware, undecorated, the increase in importations is shown as 6.1 percent of total imports in 1929 to 85.5 percent for 8 months of 1935.

(5) In the report of C. H. Stephan, Vice Consul, Nagoya, Japan, dated August 7, 1935, to the Department of Commerce, it is officially stated that the minimum wage paid in the Japanese pottery industry is: Clay workers, 37 cents for an 8½-hour day and decorators 38 cents for a 9½-hour day.

The minimum wage paid to domestic potters is 75 cents per hour with the decorators earning as high as \$14 per day. The cheapest and poorest unclassified labor receives 49 cents per hour.

(6) Notwithstanding these definite and vital facts of the competing importations from Japan, the Commission made no recommendation in the matter of the potters' complaint.

(7) Although the Commission stated in its letter of May 1, 1934, with reference to the protest under section 336, that the question of ascertaining the foreign cost of production was "very difficult and perhaps not possible of solution" as a reason for postponing action pending decision in the matter of the later protest under section 3 (e), N. I. R. A., attention was directed to the fact, and again so directed that paragraph 2, subsection E of section 336 provided against such a contingency arising in giving the Commission authority to accept as evidence "the weighted average of the invoice prices or values for a representative period", etc., and, further:

"(C) Other relevant factors that constitute an advantage or disadvantage in competition, including advantages granted to the foreign producers by a government, person, partnership, corporation, or association in a foreign country."

(8) We believe the Commission is in possession of the knowledge of such factors to the advantage of the Japanese manufacturers of pottery competing with the domestic manufacturers, as depreciated yen; governmental subsidies to the manufacturers; governmental subsidies to the shipping; average wage of less than one-tenth that paid to the American potters; child labor; large household employment of old men, women, and children; average cost of Japanese ware 38 to 39 cents per dozen; average cost of freight from Japan to New York \$0.35 per 100 pounds, while from East Liverpool, Ohio, it is \$0.50 per 100 pounds; average landed cost, minus freight, from Japan \$9.05 per gross, while average cost from East Liverpool, Ohio, minus freight, is \$11.25 per gross.

The importations of competitive ware from Japan, both for consumption and warehouse, for 1935, were 8,696,602 dozens. For the month of January 1936, 652,302 dozens; for February, 614,489 dozens, indicating that the high mark of imports for the year 1935 will be equaled if not exceeded in 1936.

It is also respectfully submitted that the principle involved in the protest of the domestic potters under section 336 goes beyond that industry and affects other large industries, such as cotton-textile manufacturers, wool manufacturers, rubber manufacturers, etc. The depression has been capitalized by the Japanese here as well as in other countries as shown in the foreign trade increase of Japan, aided by the many favorable factors hereinbefore set forth. As is stated in an article by the New York Trust Co. in the May issue of Nations Business—

"Whether measured in the terms of the Japanese yen or in quantity, both exports and imports in 1934 were well above 1929 levels, while, on a gold basis, Japan had increased her share of world import trade from 2.80 percent to 3.31 percent, and of

world trade from 2.93 percent to 3.32 percent. In the past year, still further gains were registered and, with imports valued at 2,566,762,000 yen and exports at 2,547,615,000 yen, foreign trade was even greater than in the previous record year of 1925. The penetration of Japanese goods into new markets and their successful competition with the products of other exporting nations have aroused widespread interest—in some quarters decided concern.

"What Japan has done is to take advantage of depressed economic conditions throughout the world to offer relatively cheap goods which have had a special appeal because of reduced purchasing power. In some instances this has meant an invasion of markets of higher-priced goods; in others, it has created a market where none would otherwise exist."

The reduced purchasing power will be continued just as long as we permit our factories to be closed or working on part time, with millions of the unemployed walking the streets, while at the same time the industries and those holding jobs are taxed to provide a dole and for the creation of artificial employment; just as long as we permit our markets to be swamped with the cooile-labor products of Japan and European cheap-labor countries. In the pottery industry alone, its 20-odd thousands of normal employment, receiving 3 to 4 times that of the highest wages paid in the world for similar work and 10 to 20 times that paid in Japan, if permitted to be fully employed, would with their pay envelopes increase purchasing power to that extent. If 50 percent of the competitive pottery from Japan permitted to be dumped on our markets was added to the domestic production, there would not be an unemployed potter in the United States or an idle plant.

These cheap goods which have "created a market where none would otherwise exist" would, as previously, be taken care of by the higher-priced domestic merchandise, produced by American workmen under high-wage and living conditions existing nowhere else in the world. And this is applicable to all other industries. The high wages of one class of labor would purchase the products of another class of labor and thus form links in the chain of business recovery which would go far to reduce our unemployment and banish the depression.

Secretary Roper of the Department of Commerce, speaking in San Francisco on June 4, 1935, said:

"Certain of our importers are flocking to Japan on every steamer with samples of articles they want imitated by Japanese manufacturers, employing cheap labor with cheap living standards. Once they have established their contacts, they give blanket orders for unlimited quantities of the cheap imitations and then come home to slash prices against competitors trying to support American labor at an American wage sufficient to maintain our own living standards."

Are not all such relevant facts within the purview of subparagraph C, supra?

It is obvious that the only way in which the American potters and the twenty-odd thousands of labor can be employed and protected against the imports of low-cost-of-production ware from Japan, with the low living costs and other "relevant factors" is, as we claim, by the adoption of the American selling price as the basis for assessing duty. The determination of value in this country is easily ascertainable from the books of the American potters and all other desired data is at the service of the Commission. The Commission has at its disposal the Japanese invoices from which can be obtained "the weighted average of the invoice prices or values for a representative period."

The question involved of "like or similar" goods has been covered by oral argument and briefs, but we will be glad to submit additional brief and argument on this point, if desired.

We, therefore, respectfully urge the United States Tariff Commission to pass on our complaint under section 336, now pending within a few months of 4 years, and that it recommend duty be assessed upon importations of the competitive ware from Japan on the basis of the American selling price.

Respectfully,

THE UNITED STATES POTTERS ASSOCIATION,
By JOHN E. DOWSING,
Tariff Counsel, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning National Training School for Girls:

At the meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia held May 27, 1936, a subcommittee was appointed to visit the National Training School for Girls and investigate conditions there. Pursuant to the action of the committee Representative CARPENTER and I, Mr. HULL finding it impossible to join us because of important business, made an informal visit to the school Friday, June 19, and found conditions there very deplorable.

First in importance is the great fire hazard on account of old buildings and old-fashioned lock, controlled by levers, on the doors. This system of locking, however, we are informed by the superintendent, Dr. Smith, has recently been discontinued.

We found the buildings in a very unsanitary condition, particularly regarding toilets. Six toilets, no basins, running water in the corridor on each floor, no hot-water supply.

The kitchens are supplied with large coal ranges, no gas ever having been furnished, but we understand the W. P. A. is now taking care of this problem and gas pipes are being laid in the different buildings.

There are practically no recreational facilities. The class rooms are very meager. Employees are under civil service, but there are no trained workers or teachers of any subject.

The buildings are badly in need of cleaning and painting. There are old-fashioned caldrons for heating water in the laundry instead of a hot-water supply. There is no heat radiation in any of the bedrooms, only one or two steam coils in each corridor to supply heat.

The average offender serves 2 years. Many have been there as long as 7 years. At present there are 33 inmates. No commitments were made between July 1935 and January 1936. Federal offenders as well as District of Columbia offenders are committed to the training school.

There are in all four buildings and these contain 101 rooms. If a fire should break out in any one of these buildings, it would become a fire trap, as there would be little likelihood of the inmates being able to escape because of the antiquated system.

There is no equipment for vocational training of any kind to enable these girls to rehabilitate themselves when their term of commitment has expired; no sewing rooms, no domestic science equipment, no vocational work; in fact, nothing that is supposed to be part of the system of a training school for girls. Under these circumstances it is difficult to understand how any real good can be accomplished, as this school is merely a prison, instead of serving to assist girls who are sent there for correction. It must be borne in mind that most of these are very young girls, and it is a fact that a child born there was kept in the institution for 7 years.

At present, owing to the recent publicity given the training school, many alterations are in prospect and a much delayed appropriation of \$100,000 which appears in the appropriation bill of 1937 will go far to bring about very much desired improvements.

We were happy to meet Dr. Carrie W. Smith, the superintendent, who conducted us through the institution and explained the great lack of facilities. We believe Dr. Smith is well qualified and will make a very good superintendent; we commend her for what she has tried to do and sincerely hope we shall be able to cooperate with her to bring about the very many changes that are absolutely necessary.

In conclusion may I say that the situation of the school is fine and nothing better could be desired. There are large grounds but no playgrounds. The grounds could be used for very definite recreational purposes which would help in building up the physical condition of the inmates. It is suggested that considerable work be done along this line. It must be borne in mind that these girls are not criminals; they have been sent to this institution for correction.

It is also suggested that there be a definite division between first offenders and girls who have previously been sent there.

It is also suggested that a comprehensive program be established toward rehabilitation, keeping in mind the necessity of preparing the inmates for work when they are released.

It is also suggested that since this report is too late to be presented to the District Committee this year, it having concluded its meetings, this matter be gone into very thoroughly when the Seventy-fifth Congress convenes.

I believe it would be safe to say that in no other city of this size in the Nation could be found so intolerable a condition as has been that of the National Training School for Girls in the District of Columbia.

MARY T. NORTON,
RANDOLPH CARPENTER.

INTEREST RATES ON FEDERAL LAND-BANK MORTGAGES SHOULD BE REDUCED

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, 9 days ago a new issue amounting to \$83,000,000 of consolidated Federal land-bank bonds was offered to the public for the purpose of refunding an old issue of approximately \$83,125,000 of 4¼-percent individual bonds of the Federal land banks. These new consolidated bonds bear 3-percent interest and were offered at 100¼, and are callable in 9½ years, and are callable on January 1, 1946, and mature 10 years thereafter. Before noon of the day of the offering these new bonds were heavily oversubscribed. These facts should bring us to a consideration of the attitude of the Federal land-bank system with regard to the interest rates which are charged to farmers on land-bank mortgages. We recently had before us the Frazier-Lemke bill, which provided for the payment of interest at 1½ percent per annum, with amortization payments at an equal installment of 1½ percent per annum. The bill met defeat, although I believe it would have been of great benefit to the farmers of the country who are in distress and whose farms have been or are about to be taken away from them under foreclosures and sheriffs' sales.

At this time I do not care to call attention, except in a very brief and abstract way, to facts which show that the farmer still remains in submergence and that he is not yet on economic parity with other industries. Farm prices and farm lands have fallen. It is true that some improvement in prices

of farm products is noticeable over 1932. How much of this increase is due to agricultural legislation is a matter of doubt, but I am willing to give whatever credit is justly due to the laws which I have helped to pass here in Congress. But undoubtedly some of this increase—perhaps a major part of it—is due to other things, as, for example, the unprecedented drought which recently prevailed, and which served to raise the unit price of all farm products.

The last report as of May 15, 1936, issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, shows that the ratio of prices received by farmers to the prices paid by him stands at 85 percent only, this comparison being based upon the standard formula of using the 5-year pre-war average from August 1909 to July 1914 as a base, and this figure does not take into consideration the enormous increase in the amount of taxes which the farmer is compelled to pay. He is not at parity, but on the contrary is competing in an economic race while carrying a handicap of 15 points. He is running, as it were, in a race with a 15-pound ball chained to his feet.

One of the things that will help him materially is to reduce farm-mortgage interest rates. Heretofore Farm Credit Administration rates have been 4½ percent and 5 percent and more. As early as April 1933 I offered an amendment to a bill pending on the floor of the House of Representatives which proposed to fix interest rates at 3½ percent upon Federal land-bank mortgages. This amendment was promptly beaten by a vote of the House taken at that time. Since that time Congressmen from the farm States have been pressing the matter. We were partially successful last year when we were able to fix the Federal land-bank mortgage interest rates at 3½ percent for 1 year only, but this law expires on the 1st of July 1936. A new bill, known as the Gillette bill, H. R. 10101, was introduced early in the present session and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member. I had the honor of moving that the committee make a favorable report on the bill, and with the help of the chairman and others it came upon the floor of the House and was passed on May 4, 1936. It provided that these Federal land-bank mortgages should bear 3½ percent only until July 1, 1938, at which time the whole law will need to be rewritten. The Senate amended and passed this bill on June 1, and the House concurred in the Senate amendment and finally passed the bill as amended on June 16, 1936.

Those of us who were supporting the lower rates for farmers were compelled to accept the Senate amendment, although it was not entirely satisfactory because it restored the old contract high rates after July 1, 1937. However, the friends of the measure believed that they would be compelled to accept the Senate amendment or else that all legislation regarding the matter would fail because the Congress was about to adjourn and we felt that we could not get a conference committee between the House and the Senate to agree upon such a measure as we wanted and pass it before the final adjournment of the Seventy-fourth Congress scheduled for today.

I am stating these facts principally for the purpose of calling attention to the very imminent need to remedy this law and amend it again during the next succeeding or Seventy-fifth Congress when it meets in January. I do not hesitate to say that the farmers are entitled to this relief, and I am sorry that the lawmakers have seen fit to refuse to allow them a cheaper rate than 3½ percent and to refuse to allow even this rate to run for more than 1 year.

We must save our farm homes for those who raise the food that we eat. I believe that society does not have any moral right to eat bread unless it pays the cost of producing that bread and, in addition, allows a profit to the producer so that he will be put on an equal parity with men in all other industries. Reduction of interest rates on farm mortgages will help to accomplish this.

Now I charge that the Government of the United States is not doing its duty in this respect. It issues Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds, which are really bonds of the Government itself, and these are issued at very low rates of interest. Then the Government turns around and acquires

Federal land-bank bonds which bear high rates of interest. As a result of this transaction, the Government has made a big net profit amounting to the vast sum of \$23,393,639, as shown by a report made by the Farm Credit Administration as of March 31, 1936, which has just been released during the past 2 days. And the Government can continue from time to time to float Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds at very low rates. It has made profits heretofore and it will continue to make them hereafter. This profit is based upon the spread between the low rate which it pays upon its flotation of Mortgage Corporation bonds and the high rate which it receives from the consolidated Federal land-bank bonds.

I repeat that the Government acquires bonds of the Federal land banks which are secured by the farmer's mortgage and which are known as consolidated Federal land-bank bonds. These bonds draw interest as high as 4 percent and even more, and this high interest rate is paid to the Government. Then it turns around and, under the name of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation—which is really Uncle Sam—floats huge sums which bear interest at rates running from 1½ percent to 3 percent. There it is making a profit in no case less than 1 percent and in many cases more than 1 percent on these Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds, amounting in the aggregate to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. Now, I submit that the Government has no right to exploit the farmers in such a way and that we must remedy the faults of this unjust practice. We did something toward a remedy last year, and we are now giving some help for next year. But the basic facts remain: Uncle Sam does not treat others like this and he must not be allowed to treat farmers in such a manner.

GOOD-BYE

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

MR. SPEAKER BYRNS, GOOD-BYE
(THE TRIBUTE OF AN OLD FRIEND)

Mr. Speaker BYRNS, good-bye;
You've laid the gavel down;
Your race is run, but you have won
The goals of high renown.

Good-bye, old friend, good-bye;
Loved by your countrymen,
Long shall it be before they see
The like of you again.

Good-bye, old pal, good-bye;
Your worth shall never wane;
It may be best—you are at rest
From all of care or pain.

No points of order now;
Nor rulings, wise, to state;
No more your poise to quell the noise
Of strife and fierce debate.

No more the bells shall sound,
The quorum's need to tell;
No more the beat of hurried feet
In corridor and Well.

Tho' long your blood and life,
These things ye cease to know;
The voice was clear, you answered "Here!"—
Your last roll call, my Joe.

Mr. Speaker BYRNS, good-bye;
You've laid the gavel down;
But in its place, by Heaven's grace,
You bear a deathless crown.

—Anonymous.

THE COMMUNISTS' WATERLOO

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Communists of Russia, of the United States, and especially of Washington, D. C., are a disappointed, disgruntled, bedraggled bunch of thoroughly whipped agitators tonight. With the sine-die adjournment of this Congress they have met their Waterloo. Their plans went awry. Their strenuous intrigues and conspiring efforts met no success. They failed ignominiously.

COMMUNISM IN SCHOOLS STOPPED JULY 1, 1935

The law I got Congress to pass to prevent communism from being indoctrinated in the public schools of Washington became effective July 1, 1935. There was ample basis for passing such a law.

Early in my service here a teacher in the Western High School was suspended 1 week for trying to indoctrinate communism in her English class. Later, on May 3, 1924, 4 years after Dr. Frank W. Ballou became the \$10,000-per-year superintendent of the Washington schools, it was necessary for Congress to pass a law to stop communism from being taught by his corps of teachers, Congressman Summers then declaring that he had spoken to a number of Members, and that it was an exception to find one who did not say that his children had come to him with complaints against teachers who were teaching "disrespect to the Holy Bible" and "that ours is an inferior form of government", which are doctrines of communism. That law expired July 1, 1926.

In 1928 the Board of Education conducted an investigation of communism, and the Washington Post in its issue of April 3, 1928, stated that Communist activities had been discovered in the Columbia High School, the MacFarland High School, the Central High School, and the Business High School.

On March 16, 1936, the Federation of Citizens Associations, embracing 63 different organizations of citizens in Washington, ascertained that a man who had been advertised by the Moscow University in Russia as having some connection with its summer school had been employed by the Board of Education to deliver lectures on so-called character education, but in fact was on the subject of "a new social order" which required the teacher's philosophy of education "to be changed fundamentally", he being paid \$50 and expenses per lecture, out of funds furnished by Congress, and said Federation of Citizens Associations petitioned my subcommittee not to appropriate any more money for so-called character education, and to pass a law forbidding communism to be indoctrinated in the schools. It was upon such petition that we passed the law, which became effective July 1, 1935.

On November 12, 1935, said Federation of Citizens Associations appointed a committee, Hon. George E. Sullivan as chairman, Hon. Harry N. Stull, Mrs. George Corbin, and Mrs. Horace J. Phelps, to investigate communism and to eliminate subversive books from the schools.

On March 28, 1936, after an exhaustive investigation, said committee reported to said Federation of Citizens' Associations that there had been found "an abundance of anti-patriotic and procommunitistic matter in the schools, and also matter tending to 'seriously affect and undermine fundamental morals of the pupils in the matter of sexual relations', and recommended that no more money should be appropriated for so-called character education, and that said law stopping communism should not be repealed. That committee report was adopted by the Federation of Citizens' Associations.

PROPER FACTUAL INSTRUCTION ALLOWED

The chief legal authority of the District of Columbia, Judge Prettyman, ruled that the said law we passed did not in any way prevent proper factual instruction, but that it prevented any and all attempts to indoctrinate communism.

COMMUNISTS DEMANDED REPEAL

We were not surprised when Communists demanded that this law be repealed. We knew they would not like it. We knew it interfered with their plans. We knew they would be angry. We knew they would attack us for passing the law. We knew such law would make us incur their everlasting enmity.

But in order to stop communism from being indoctrinated in the schools, we were willing to accept the consequences.

It was, however, a great surprise to us that lined up with the well-known Communists, and Communist newspapers of the country all clamoring for repeal, we found Superintendent Frank W. Ballou, the Board of Education, the Teachers Union—affiliated with the American Federation of Labor—the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK], the gentleman from California [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SISSON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], chairman of the District Committee, aided and abetted by

the five Washington newspapers and the National Education Association, and finally by the Member from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Notwithstanding the fact that at the time said law was passed it was read in the House by the Clerk and regularly passed without one voice being raised against it, and likewise was read in the Senate by the clerk there, and regularly passed by the Senate without a voice being raised against it, and was signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who carefully studies every bill before he approves it, the above-named Representatives all claimed they did not know anything about its passage. They could justly blame no one but themselves for not knowing about business regularly passed by the House of Representatives.

THE "SISSY BILL"

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SISSON] introduced a bill to repeal said law, so that the 3,169 officers and teachers in Washington could teach what they pleased, and could lawfully indoctrinate communism if they desired. It was well nicknamed the "sissy bill."

For months efforts have been made to pass the "sissy bill." We have fought them back at every step. We have prevented them from passing it on a regular District day. We have opposed their efforts to get a special order. We have opposed their attempts to obtain a special rule. We have watched them on the House floor constantly for several months to prevent them from getting the repeal bill up under unanimous consent. We have watched a companion bill in the Senate and have arranged with Senators to stop its passage there.

And the "sissy bill" did not pass. The "sissy bill" is dead. It died with the sine-die adjournment.

A GREAT VICTORY FOR AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, the burial of the "sissy bill" is a great victory for Americanism. For, by killing this bill, we still have a law that prevents the indoctrination of communism in our public schools.

We have won another victory for Americans. My subcommittee prevented any appropriation being made for so-called character education, which money amounting to about \$80,000 per annum for the last 2 years, has been perverted and used for subversive purposes. Communism must be removed from our schools. Superintendent Ballou and his Board of Education must instruct the 3,169 officers and teachers that they must obey the law as construed by Corporation Counsel Prettyman. If they refuse to do so, we will find a proper and lawful way to place in charge a new superintendent of schools and a new Board of Education.

OPPOSITION FOR REELECTION

Because of their chagrin in being completely whipped in their efforts to repeal the law that prevents communism from being indoctrinated in the local schools, which all of the Washington papers except Hearst's have daily advocated, and because I have refused to obey the orders of the Washington Board of Trade and the five Washington newspapers, and have resisted their efforts to take out of the United States Treasury the sum of \$17,000,000 under their old 60-40 steal and apply it to payment of the annual taxes of Washington people, who pay less taxes than any other people in the world, it is reported here that they have raised a large campaign fund, estimated to be \$25,000, which is to be sent into my district in efforts to defeat me. I am deeply indebted to the Washington Herald for telling about it. Forewarned is forearmed. I am checking up on them and am watching them. I am going to know how they spend this money, who spends it, what it is spent for, and am going to see to it that a proper report of it is made under the Corrupt Practices Act. Things have come to a pretty pass when a man is to be punished for having done his duty. The following will show my attention to duty:

CERTIFICATE FROM TALLY CLERK

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 20, 1936.

I hereby certify that during this session of Congress, adjourning tonight, there have been a total of 136 roll calls in the House of Representatives, and that Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON has answered each and all of said 136 roll calls.

HANS JURGENSEN, Jr.,
Tally Clerk, House of Representatives.

Notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Townsend and his leaders, who took from aged poor people about \$1,250,000 they could ill afford to lose, said that "fires must be built under BLANTON, of Texas, and BANKHEAD, of Alabama", and that all precincts in our districts must be organized against us, I want to show that the man in Congress whom Dr. Townsend depended upon to introduce and pass his Townsend plan, Congressman McGROARTY, who is a magnificent gentleman, and whom every Member in Congress loves, does not agree with the Washington Board of Trade and the five Washington newspapers:

LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN STEVEN M'GROARTY, AUTHOR OF THE BILL FOR THE TOWNSEND OLD-AGE PENSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1936.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have learned with much regret that certain interests are opposing you in your district for reelection to Congress. I trust that the people of your district will not permit themselves to be deceived by such opposition, which, in my judgment, is unwarranted and unwise.

I would think that your constituents have learned by this time of your value to them and to our country in your long service in Congress. I have watched you closely during the sessions of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and, as your fellow American, I would consider your defeat as really in the nature of a national calamity.

Watching you closely as I have done in all your actions and utterances, I do not hesitate to testify now not only to your honesty of purpose on all occasions but as to your outstanding ability as a legislator. God knows there are not too many men in public life possessed of your fearlessness and ability, and men of your caliber are needed now in Congress more than at any other time almost in our country's history.

While we have disagreed to some extent on the merits or wisdom of the Townsend old-age-pension plan, I am glad to state that I have found you candid and honest in your criticism, but at the same time sympathetic with the principle of old-age pensions.

Please accept my sincere good wishes for your success and believe me always to be,

Faithfully yours,

JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY.

THE RAILROAD EMPLOYEES' PROTECTIVE AGREEMENT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, 138 railroads and 20 standard railroad labor organizations reached an agreement recently which will provide financial protection for railroad employees whose jobs might be jeopardized through future railroad coordination and consolidations.

This agreement has been hailed as a national achievement by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, Railroad Coordinator Eastman, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, labor spokesmen in Congress, and by leaders of labor throughout America, because it constitutes the first pact of its kind ever negotiated to cover an entire industry in adjusting the differences between employers and employees and in applying the principle of collective bargaining.

This victory for labor obviates the necessity for enactment of the Wheeler-Crosser bill, which has been strongly advocated in this session of Congress. In its provisions, it carries out the intent of the Wheeler-Crosser bill.

The 5-year agreement which has been reached voluntarily between the carriers and employee organizations requires that the railroads give 90 days' written notice to employees who are to be affected adversely by consolidations. Thirty days after the notice has been given, the company is to meet with the labor representatives to work out the situation. Disputes over the displacement of employees are to be handled through machinery set up in this agreement.

There will be no reduction in the compensation of an employee if, as a result of a consolidation, he is placed in a job affording a lower wage. Displaced employees will be given certain "allowances" which range from 60 percent of their wages for 5 years to those men who have 15 years or more service; to 2 months' full wages to men with 1 year's service. These men will hold full rights insofar as reemployment, hospitalization, and similar privileges are concerned.

In cases where the employee chooses to accept a lump-sum settlement he must give up his rights to reemployment, and so forth, but if he has from 5 to 15 years' service he will receive the equivalent of 1 year's full pay. Under this plan

for those who have less than 5 years' service the lump-sum payment is progressively less.

Another important provision of the agreement provides that moving expenses and property losses sustained by transferred employees shall be borne by the carriers.

Especially vital to the agreement is the clause wherein the 138 carriers who signed the pact agree not to coordinate with any of those carriers which did not participate in the agreement. Several railroads, mostly from the southern part of the country, did not send representatives to the conference at which the agreement was reached. It is expected that these companies will shortly become parties to the agreement but in the meantime the signatories are bound not to coordinate with such companies until such time as they do definitely agree to the terms of the pact.

The cooperation which made possible the consummation of this agreement speaks well for labor's future and points the way for similar agreements in other industries.

It is an epoch-making agreement which blazes a new trail in the field of labor relations. The railroad representatives who cooperated in the consummation of this agreement are to be congratulated. The chief executives representing the Standard Labor Organization displayed a brand of statesmanship unrivaled in the annals of labor's progress.

PRESENT STATUS OF THE FIGHT FOR FEDERAL ANTI-LYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is to me a source of much regret that the Seventy-fourth Congress is adjourning without enacting a Federal law to curb the dreadful crime of lynching.

The satanic work done by lynching bees is enough to make the cheeks of every true American turn crimson with shame.

The utter heartlessness and cruel savagery so often exhibited by mobs in torturing their cringing victims must create envy and jealousy among the fiends of hell. Such acts as are committed when the devil takes control of a mob comprise the "perfect crime" against civilization.

The crime of lynching is the ugliest, the blackest, the foulest blot on civilization, and our failure to take effective steps to wipe it out is a burning national disgrace.

If we Members of Congress were actuated, as we should be, by the dictates of humanity; if we were controlled, as we should be, by the spirit and precepts of Christianity, we would do something to suppress this monstrous evil.

There is power in the Federal Government to handle this situation if Congress will enact the necessary statute applying penalties to communities that tolerate lynchings. If communities were made liable in damages for every such outrage against humanity, lynching would cease to be popular and lynchings would not go unwhipped of justice as often they now do, and there would be a rapid drop in the number of lynchings.

On the opening day of the recent session I introduced an antilynching bill, which would reach this evil with penalties so drastic that it would insure a discontinuance of such outrages. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee, along with a number of similar bills, all aimed at the crime of lynching.

When the session drew toward its close and it became apparent that the committee was not disposed to act on these bills, Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, wrote to me from New York as follows:

In our opinion, a declaration of party policy by the Democratic Party on antilynching legislation at this time would do more than any other single thing to check lynchings and to insure action by the Congress.

On the heels of his letter Mr. White came to Washington with a petition already prepared calling a caucus of Democratic Members of the House to consider the subject of antilynching legislation, and he asked me if I would sign it, to which I replied:

Certainly I will sign it, and I will do everything I can to support the petition, though I do not believe that sentiment is far enough developed that we can hope for favorable caucus action now.

I was the first Member he approached, and I was the first Member to sign the petition. In a letter to me, dated March 27 last, Mr. White said:

We are deeply grateful to you for your interest, and are especially appreciative of your being the first person to sign the petition to the leader of the caucus, and your cooperative spirit throughout.

The requisite number of signatures was secured and the caucus was held, but it failed to accomplish anything on account of lack of a quorum.

Thereupon we decided to avail ourselves of our parliamentary rights to file a discharge petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further control over antilynching legislation and to bring it before the House for debate and a vote. Discharge petition no. 32 was filed at the Speaker's desk by Representative GAVAGAN, of New York, to force a report on H. R. 5, Mr. GAVAGAN's antilynching bill.

A discharge petition does not become effective unless or until it is signed by 218 Members of the House, a majority of Members of that body. After the required number of signatures is secured, 7 days must elapse before the bill can be taken up in the House. Two hundred and eighteen Members, the required number, signed the Gavagan petition, but Congress adjourned sine die before 7 days had elapsed and the bill never was brought up for a vote.

For my interest in antilynching legislation, and particularly for my active support of his discharge petition, I have been rewarded with a letter from Mr. GAVAGAN, which I treasure and which is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1936.

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your cooperation in procuring the discharge of the Judiciary Committee on my antilynching bill (H. R. 5). Without your signature to this petition it would not have been possible to discharge the committee, and I wish you to know that I am very grateful.

No matter what honors may come to you in the future, I am quite certain that you will look back to your signature on this petition, seeking justice instead of mob rule, as one of your finest contributions to your country.

Again assuring you of my appreciation and esteem, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN, M. C.,
Twenty-first District, New York.

Right is not going to be forever on the scaffold, and wrong is not going to be forever on the throne. Sometime the Congress of the United States will take this monstrous evil of lynching in hand and suppress it. I will be happy if I may contribute toward that end. If I am reelected to Congress I shall reintroduce my antilynching bill on the opening day of the next session, and I shall press it with all the vigor I can command for the earliest possible consideration.

BONDHOLDERS' INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman from Illinois, Mr. SABATH, a few moments ago made a very interesting address to the House, in which he reviewed the activities of the so-called Bondholders' Investigating Committee, and during the period of that speech emphasized the fact that he would be unable to have considered before adjournment either of the two bills that he has introduced which we all hoped would correct the evils disclosed by his committee.

First, I want to take this occasion to commend not only Mr. SABATH but the entire personnel of the special investigating committee for its wonderful accomplishments. No one can deny that as a result of the disclosures operations by crooked bondholders' committees were checked; and that meant a saving of an unestimated amount to the people of this country, but it ran up into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Every time that this committee is mentioned I think of the losses that my own constituents suffered. I happen to represent a class of people who are thrifty. They are not capitalists or great industrialists, but a hard-working class. They were attracted by the unusual high interest rate of the bonds that were sold for the construction of all types of buildings, and they purchased bonds from their meager savings. There

was one outstanding group of American citizens of Polish descent who were induced by a clever salesman to invest in these bonds, and they lost every dollar that they invested. I feel confident that if we had a law such as Mr. SABATH and his committee now desire passed their life savings would not have been wiped out. We have other groups in St. Louis that have suffered—in fact, millions of dollars were lost in my city not only by the people of my district but by the people of adjoining districts, as it was a fertile field for the sale of bonds of this character during the period that the country was running wild. I merely mention this to show my intense interest in the welfare of this committee, but the real purpose of my remarks is to call the attention of the House to just what happened in regard to the appropriation of money to be used by this committee in furthering its investigation.

As I recall it, the committee received several appropriations.

As the members of the committee know, when an application was made for \$50,000 additional the last time they applied for financial assistance, there was a group in the House that absolutely was opposed to the continuance of the committee. There were members of the Committee on Accounts that felt that the committee should make a final report without getting more money. The committee had shortly before held hearings in St. Louis, and I knew of the good work that was being done and therefore I was in favor of continuing the investigation. I took the position that this committee was not going to cost the Government of the United States a dollar, but on the contrary it would bring money to the Treasury because of the information furnished by this committee to the Treasury Department a large amount of additional income taxes would be collected which would far offset the small amount that the Congress had allocated to the committee for investigating purposes. Mr. SABATH introduced a resolution requesting \$50,000. There was strong opposition to his resolution, but as he knows, I took the lead and made a fight for an additional appropriation. Mr. SABATH personally told me that if we could not get the \$50,000 he would be willing, if necessary, to take \$25,000, but it would cripple his investigation. I asked him if \$35,000 would be helpful, saying, as there was a fight among members of the committee and there was strong opposition in the House, naturally it would be to his best interest to effect some kind of a compromise. He replied that he would be most happy if he could get the \$35,000.

The Committee on Accounts held a hearing. Mr. SABATH, Mr. FULLER, of Arkansas; Mr. McLEAN, of New Jersey; Mr. O'MALLEY, of Wisconsin; Mr. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, were among the members of his committee who appeared and testified. Every one of the members of his committee were asked the question if additional appropriation was made, would they be able to make a final and complete report. Their unqualified answer was "yes." That question was asked for the purpose of showing that this would be the last appropriation they would request.

When the committee voted on the resolution, one member, who everyone thought was sympathetic with the investigating committee, offered an amendment to reduce the amount to \$10,000 additional, with the promise that no additional appropriation would be made. I personally offered an amendment to this amendment, providing for an appropriation of \$35,000. After a heated discussion my amendment carried and I was ordered by the chairman to call up the resolution in the House.

A group was going to fight this resolution, but after I conferred with them and assured them that this would be the end and I was authorized by the chairman and members of the investigating committee to make the announcement, they agreed not to oppose the resolution. I controlled 1 hour of time on the resolution, and after opening the debate I yielded time to Mr. SABATH, Mr. FULLER, Mr. McLEAN, and to Mr. DIRKSEN, all members of the investigating committee.

The RECORD will show that we all were questioned by Members of the House and were required to show that if the resolution passed we would not bring in another resolution appropriating additional money, and Mr. SABATH stated that the committee would make a complete and final report, as well as introduce bills to correct the evil.

I remember distinctly being asked by the minority leader, Mr. SNELL, if this would be the last appropriation, and when I replied that it would I was further required to state that I personally would oppose any effort to provide an additional sum. This was absolutely necessary in order to prevent opposition to the resolution, and now I cannot place myself in a position, Mr. Speaker, of making a promise to this House and then going back on that promise.

I merely wanted the RECORD to show that I approve of the investigation, that I supported the request of the committee for money to carry on its investigation, and feel that I was more responsible than any member of the Accounts Committee in securing favorable action on the last appropriation of \$35,000.

Investigating committees many times bring no good results. The money that we have appropriated for this committee, however, has been very well spent and I predict now that some legislation will pass next session that will for all time curb this evil. In conclusion let me say there is a strong belief that the present Securities Act is so drawn that it will prevent many of the unethical practices which promoters have been engaging in and which were the subject of the investigation.

BENEFITS WHICH VARIOUS STATES EXTEND TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring before this body some very interesting data regarding the steps that have been taken by various States to assist veterans, widows, orphans, and so forth, with a view to providing other Members information which should be very useful to them in handling voluminous correspondence from such sources.

As a member of the Committee on Pensions and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation; as the founder of the Retired Men's News, a paper which enjoys a wide circulation among veterans throughout the Nation; and as one who has taken a leading part in veteran affairs by introducing various measures designed to assist those in these categories in many ways, I am naturally in receipt of more correspondence on this subject than is the average Member. Knowing that I am a veteran of two wars and that I am familiar with military administration as well as the Veterans' Administration, and because of my many years of service in the Regular Army as an enlisted man, other Members frequently refer to me letters that they receive from veterans. Consequently, the voluminous correspondence which I receive from all sources on this subject has prompted me to do considerable research in order to eliminate routine and insure prompt replies to all letters received.

Following is a list of veteran benefits provided by the several States, also a recapitulation of additional benefits regarding which information is frequently sought by Members for their constituents:

SOLDIERS' HOMES MAINTAINED BY STATES

California: Veterans of any war now admitted to the home. Additional funds have been appropriated for new building.

Connecticut: World War veterans now eligible for admission to State homes and the wives and dependent children receive a monetary allowance while they are domiciled at the home.

Idaho: Ex-service men of the World War now admitted to the State home.

Iowa: State home maintained for veterans, wives, and children.

Kansas: World War veterans now admitted to State home.

Michigan: World War veterans admitted to State home.

Minnesota: Benefits of State home extended to veterans of World War and their dependents under certain conditions.

Montana: Disabled veterans admitted to State home.

Nebraska: Soldiers and Sailors Home admits veterans of the World War who are disabled and incapable of earning a living. Their dependents are also admitted under certain conditions.

New Hampshire: Home maintained for care of disabled, needy, diseased, and aged veterans.

New Jersey: Veterans and widows admitted to State home.

New York: World War veterans now admitted to State home.

Ohio: Home maintained for such of the disabled veterans as are unable to earn a living.

Pennsylvania: Home maintained for disabled and indigent veterans of any war.

Rhode Island: Home for disabled, diseased, feeble, and indigent veterans.

South Dakota: Soldiers' Home at Hot Springs admits veterans who were incapacitated; also wives or widows who are over 60 years of age.

Washington: Any veterans, if 25 percent disabled and indigent and who has been a resident of the State 3 years or more, is eligible for domiciliary care and hospitalization at the State home.

HOSPITALIZATION

Michigan: The State pays \$1 per day, and the county of which the veteran is a resident pays \$2.10 additional per day, for treatment of all cases of tuberculosis. General hospitalization now under consideration by State authorities.

Nevada: State hospital provides separate quarters for treatment of shell shock and mental disorders.

New York: State hospital constructed for the sole purpose of caring for and treating veterans of the World War.

Oklahoma: Considerable funds available to cover cost of treatment of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Pennsylvania: State-aided hospitals treat all veterans who are awaiting Federal hospitalization.

Wisconsin: Hospitalization, medication, and surgical treatment provided at cost for veterans, who are given preference in admission.

HOME AND FARM PURCHASES

California: To enable veterans to purchase farms or homes the State enacted a law which enables veterans active in the service in time of war and who were residents of the State when they entered the service to select a home—maximum value, \$5,000—or farm—maximum value, \$7,500—in California, the State assisting the veteran in the purchase. The State buys the property for the veteran, accepting a down payment of 5 percent of the cost of the home, or 10 percent of the cost of the farm, as the case may be, amortizing the balance over a period of 20 years at 5-percent interest, in monthly or yearly installments, there being no taxes on the property thus acquired. Five percent of the cost is charged by the State for services rendered.

Colorado: State land settlement board assists veterans in settlement upon lands within the State for agricultural purposes.

Idaho: Ex-service men given preference in land grants.

Oregon: Land settlement commission provides useful employment and opportunity to acquire farm houses with profitable livelihood on the land for veterans.

EDUCATION OF THE DISABLED

California: State appropriation of \$500,000 to aid veterans to continue their education, a maximum of \$1,000 being allotted to individual veterans to cover payment of tuition and other fees or an amount for living expenses incident thereto, not to exceed \$40 monthly.

Colorado: State educational loan board loans as much as \$200 to veterans within the State for a period of 5 years, to be used for educational training in State institutions.

Connecticut: Education of blind veterans provided at expense of State.

New York: Vocational training of the disabled provided by the State. Outright grant of \$500 each year to each blind veteran.

New Jersey: State law provides for rehabilitation of all veterans who are incapacitated.

South Carolina: All veterans granted free tuition in State college.

WELFARE WORK

Idaho: State welfare commission renders emergency assistance to disabled and destitute ex-service men and their dependents.

Illinois: Appropriation for care of indigents and all needy veterans.

Kansas: Destitute ex-service men and their wives, widows, or children under 14 provided with necessities of life at their own residences.

Maryland: State appropriation for temporary relief of veterans of all wars.

Massachusetts: Financial assistance given veterans and the widows and children of veterans.

Michigan: Financial assistance given veterans in emergency.

Minnesota: Department of soldier welfare for relief of disabled veterans and the dependents of veterans.

Nebraska: Endowment fund of \$2,000,000 appropriated by the State to aid disabled and needy ex-service men and the wives, widows, or children of same.

New Hampshire: Needy ex-service men and dependents cared for in their own homes, if necessary, or at the State home.

New York: Liberal cash allowance for all sick or disabled veterans, residents of the State, and their dependents, provided they receive no assistance from the Federal Government.

Oklahoma: Soldiers' relief commission well supplied with appropriated funds for disabled veterans.

Pennsylvania: Large fund for direct relief of indigent veterans and their dependents.

South Dakota: Relief given sick and disabled veterans until they can be provided with vocational-training facilities or Federal hospitalization.

Vermont: Sum available to aid indigent and disabled veterans who are unable to avail themselves of the privileges of the State home.

Wisconsin: State aid given ex-service men, their wives, widows, or helpless children in emergency.

States	Burial allowance	Headstones	Free or reduced vending-peddling license	Discharge recording and record certification	Free notary service	Civil-service preference	Maximum tax exemptions		Financial aid to indigents	Relief provided for the children of veterans by the States
							Property of World War veterans	Property of Spanish-American War veterans		
Alabama	None	No	Reduced	No	No	No	(1)	(1)	No	War orphan education.
Arizona	\$150 ¹	do	No	Free	Free	do	\$2,000	\$2,000	Yes	Relief commission.
Arkansas	None	do	do	No	No	do	None	None	No	War orphan education.
California	\$125	Yes	Free	Free	Free	Yes	\$1,000	\$1,000	do	\$450 annual orphan tuition.
Colorado	\$50	No	No	No	No	No	None	None	do	Guardianship Act.
Connecticut	\$100	\$35	do	do	do	do	\$3,000	\$3,000	Yes	\$200 annual orphan tuition.
Delaware	\$100 ¹	No	do	do	do	do	None	None	No	Annual appropriation.
Florida	None	do	do	Free	do	do	do	do	do	\$300 annual orphan tuition.
Georgia	do	do	Free	do	Free	do	do	do	do	None.
Idaho	\$75	do	No	do	No	do	\$1,000 ¹	do ¹	Yes	Welfare commission.
Illinois	None	do	do	do	do	Yes	None	do	do	Annual appropriation.
Indiana	\$75	do	Free	do	Free	do	\$1,000	\$1,000	No	Do.
Iowa	\$100	\$16	No	do	No	do	\$500 ¹	\$1,800 ¹	Yes	Do.
Kansas	None	\$20	Free	do	do	do	None	None	do	Guardianship Act.
Kentucky	do	No	No	No	do	No	do	do	do	\$150 annual orphan tuition.
Louisiana	do	do	do	Free	do	do	do	do	No	Children's Aid Act.
Maine	\$100 ²	do	do	25 cents	do	do	\$5,000 ¹	do	Yes	\$150 annual orphan tuition.
Maryland	None	do	do	No	do	do	None	do	do	\$150 war orphan grant.
Massachusetts	\$100	do	do	Free	do	Yes	Variable	Variable ¹	do	Children's Relief Act.
Michigan	\$100	do	Free	do	15 cents	do	None	\$2,000	do	Tuition exemptions.
Minnesota	\$100	Yes	do	25 cents	No	No	do	None	do	Children's Relief Act.
Mississippi	None	No	No	Free	do	do	do	do	No	Do.
Missouri	do	do	do	No	do	do	do	do	do	None.
Montana	\$100	do	do	Free	do	do	Conditional	Conditional	Yes	\$250 annual orphan.
Nebraska	\$90 ¹	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	None.
Nevada	None	do	do	No	do	Yes	\$1,000	\$1,000	No	Do.
New Hampshire	do	do	Free	do	do	do	\$1,000 ¹	None	Yes	\$150 annual orphan tuition.
New Jersey	\$200 ²	\$50	do	Small fee	do	do	\$500	\$500	No	Direct financial aid.
New Mexico	\$75 ¹	No	No	No	do	No	\$2,000	\$2,000	do	None.
New York	\$100	Yes	Free	Free	do	Yes	None	None	Yes	Direct financial aid.
North Carolina	None	No	do	do	do	No	do	do	do	Free tuitions.
North Dakota	do	do	No	No	do	do	do	do	No	Do.
Ohio	\$100 ¹	do	Free	do	do	Yes	do	do	Yes	Direct financial aid.
Oklahoma	\$150 ¹	do	do	Free	do	No	\$300	\$300	do	Crippled child care.
Oregon	None	do	No	do	do	10 percent.	\$1,000	\$1,000	Yes	Direct relief.
Pennsylvania	\$75 ¹	Yes	Free	do	Free	Yes	None	None	do	\$200 per annum for each war orphan.
Rhode Island	None	No	No	do	No	No	\$1,000	\$1,000	do	Do.
South Carolina	do	do	do	No	do	Yes	None	None	No	\$150 per annum for each war orphan.
South Dakota	\$100 ²	do	do	do	do	No	\$5,000	\$5,000	Yes	None.
Tennessee	None	do	do	Free	do	do	\$500 ¹	\$500 ¹	No	Direct relief.
Texas	do	do	do	do	do	do	None	None	do	Child Welfare Act.
Utah	do	do	do	do	do	do	\$3,000	\$3,000	do	\$100 per annum for each war orphan.
Vermont	do	Yes	do	No	do	do	None	None	Yes	Do.
Virginia	do	No	do	Free	do	do	do	do	No	\$150 annual orphan tuition.
Washington	\$100	do	Free	No	do	Yes	do	do	None	Child Welfare Act.
West Virginia	None	do	No	do	do	No	do	do	No	War orphan education.
Wisconsin	do	do	Free	do	do	Yes	do	do	Yes	None.
Wyoming	do	do	No	do	do	No	\$2,000	\$2,000	No	Do.

¹Indicates poll-tax exemption.

²Indigents only.

³Includes wives and widows.

⁴Indicates business property only.

THE FEDERAL LAND-BANK SYSTEM—ITS OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, the farm-loan system, as organized under the act of 1916, was nonpartisan and cooperative. It was established after an American commission went abroad in 1913 to study European land-credit systems. The chairman of this commission was the late Senator Fletcher, of Florida. Upon its return the members filed their report with Congress, declaring that all successful European systems of farm credit strictly followed the cooperative principal of farmer ownership and farmer control. After 3 years of further study from 1913 to 1916, during which time the

Governors of all of the States and prominent farm leaders were invited to advise the commission so that the European plan might be adapted to the different American conditions, the act was finally passed and it adopted these cooperative principles.

To preserve the nonpartisan character of the supervisory authority of the system a Farm Loan Board was provided, with the restriction that the President could not appoint more than one-half of such board from any one political party. This Board was given broad supervisory powers. Twelve Federal land banks were organized. Before the New

Deal came into power in 1933 the directors of these banks were chosen as follows: Three were appointed by the Federal Farm Loan Board, three were elected by national farm-loan associations, and a director at large was selected by the Farm Loan Board from the three highest nominees of all of the associations. In this manner and because of this set-up full recognition was given of the cooperative principle of management.

The most important cooperative units, of which there are now 5,000 in the United States, are the national farm-loan associations, in which full powers of local control were granted by the original Farm Loan Act. These associations have guaranteed all the loans of their neighboring farmer members. Each borrower has subscribed for 5 percent of the amount of his loan in the stock of his association, and the associations have in turn subscribed an equal amount of stock in the Federal land banks. Individual farmer borrowers own all of the stock of the national farm-loan associations. Their investment now amounts to \$113,000,000.

But what happened in 1933 upon the coming into power of the present Democratic administration? The Farm Loan Board was abolished and all the powers for 17 years exercised by that Board were transferred to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, an appointee of the President. Before 1933 these national farm-loan associations elected four of the seven directors of each Federal land bank, but the New Deal legislation of 1933 permits them to elect only one out of the seven. Four are appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, one is selected by the production-credit associations, and one by borrowers from banks for cooperatives, although neither of the last two named institutions own a dollar of stock in any Federal land bank. Furthermore, these national farm-loan associations, being cooperative organizations, are now required to sign contracts with the Federal land banks and the Farm Credit Administration stipulating that such associations shall at all times have and keep in office a secretary-treasurer satisfactory to the bank. Hence it will be seen that in place of a nonpartisan system we now have a perfect piece of machinery for absolute political control of this \$2,000,000,000 institution upon which the farmers depend and for which they have subscribed over \$100,000,000 in stock under the representation and belief that they would have the ordinary element of stock ownership, to wit, management control.

We now have what may well be made in a Republican administration a Republican farm-loan system and in a Democratic administration a Democratic farm-loan system. Let us look at the set-up. The President appoints the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, who is given no definite term of office under the law, and who can be cashiered at any time. This Governor appoints a general agent to represent him in each Federal land bank. There is no such officer mentioned in any of the farm-credit legislation from 1916 to date, but nevertheless the agent is appointed. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, through his personal appointee, the general agent, and through the four directors of each land bank, directly appointed by him, and the two directors from institutions in which the Government owns at least 90 percent of the stock, has complete power over the policies and personnel of every Federal land bank. More than that, under this new contract, through which associations are required to select secretary-treasurers satisfactory to the bank, these associations may likewise be politically dominated by Washington.

I cannot say what the change from a nonpartisan to a partisan system has cost the farmers of the United States. The trained executives of the Federal land banks, with years of experience prior to the advent of the New Deal, have been forced to accept personnel from outside of their districts uninformed as to conditions and oftentimes theoretically instead of practically minded about farm-credit problems. These acts on the part of the present administration toward this credit system are wholly unjustified. The farmers in the eighth Federal land-bank district of Omaha, including my State of Iowa, have paid \$21,000,000 for the stock of that bank, being 75 percent of the total capital stock, yet they

are permitted to elect only one director, and the policies are under the complete control of a Washington bureau. This violates all cooperative principles and is in flagrant disregard of the ordinary rights of corporate stockholders.

Admittedly due to the conditions during the depression it became necessary or proper for the Government to advance funds so that these institutions could make loans to thousands of farmers throughout the country. Because of these advances it was proper for the Government to ask for a larger measure of control during the emergency if it were thought that the national farm-loan associations and Federal land banks were not competently officered and able to handle the larger problems. I do not believe that it is your judgment, as it is not mine, that a Government bureau can operate any more efficiently and economically than private organizations do. The best managers will come from the group whose money is invested in the enterprise. "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." But while the Government may have been justified in asking for greater control there is no reason why it should have acted differently in this case than in those cases where it bailed out banks, railroad companies, insurance companies, and so forth, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It conditioned such aid upon representation upon the boards of these institutions but it did not destroy any of the rights of the stockholders and did not take away the normal powers of the directors. During the 17 years of operation of this system prior to 1933, the officers and directors of the national farm-loan associations and of the Federal land banks had demonstrated their ability to manage the system and they were at least entitled to the same consideration that the Government gave to these other private institutions which it also financed.

What did the Government put into the system? In January 1932, which was 14 months before the New Deal took over the control, Congress voted \$125,000,000 as an additional capital stock subscription for the Federal land banks. At that time Congress showed its confidence in the management of these banks and associations by making no provisions whatever for restricting these local operations. Since 1933, additional advances have been made by the Government for surplus to take care of the moratorium and the extension of principal and interest payments. This amounts to about \$100,000,000, which will be repaid as soon as payments are made on these postponed installments. Then again and through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (which is really the Government itself) the Government has guaranteed \$750,000,000 of bonds issued by such mortgage corporation, the proceeds of which were used to purchase Federal land-bank bonds. These practically Government issues were sold at a very low rate to take up Federal land-bank bonds, most of which bore a 4-percent rate. As a result of this transaction the Government has made a big net profit which amounts to the vast sum of \$23,393,639 as shown by the report of March 31, 1936. There is no excuse for continued unreasonable centralized Washington control of the system because of this bond transaction. Federal land-bank 4-percent bonds were quoted in this morning's paper (June 20, 1936) at from 104 $\frac{1}{8}$ (for the lowest issue) to 110 for the issue having the best market price. Whenever it sees fit the Government can therefore relieve itself of the guaranty upon the \$750,000,000 obligation and realize a handsome profit of from about 5 to 10 points. And the Government can continue from time to time to float Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds at very low rates. It has made profits heretofore and it will continue to make profits hereafter based upon the spread between the low rate which it pays upon its flotation of Mortgage Corporation bonds and the high rate which it receives from consolidated Federal land-bank bonds.

At the cost of repetition I call attention to the fact that the Government acquires the bonds of the land banks which are secured by farmers' mortgages and are known as consolidated Federal land-bank bonds. These bonds draw interest as high as 4 percent, and even more than this high interest rate is paid to the Government. Then it turns around

and under the name of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation—which is really Uncle Sam himself—floats huge sums which bear interest at rates running from 1½ percent to 3 percent. Therefore it is making a profit in no case less than 1 percent, and in many cases more than 1 percent, on these Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds amounting in the aggregate to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. Now, I submit that the Government has no right to exploit the farmers in such a way.

I have never been able to find any detailed and specific and separate and comprehensive profit-and-loss statement from each of these several land banks. I asked Governor Meyers for such a report about 3 months ago, suggesting that Congress ought to be informed upon the question so as to be able to enact proper legislation. He replied that such information had never been given out. Now, in the closing days of this Congress and on yesterday, June 19, and after the time has gone by within which there is any chance of enacting new legislation—we will adjourn sine die today—there has come to my hands a letter dated June 18, 1936, from Mr. F. F. Hill, Deputy Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, as follows:

In accordance with our letter to you of April 2, 1936, there is enclosed herewith a copy of the Farm Credit Quarterly of March 31, 1936, which has just been made available for distribution. I wish to call your particular attention to the profit-and-loss statement for the Federal land banks appearing on page 8, and a similar statement for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation which appears on page 11.

I am very grateful for this letter and for this information and thank Mr. Hill for it. But there is no attempt to show any profit-and-loss statement of any specific one of the 12 Federal land banks. This information would have been helpful if we could have had it sooner. For example, it would have helped us to get cheaper rates of interest for farmers. Some progress has been made along this line in the passage of H. R. 10101, notwithstanding the belated information and our lack of knowledge. But this bill was amended in the Senate and is inadequate and covers the situation for 1 year only. After July 1937 it compels the farmers to return to the old rates, which are too high and are indefensible.

The Republican national platform declares for the restoration of the system and for a decentralized nonpartisan control. The language is clear. We should put the authority again close to the people—close to the farmers who bought and paid for the stock in the banks and who at the time they borrowed the money had the right to run their associations upon the cooperative principle. They know how to do it in my section of the country. They have done it. In addition, they have successfully operated cooperative grain elevators, hog-shipping associations, creameries, and other cooperatives.

The attitude of the present administration toward the 650,000 farmers who are members of these national farm-loan associations can be explained in only one of three ways; (a) either this is a cold-blooded, determined effort to build a political system with complete power in the appointee of the President, (b) or else the administration now distrusts the ability of the farmers to run their own institutions, (c) or else it has neglected to give any thought to the matter.

Whatever may have been the cause for this ruthless destruction of the cooperative control principles of the Farm Loan Act, I protest that this system must not be made a political machine for the party in power and that the control of these institutions should not be removed from the men who built them and paid for them.

The Republican Party has assured these 650,000 farmers that their rights will be restored in the following clear statement from the platform adopted by the Cleveland convention.

We propose . . . to provide for decentralized nonpartisan control of the Farm Credit Administration and the election by national farm-loan associations of at least one-half of each board of directors of the Federal land banks, and thereby remove these institutions from politics.

Surely the Government cannot complain of such a proposal.

I do not now make these comments out of any partisan spirit; but, on the other hand, I make them by way of constructive criticism and in the hope that the law will be properly amended by the Congress which is to be elected in November of this year. I want remedial legislation.

ROOSEVELT AND RECOVERY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following in addition to the facts contained in my radio speech on Roosevelt and Recovery:

PAYMENT OF SOLDIERS' BONUS

During my service in Congress I consistently advocated and supported the payment of this just debt, and am glad that it has now been discharged. The payment of these certificates not only discharged a debt due to the World War veterans, but is a godsend to many who are in need at this time. Furthermore, it will equitably distribute throughout the country a large sum of money that will, in my judgment, materially aid in the recovery from the depression.

I have also supported legislation in behalf of disabled veterans and dependents of deceased veterans, and have spent much time in assisting veterans and their dependents in presenting their claims to the Veterans' Administration.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Under the Social Security Act the Federal Government, for the first time in history, provided funds for old-age pensions, thus giving just recognition to that class of aged and worthy citizens for many of whom there is always a depression.

The Federal Government contributes to the States not exceeding \$15 per month to all persons 65 years of age or over, provided the State will match it with a like amount.

It has been erroneously charged that the Federal act requires a pauper's affidavit to be eligible for such pensions, but this is untrue. Each State passes its own laws prescribing what the financial condition of a person must be in order to receive a pension, and the amount thereof.

If pensions of less than \$30 a month are paid in any State, or unjust restrictions of eligibility are imposed, the fault lies with the State and not the Federal Government, for the Federal act has left free and unrestricted the imposition of all requirements in obtaining pensions to the respective States.

While the legislation is not all that could be desired, it is a step in the right direction. Like any new law, especially upon a subject concerning which there has been no previous legislation, experience will doubtless demonstrate defects, and it can and will likely be liberalized.

I favor the payment of as large a measure of assistance to the aged as the Government can reasonably make without impairment of its solvency or undue inflation of prices.

NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

Congress at the last session passed a temporary neutrality bill, which expired on February 29 of this year; but a few days prior thereto we passed another bill, strengthening the act previously passed and extending the date of its effectiveness until May 1, 1937.

This act is designed to keep our country from becoming involved in war between other countries.

Being a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which handled this legislation, I had much to do with its consideration and served as chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the bill. Time does not permit a discussion of this important measure, but it goes far in removing the causes that might involve us in war between other countries.

There is one question upon which the American people are agreed, and that is that we have had enough of war.

If the provisions of this neutrality law had been in effect, it would have contributed much toward keeping our country out of the World War.

REGULATION OF COTTON EXCHANGES

Another bill for which I voted (H. R. 6772) and which has, within the past few days passed both Houses and now awaits the President's signature, is a bill to amend the Grain Futures Act of 1922, so as to make that act applicable also to cotton futures.

The price of cotton has too long been controlled by the manipulation of professional brokers upon the futures market, and while there has been some restrictive legislation as to grain, the cotton-futures market has gone unregulated and uncontrolled.

While this act is not as drastic as I should like to have seen, yet it is a step in the right direction, and confers upon the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General authority to fix limitations upon purely speculative trades and commitments. Hedging transactions are expressly exempted. It is designed specially for the purpose of preventing overspeculation and a type of racketeering by a few large professional traders who, by combination and collusion, have controlled the cotton-futures market to the detriment of the American farmer.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

This act, passed at the present session and approved by the President on May 20, creates the Rural Electrification Administration, whereby loans may be secured for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas. Nothing will add more to the comfort, satisfaction, and happiness of the rural population than the electrification of farm houses. The farmer can use electric power not only for illumination of his home but also in the operation of water pumps, feed grinders, milking machines, small motors for many uses, and refrigeration; and it will be a means not only for the saving of money but relieve also much of the drudgery of farm work.

COTTON-REDUCTION PROGRAM

The Government in a very short time made rental contracts with millions of cotton and wheat farmers.

In dealing with such a vast number the Government has doubtless made some mistakes and some injustices have been done individual farmers. The small farmers have in some instances been discriminated against, especially those who had theretofore reduced their acreage before the Government took charge of the reduction program.

Congress is in nowise to blame for these discriminations and injustices, for while they pass the laws, the administration of them is necessarily left to executive agencies, and frequently there are instances where the administration of a law is in conflict with the will and intention of Congress.

When one of the cotton-control bills passed the House I offered and secured the adoption of an amendment reading as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the manner of allotment to individual farmers, shall provide that farmers who have voluntarily reduced their cotton acreage shall not be penalized in favor of those farmers who have not done so.

Again, when the farm bill substituted for the A. A. A. passed the House at this session, I spoke in favor of and supported an amendment by my colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES], which was adopted, to wit:

In carrying out the provisions of the bill the Secretary shall in every practical manner protect the interest of small producers.

I likewise supported another amendment to this bill offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] designed to protect the interests of the tenant farmer, which was also adopted.

TEXAS CENTENNIAL

A notable victory for Texas was achieved in the passage of the bill appropriating \$3,000,000 for participation of the Federal Government in the Texas Centennial.

My colleague, Mr. LANHAM, of Texas, and I were appointed by the Texas delegation as the steering committee in charge of the bill. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, and I directed the hearings there and succeeded in securing favorable action by the committee and was the author of the committee's report on the bill. And when the bill was debated in the House I participated therein and also had charge of the time consumed in debate.

With one exception this was the largest amount ever contributed by the Federal Government to any exposition held in this country. The amount was not excessive. The winning

of Texas independence from Mexico was not sectional. The valorous men who composed that army and the statesmen who established the Republic of Texas came from nearly every State of the 24 which then comprised the Union. The Texas Centennial celebrates not only the winning of the independence of Texas but also a chapter in our history by which the United States, by the subsequent annexation of Texas and the war to make effective the annexation, acquired nearly one-third of its present domain.

RELIEF

The Government has spent vast sums of money in trying to assist the unemployed by creating Federal work for those upon relief. With the expenditure of such a large sum, many injustices have doubtless been done and many projects have been undertaken that were perhaps unwise, but these instances are the exception rather than the rule.

Congress has appropriated these funds upon the recommendation of the President, and the expenditure and administration thereof have of necessity been left to governmental agencies; and if abuses have occurred, either in the selection of projects or discrimination against men, these have not been the fault of Congress.

Aside from the Government work for relief of the unemployed, perhaps even more criticism has been directed against the distribution of funds to those strictly upon relief, but the expenditure of these funds differs from that of Federal work for the unemployed, for as to relief funds the Federal Government contributes to each of the States an amount to be expended by the States and the respective States select the personnel for the distribution of these funds, and relief funds are handled by the State governments and their officials rather than by the Federal Government.

There are doubtless many who have received relief who are not entitled to it, and others who have been denied relief which should have been accorded; but Congress felt that the State governments, being closer to the citizens than the Federal Government, would be in better position to select the personnel for the administration of these funds, and hence delegated this authority and responsibility to the States, and any criticism as to expenditure thereof rests against the State governments rather than the Federal Government.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS MADE IN SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The Federal Government has made cash contributions and loans in the eight counties comprising the Sixth Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent, in an aggregate amount of \$34,304,501.54, itemized as follows:

Adjusted compensation paid World War veterans.....	\$4,219,014.00
Farm rental and benefit payments and profits on cotton options to Mar. 1, 1936.....	13,186,022.03
Civilian Conservation Corps (approximately).....	1,200,000.00
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.....	1,179,579.00
Public Works Administration.....	665,430.00
Works Progress Administration.....	1,025,428.40
12-cent cotton-loan program.....	2,912,489.22
Federal Housing Administration.....	212,939.51
Farm Credit Administration.....	6,726,847.00
Resettlement Administration.....	691,601.83
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	2,065,149.95
Post-office buildings (approximately).....	220,000.00

Total..... 34,304,501.54

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING AT BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks at the dedication of the new Federal building at Buffalo, N. Y., on May 29, 1936, as follows:

I am glad to be here to officiate at the laying of the cornerstone of our new Federal building. Buffalo now has three Federal buildings wherein are housed the activities of the Federal Government serving this area. The first of these buildings, known as the Post Office and Customs House, was erected in 1858. The site, which is located on the corner of Seneca and Washington Streets, was purchased for \$45,000, and the building was erected at a cost to the Federal Government of \$150,839. The present Post Office building was erected in 1901. The site cost the Federal Government \$477,884, while the building was constructed at a cost of \$1,554,598, the total cost of the building and site being \$2,040,831.

This building, which will be a more beautiful edifice when it is completed and extended, will stand as a monument between an epoch that is past and the beginning of a new era in the

design and construction of modern buildings. It is fitting that we participate in ceremonies of this kind, for this building is dedicated to the uses of all our people. It is proper that these ceremonies be attended by distinguished and representative men and women of Buffalo and Erie County, as well as by representatives of the Federal departments whose agencies will be housed within its walls.

There will be housed under the roof of this building many Federal agencies now located in various buildings throughout our down-town district. The concentration of these agencies will improve the efficiency of the service and add to the convenience of our citizens.

We are grateful to the Congress for the action taken by that body which provided the funds for its erection. We are likewise grateful to the interdepartmental building committee for the great part they took in making this day a reality. We thank those who designed this beautiful building, and all who have had a part in its construction.

This building is typical of the power and the glory of our Nation, and marks the industrial and social progress of our city. Its location adds to the beauty of our civic center and makes more impressive the scene which greets the eye of our visitors.

The business interests of our Government are both large and complex. The happiness of our people is concerned with the intelligent, sympathetic, and efficient manner in which our business and our industry are directed. Business, in large measure, depends upon the attention to duty, as well as the loyalty, of those who are employed by the Government to carry on its work.

It is necessary that the rights of property be protected, and that same protection must be given whether the property rights be large or small. The vast industrial organization, the small business concern, or the home, or the rights of the individual to earn a livelihood must each be the concern of a wise and effective government. It is as important that the duties and responsibilities associated with the ownership of property be observed as it is that the rights of property receive protection. The future of our people demands that these two principles go together, and that human rights, as well as property rights, go hand in hand in a well-organized society.

It is from here that equal and exact justice is dispensed to all. It is here that the powerful and authoritative arm of the Federal Government stands to protect the poor and the defenseless and to curb those who would become either arrogant or lawless.

The chambers of this building should never be barred to those who would dispense justice, nor to those who would suffer from an injustice. May those who rule, as well as those who judge in this edifice, rise up to that lofty vision of the fathers of our Republic, who visualized justice as being clothed with dignity, as being supported by loyalty, charity, and truth.

One cannot help being moved to patriotic impulses when ceremonies like this take place. Our minds turn in the direction of the great Federal Government and its agencies, which have meant so much to our people through the years of our Republic's existence. Our memory goes back to the great men and splendid women who founded our beloved country; to those sturdy pioneers who gave form and substance to our National and our State Governments; to those patriots who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor that the principles upon which this Government was founded might be given opportunity to prove their righteousness. It was the men and women supported by the leadership of Washington, of Jefferson, and of Jackson who established a government founded on high ideals, on sound laws, and with equal opportunity, the rich heritage of their descendants.

Here in this country democracy goes on, while all about us nations shaken with violent reactions have set up a dictatorship or welcomed back the monarchy of old. Here the rich and the poor, the farmer and the industrialist, every group and every section of our people are considered without discrimination of any kind, and it is they who constitute the primary concern of our great democratic institutions. Whenever we enter this building let it remind us of the power, the dignity, and the equality of these United States, and let those lasting principles which animate our Government serve the common welfare.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT CALLS FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SECURITY OF ITS PEOPLE

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the economic and social security of our people and our Nation has been discussed during the last 2 years more than ever before in the history of the Nation.

It is only natural that when a people are oppressed that they become active on this subject. When they are prosperous they give little thought to economic security or social security.

When the people of a nation are prosperous it is sad to note that they neglect the institutions and make for social and economic security. For example, during the years 1920 to 1929, when money was cheap and plentiful, individuals and families neglected their homes; school boards and school authorities neglected to build for the future; municipalities, States, and even the Nation neglected to provide for a rainy

day. As the result, when the rainy-day cyclone came in 1929 the structure in these institutions was not strong enough to withstand the momentum of the cyclone.

A nation is only prosperous and secure in proportion to the prosperity and security of the farmers and the little-home owners. The carelessness during the years from 1920 to 1929 and panic of 1929 to 1933 ruined tens of thousands of farmers and hundreds of thousands of home owners.

We are all happy in the fact that the Seventy-third and the Seventy-fourth Congresses, piloted by Franklin D. Roosevelt, set up a constructive series of legislative procedures that has brought hope and cheer to the hearts of our home owners and our farmers.

My belief in social security was put into action when I worked for and voted for the following measures in Congress:

(a) The Banking Act—only 4 failures as compared with some 1,300 under Hoover's administration.

(b) The Home Owners' Loan Act, saving thousands of homes from falling under the sheriff's hammer.

(c) Farm debts, refinancing—act establishing corporation to aid, giving aid to tens of thousands of farmers.

(d) National Securities Exchange Act (act designed to keep the swindlers from gold-bricking the people).

(e) Currency system; to protect act (an act that prevents international bankers and the like from cornering the money market and creating depressions and panics).

(f) Enlarging and enriching the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (we now give assistance to the little fellow).

(g) Old Age Security Act (making certain provisions for pensioning the old).

(h) Acts providing funds and set-ups, such as the C. C. C. camps; Public Works Administration activities; soil-conservation activities; home-building activities; farm-protection activities.

(i) Guffey-Snyder Coal Stabilization Act (giving labor certain rights in collective bargaining and wage adjustments).

(j) Railroad Pension Act and Wagner-Connery Labor Act.

(k) Legislation adjusting tariff to the effect that we now have a greater tariff income.

These, with other dovetailing acts, we put into effect. The results can be found all around you. All we have to do is close our eyes and think of the poverty and bread lines of 1932 and the early part of 1933 and we will know that something happened to bring about these wonderfully improved conditions. The thing that happened was your Congress and your President set up machinery at Washington that is functioning in the interests of the little-home owner, the farmer, the laborer, and the little-business man.

Mr. Speaker, my training and my teachings in life compel me to be a supporter of our constitutional form of government. I cannot and will not support any of these communistic or other "istic" phases of so-called government.

My people want an opportunity to work for a living. My people do not want hand-outs or doles. My record in Congress indelibly stamps me as fighting for legislation that will give every man an opportunity to go out and make an honest living and earn an honest wage. I stand for legislation that does not discriminate when it comes to race, creed, or conditions of servitude. In fact, this Roosevelt administration has done more to break down the barriers that for years caused class distinction than any other administration.

Our citizens of foreign extraction have received more consideration under this administration. The colored people have received more consideration under this administration. True, the antilynching law did not come before Congress, but I, for one, will support it when it does come up, if it is in the form that my colleague, Congressman MITCHELL of Illinois, now has the bill drawn.

The farmers, the laborers, and little-business men have received real substantial help through the measures enacted by the Seventy-third and the Seventy-fourth Congresses. These groups received promises for years and years, but never very much actual help until the Roosevelt administration started to function.

Youth, the young men and the young women, have received substantial help during this administration. At the beginning of 1933 some 4,000,000 boys and girls were walking the streets and highways and byways. Today we find less than 1,000,000 of these splendid young people idle on our streets.

No wonder that both the young and the old are enthusiastic about the New Deal program. In fact, it is not a New Deal; it is just the deal that our forefathers handed down to us, restored to a working basis, whereby human rights are on a level with all other rights of a free people. This is as it should be under our Constitution.

THE MACHINE, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND SHORTER HOURS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the biggest problem we have in America—in fact, the biggest problem in the world today. That problem is unemployment.

The cause of the problem is technological, and the by-products of the problem are deficits, taxes, communism, vice, crime, relief, and a hundred and one associated minor problems. Put the unemployed back to work and all these problems will diminish or vanish from our midst.

I hold that the natural resources of America are sufficient with our present manpower and our existing capital set-up to furnish all the necessities of life, including food, clothing, shelter, transportation, and the entertainment of our population. Our modern machine methods have made it possible for a part of our population to produce as much and more than we have been able to consume. Our problem is therefore to care for that portion of our population which under existing circumstances cannot be gainfully employed. Are they to starve to death? Will they be continued on made-work projects? Will we imitate England and assign a large portion of our citizens to a life of indolence on the dole? Or are we to provide for their employment in private enterprise?

Of all these methods I prefer private employment. I would have it provided for by a law which would compel a reduction in the work period commensurate with work opportunities available for our working population. If unemployment results from machine efficiency, then the only practical solution is in a reduction of the workday for the employees of America.

Every authority agrees that productive efficiency during the passing years has revolutionized the operating processes of industry. The driving urge was to produce a greater volume of goods at the expenditure of less human energy. The result has been more and more production with fewer and fewer men. There is no exception. It is true in every enterprise, as a survey of the roster of all industry will show.

A significant case of this character received the consideration of Congress recently—railroad workers, a short time ago numbering 2,000,000, now scarcely total 1,000,000, and with a further prospect of an early reduction of 150,000 more railroad employees, resulting from sweeping consolidation proposals made by Mr. Eastman, the former Railroad Transportation Coordinator.

Coal miners now average scarcely 3 days a week, despite the reduction in hours to 7 a day. The same situation is more or less true in all industry. Modern machines and mass-production methods have already reduced the workday and the workweek, but in most cases the workers have been denied their share in the fruits of these modern tendencies.

There is no more appropriate time for a serious consideration of this problem than at present. Industry can well afford in most instances to reduce the workday of those now gainfully employed. The Government cannot long continue the tremendous expenditures which now provide made work and home relief for millions of our people. The constant and steady upswing of business, the tremendous increase in profits, the rising tide of business expansion, make it compelling for us to increase the consuming power of our people lest this sudden boom be followed by another collapse.

Every authority of note tells the story of added industrial profits, of a sharp rise in dividend payments, of the unusual increase in industrial production, of the remarkable gains in the iron and steel industry, of the record-breaking sales in the motor industry. However, these gains cannot continue

permanently unless consumer buying—the foundation of all these gains—is placed upon a parity with our increased productivity. Not only is it necessary, therefore, to relieve the problems which menace government and disturb industry but the elimination of our unemployment problem by shortening of the work period is essentially necessary if we are to avoid a repetition of the crash of 1929.

In his Baltimore speech to the youth of America the President of the United States charted the course which industry must follow—a reduction in the work period, an increase in the leisure time is the philosophy contained in that historic utterance. Its logic is strengthened and fortified by the presence of millions of men in our country rendered idle by the efficiency of machine productivity. However, captains of industry like Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., of General Motors, declare that unemployment will result from the application of the President's recommendations; and from the pen of that noted writer Walter Lippmann, we learn that the President's promise of better life with less work defies common sense.

Mr. Sloan, to further quote him, declared:

That is like saying if we bake less cake, we will have less cake to eat.

While Lippmann, on the other hand, observes:

They cannot eat more cake by eating less cake.

And then he adds:

If the older people and the younger are to be supported in leisure, the others will have to provide their support.

And from these observations they raise a thesis charged with absurd deductions.

A sample of their absurdities is this statement made by Mr. Lippmann:

If working less is the cure for unemployment, then total unemployment ought to produce the abundant life.

Carrying out the Sloan and Lippmann philosophy to the other extreme, the abundant life will result only in working our people from the cradle to the grave, with such leisure as will be theirs to be provided not here but hereafter.

Production is the cornerstone of well-being. No one denies it. Wages, profits, taxes—everything must be paid out of production. The more produced, the more there is for social distribution. Of course, the man who does not work must be kept by the man who does. There can be no exception to that rule. That lesson has come home to us during the last 6 years. The Nation is called upon to provide work relief and home relief through taxes for its unemployed ranging from ten to twenty million people. The situation results from economic maladjustment, throwing production and consumption grossly out of balance, creating the harrowing paradox of plenty causing poverty, with all of its devastating trail of related miseries.

To the ultimate solution of this grave situation, the President has successfully directed the Nation's industry. National wealth production—which dropped from its 1929 high of eighty-five billion to its 1932 low of thirty-eight billion—is now above the sixty-billion mark, with the continuance of its rising trend as certain as tomorrow's sun. It is plain enough to any observer whose reasoning is not distorted by partisan design or reactionary thinking that if the millions now unemployed, or on part-time jobs, could be given steady work on modern machines and on a 30-hour-week basis, America's wealth production would soon reach, and likely pass, the one-hundred-and-fifty-billion-a-year mark. Then would come health and leisure, free from care and grief. And then the added cost of Government as well as the added cost of caring for both our older and our younger folks would seem trifling in comparison with our increased national income.

Today there is no problem of production. To give willing workers a chance to produce—that is our main problem.

"Notwithstanding the reductions in hours of labor", reported the committee on economic changes, of which the Honorable Herbert Hoover was the chairman, "per capita productivity is nearly 60 percent greater than it was toward the close of the nineteenth century; the increase in per capita

productivity in manufacturing from 1922 to 1925 was 35 percent; the productivity of farm workers has increased at a rate probably never before equaled."

Since the report of the Hoover committee on economic changes, productive efficiency per unit of worker has been going forward at a constantly accelerating pace, with no end in sight. Call the roll of industry, one after another, and each presents a romance of industrial revolution, as old producing methods give way to new. Surplus and disposition of surplus is the only economic problem. Today, with production running steadily upward, the mills, mines, factories, and farms will not be able to employ more than 80 percent of the workers they required in predepression days.

With sufficient purchasing power, America has a potential productive capacity that defies the imagination. This carries with it a certain promise of higher living standards for the average man and woman than ever enjoyed before, and this on a basis of shorter labor hours than heretofore has met popular sanction.

Today we are caring for our older people, our younger folks, and many who are in between those periods of life. They all stand before us the victims of our machine productivity. President Roosevelt, having this in mind, indicates the manner by which this present, expensive, planless basis may give way in an orderly and progressive fashion to a more enlightened and equitable policy; a policy based upon a fair and just distribution of earnings, by reducing the work period and giving to every willing hand the inherent right to work. It is the course that progress must take. Man has perfected no better plan. Its simplicity recommends its application above every other device yet advocated. It necessitates no bureaucracy or governmental supervision. It substitutes a lesser number of days in the workweek than is now the case. It merely reduces the hours per day to a lesser number than is now in effect. The acceptance of this simple plan on the part of Government and industry solves the most important problem of the day. We control the machine or it ruins us.

RECIPROCAL ECONOMY OF SELF-HELP

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, cooperative self-help associations have proved in the last 3 years to be the best method through which to meet the problems arising out of unemployment and need.

The assistance given to these self-help groups on the part of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration has been small compared with the vast sums expended by the Administration for direct relief or work relief.

From July 1933 to October 31, 1935, the Administration extended grants to some 208 self-help cooperative groups amounting to \$1,656,578. At the end of this period these groups reported assets in equipment and inventories of \$1,145,595 besides a total value of \$3,115,094 received by members in the form of goods and services. Concurrently a cumulative total of \$2,279,396 in relief savings had been accomplished by these activities.

Participating in these 208 groups during this period were some 30,000 unemployed people, with their dependents, amounting to around 100,000 individuals. The activities of these self-helpers have resulted in the saving of crops that would otherwise have gone to waste. In their operations of trading labor and services many farmers, small manufacturers, and businessmen have been able to expand their operations by acquiring labor through trading their surplus produce and goods, for which there was no ready profitable cash market.

How far the benefits resulting from the unemployed trading their labor and services have reached outside of their own ranks would make an interesting research and would undoubtedly prove that the self-help, or reciprocal-economy cooperative could, if properly encouraged and directed, become a potent factor in national recovery from depression.

The self-help cooperative, when properly organized, becomes a center of hope and courage for its membership.

Here the unemployed can always invest their labor and receive something in return for it without feeling that they are being pauperized by asking for relief. More than that—the cooperative becomes a recruiting ground for private business. In the trading operations members of the cooperative come in contact with farmers, manufacturers, and employers of every sort. The kind of men and women who would rather work for a living than go on relief also make the most desirable employees, and employers within the trading radius of a self-help cooperative soon learn that here is an excellent source of dependable labor. Thus the self-help cooperative becomes an asset to the employers of the community in which it is located as well as to the community itself by its reduction of relief costs.

In furnishing private business with dependable labor the self-help cooperative often loses its best and most valuable members. This of necessity tends to make the level of average efficiency of production in the cooperative low. They lose their best members who go on cash jobs when they have regained their courage and gotten into the swing of working for a living.

In spite of this handicap which would wreck most private enterprises the self-help cooperatives have proved successful.

The amounts invested in these enterprises by the Federal Government has been about a hundred dollars per worker. In comparison to this the investment considered necessary in private enterprise per worker is somewhere between \$1,000 and \$1,500. In the light of these facts the achievements of these struggling groups have been nothing short of phenomenal.

Our Government can well consider ways and means of turning the major portion of relief expenditures into the building of reciprocal economy.

Through the development of organized self-help a solution to the unemployment problem is being found by the unemployed themselves.

In Oakland, Calif., the self-help group known as the Unemployed Exchange Association, U. X. A. for short, has been operating since June 1932. This organization has hundreds of businessmen on its books with whom a brisk trade in labor, services, and commodities has been developing and increasing.

The relief saving to the county of Alameda amounted to more than \$150,000 before this group received any aid in the form of grants from the F. E. R. A. With Federal grants plus trading operations of their own the U. X. A. has acquired and is operating a sawmill in the foothills of the Sierras above Oroville, Calif., and the organization is trading lumber to farmers in several counties, taking surplus produce in exchange. The U. X. A. has proved an incalculable asset to all the people of the communities in which it is operating.

In Santa Barbara, Calif., a younger self-help group organized after the reciprocal-economy pattern evolved by U. X. A. has been operating during 1935. This group has earned hundreds of tons of food for its participants and has become a real asset to Santa Barbara. The Santa Barbara County Cooperative Industries, group no. 1, has scores of businessmen and farmers on its books as trade agreements besides over a thousand members. It has been endorsed officially by the local chamber of commerce, the Bankers' Association clearing house, the county board of supervisors, the city council, the mayor, the superintendent of schools, the Parent-Teachers' Association, the Y. M. C. A., the City Teachers' Club, the Kiwanis Club, the Native Sons of the Golden West, and many other organized bodies, besides the majority of business and professional leaders individually.

The Santa Barbara group has the community of Santa Barbara united in its support and has proved that reciprocal economy is an acceptable application to unemployment and need.

In 28 States and 3 Territories organized self-help has proved superior in its effects to relief and work relief. Out of these efforts, made primarily by the people themselves, has grown a method which is known as reciprocal economy.

This is an orderly, constructive, understandable method which makes it possible for unemployed people to work for a living instead of going on relief. It has become a proved method, acceptable to organized business, organized labor; and it has proved to be an asset to Government in reducing relief expenditures, in expanding the usefulness of relief expenditures, and in eliminating in many cases the need for relief expenditures. This method may well be instituted as the proper and most effective method for our Government to apply relief funds through.

ALAMEDA NAVAL AIR STATION

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, legislation providing for the establishment of a naval air station at Alameda has passed both the Senate and House and is now pending before the President. I have no doubt but what he will sign this very important measure.

This matter was initiated November 6, 1935, when Admiral E. H. Campbell, United States Navy, commandant of the twelfth naval district, stationed at San Francisco, Calif., dispatched the following letter to the mayor of Alameda:

NOVEMBER 6, 1935.

HON. HANS W. ROEBBE,
Mayor of Alameda, City Hall, Alameda, Calif.

DEAR MAYOR ROEBBE: The Navy Department has under consideration the establishment of an air station on San Francisco Bay for heavier-than-air craft—landplanes and seaplanes.

This will involve, first, the acquisition of a suitable site for the air station, to be followed by the development of the site acquired. Both of these depend upon favorable action by Congress.

Studies of available sites give high priority to the Alameda airport location, owned by the city of Alameda, and at the present time under lease by the city to the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

As the representative in this area of the Navy Department, the commandant, twelfth naval district, has been directed by the Secretary of the Navy to contact the city officials of Alameda to ascertain whether the city is willing to convey to the Government for naval uses, at a nominal consideration, approximately 346 acres of land at Alameda, subject to leasehold and improvements of the Alameda Airport, Inc., said conveyance to be made as soon as the Navy Department secures authorizing legislation from Congress to purchase the leasehold and improvements and accept conveyance of this land.

In addition to the land under lease to the Alameda Airport, Inc., the Navy Department desires to acquire under similar conditions the adjoining approximately 500 acres of tideland and submerged land to the southward and westward, owned by the city of Alameda, which the commandant understands is free of encumbrances. It is the Navy Department's intention, when assured that this property can be acquired by the Government for naval uses, to present to Congress a program of development and construction for a first-class air base at the Alameda site.

The requirements of the new base will be such as to provide landplane facilities for the airplanes assigned to three carriers and seaplane facilities for two or more squadrons of large patrol planes, a total of approximately 300 airplanes. In addition, overhaul facilities would be required for the above aircraft and engines, barracks for approximately 2,000 enlisted men, docking facilities for 3 carriers and 1 or more large tenders. The total expenditures would involve several million dollars. Approximately 300 civilians would be employed, with a total annual pay roll of approximately \$500,000; this in addition to the pay roll of enlisted men attached to the base and ships lying at the base.

It is proposed that the Government occupy the property immediately after congressional authorization and funds are provided for the acquisition of the leaseholds and improvements, and that development would proceed as fast as authority and funds permit.

Consideration of a location for a naval landplane and seaplane base on San Francisco Bay depends upon the early availability of sufficient land and adjacent water front to permit development as outlined above. The commandant is most interested in learning if the city of Alameda is favorable to conveying this property to the Government for the purpose set forth at a nominal consideration.

An early reply will be appreciated in order that the Navy Department may proceed with the necessary steps to secure legislative authority.

Yours sincerely,

E. H. CAMPBELL,
Rear Admiral, U. S. Navy,
Commandant, Twelfth Naval District.

Following the receipt of this letter, the city of Alameda called a special election on January 28, 1936, for the purpose of voting upon the proposition as to whether or not the city would deed for a nominal consideration 929 acres of land to the United States for the purpose of establishing a naval air station thereon. In due time identical bills were introduced having for their objects the establishment of this naval air

station. On March 12, 1936, Adolphus Andrews, Acting Secretary of the Navy, reported on the House bill as follows:

[No. 523]

TO AUTHORIZE THE ACQUISITION OF LANDS IN THE CITY OF ALAMEDA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS A SITE FOR A NAVAL AIR STATION AND TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION AND INSTALLATION OF A NAVAL AIR STATION THEREON (H. R. 10708 AND H. R. 11039). MR. CARTER

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 12, 1936.

The CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bills (H. R. 10708 and H. R. 11039) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the city of Alameda, county of Alameda, State of California, as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon, were referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for comment and recommendation. It is noted that the two bills are similar in purpose but that the bill H. R. 11039 contains a more detailed description of the property in question.

The purpose of these bills is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire on behalf of the United States at a cost not to exceed \$1, as a site for a naval air station, from the city of Alameda, Calif., a parcel of land containing approximately 95 acres of hard land and 884 acres of tide land, free from all encumbrances except a certain lease entered into by and between the city of Alameda and the Alameda Airports, Inc., a subsidiary of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

Both bills authorize the appropriation of the following sums: "(a) Not to exceed \$296,000 for the purpose of acquiring the Curtiss-Wright Corporation leasehold interest and all improvements of every kind and nature on said tract of land;

"(b) Four thousand dollars to be paid to the city of Alameda, Calif., to reimburse said city for the expenses of a special election held for the purpose of authorizing the city council of the city of Alameda to convey to the United States the above-described parcel of land for the above-specified purpose, and for incidental expenditures in connection with such conveyance; and

"(c) One million dollars to be used for any of the purposes as set forth in section 2 of this act."

A special election was called and ordered to be held in the city of Alameda, Calif., on Tuesday, January 28, 1936, for the purpose of submitting to the qualified electors the proposition to give, grant, convey, and alien forever to the United States of America the lands above mentioned for the aforesaid purposes. The total vote cast for and against the proposition was as follows:

For the proposition.....	8,284
Against the proposition.....	378

Thereafter on January 29, 1936, the city council adopted resolution no. 2035 authorizing and instructing the mayor of the city to make, execute, and deliver for and on behalf of said city a good and sufficient deed giving, granting, conveying, and alienating to the United States of America forever for use as a naval air base the lands above referred to—

"Provided, however, That at least \$1,000,000 be expended for, or contracted to be expended in the actual work of development of said naval air base by December 31, 1939, otherwise said lands shall automatically revert back to said city of Alameda."

This project is of great importance to the efficiency of the Navy and was assigned the highest priority in the draft of the public works authorization bill recently submitted to Congress and introduced in the Senate on February 22, 1936, as S. 4078. It is possible, however, that the Navy Department may at some future date find it expedient to use this site not only as an air station but also for other purposes. The Navy Department therefore recommends that the bills be amended by inserting, after the words "naval air station" in line 5 of page 1, the words "or other naval purposes."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the bills, if amended as recommended, would not be in conflict with the program of the President.

The Navy Department recommends the enactment of the bill H. R. 11039 if amended as suggested.

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPHUS ANDREWS, Acting.

The Senate bill passed the Senate as originally introduced. The House bill was amended before leaving the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, and was further amended on the floor of the House, but the main purposes of the bill were not interfered with. The Secretary of the Navy and the Navy officials consider this project of great importance to the efficiency of the Navy, and it has been shown the highest priority in the draft of the public works authorization bill which was submitted to Congress.

This tract of land is located in the city of Alameda, on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay. The Navy proposes to use this area primarily for a hydroplane base, but requires also a landing field for landplanes. There is already established on this area a modern first-class airport of landplanes consisting of an administration building, a hotel,

hangars, repair shop, warehouses, lighting equipment, and other facilities ordinarily found in connection with a modern airport. There are at present also facilities for the landing of hydroplanes. The Clipper ships, owned by the Pan-American Airways, use this area as their California terminal.

From the point of the view of the Navy, this tract of land is ideally located for facilities for both hydroplanes and the landplanes.

The citizens of Alameda are to be congratulated for their generosity in donating this area to the Government. The use of aircraft is, as one of the arms of our national defense, increasing each year, and this project is one of the most important units in the coast defense of the Pacific coast.

The Navy Department is anxious to begin construction at the earliest possible date on this undertaking, and I believe that the Congress of the United States should furnish ample funds to insure that this naval air station will be completed in the not distant future.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE OF NOMINATING DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES FOR THE PRESIDENCY SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio address on the two-thirds rule, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I speak to you now from Washington, D. C., as Congressman at Large from Oklahoma. I am a Democrat. I subscribe to the principles of Jeffersonian democracy. Coming to you as a Representative in Congress from the great Southwest, it would be natural for me to concur with southern statesmen in their traditional espousal of the two-thirds rule for nominating candidates for the Presidency. However, my tenacious adherence to the tenets of social and governmental justice as laid down by Thomas Jefferson and my inherent inclination toward liberal democratic government impel me to vigorous opposition to the two-thirds rule. I favor complete abolishment of this rule.

I have not discussed the subject with my colleagues in the Congress. I was probably invited by the National Broadcasting Co. to speak to you this evening because I am one of the few southern Members of Congress who have broken the shackles of tradition and who privately and publicly are willing to throw off the curse that has jinxed the Democratic Party since 1832. I have heard that President Roosevelt and Jim Farley favor abrogating the two-thirds rule. This being true, those who hold similar views to mine will probably be in the ascendancy at the national Democratic convention scheduled during the week in Philadelphia. There is considerable talk that that convention will discard the two-thirds rule. At any rate, the question will give the Democrats something over which to fight. There will be no scrap over who will receive the nomination for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency. The platform undoubtedly will offer no opportunities for lively, spirited debate, because it assuredly will be, and properly so, a reiteration of the platform of 1932 and a pledge for the continuance of the broad social and economic program of the Roosevelt New Deal. The question of abrogating the two-thirds rule, then, should provide a morsel of raw meat over which the delegates can maintain the usual combatant color of Democratic conventions.

I am opposed to the two-thirds rule because I believe in majority rule. I cannot interpret the two-thirds rule to be Democratic Jeffersonian liberalism. With the two-thirds rule in vogue, we review political conventions of the Democratic Party over the past 100 years and find that too often the minority controlled the convention. A minority group may not be able to nominate a candidate, but it can prevent the nomination of a candidate of the majority. The Democratic conventions of 1912 and 1924 are typical examples. Champ Clark in the former and McAdoo in the latter are typical of the truth of this statement. Both had the majority of delegates at the conventions.

Any man or woman, with few technical exceptions, who receives a majority of popular votes is the person who is elected to office. This holds true from the Presidency down the line to the position of constable. We would not think of requiring a candidate for office to obtain two-thirds of the votes before he would be declared the winner. We would not think of restricting ourselves to the point where we required a Presidential candidate to obtain two-thirds of the electoral vote of the Nation before he could take the oath of office of the Chief Executive. We would not countenance a situation whereby a Governor of a State would have to secure two-thirds of the votes to be elected. We would condemn any private or public citizen who advocated the two-thirds rule in electing State representatives, county judges, county attorneys, or the clerk of school boards. Who would defend a man who argued that county commissioners or city commissioners must have two-thirds of the total vote before they could be elected? Without attempting in the least to diminish the home popularity of my colleagues in Congress, and with all due respect, let me ask the question: How many of them would have been serving in the Seventy-fourth Congress, which has just adjourned, if they had been required to practice the two-thirds rule? We do not practice these principles at home; why should we handicap our party and our Government in our quadrennial conventions? Why practice this religion on Sunday, as it were, and go home to sin the remainder of the week?

Why must we deviate from a universal majority practice of nominating and electing our officeholders to the inconsistency of establishing undemocratic procedure in our Presidential conventions?

This question of the two-thirds rule is much graver than matter-of-fact, offhand thinking reveals. The machinery of our democratic form of government is political. Our oft-referred-to ship of state is a political offspring. Thanks to those great minds that drafted our Constitution and pursued the campaign for its ratification by the Original Thirteen Colonies, our form of government is fabricated with democratic elasticity. The two-thirds rule is the only inconsistency in that democracy. Undoubtedly its infamous results were not anticipated by our founding fathers. If they had been, doubtless prohibitive measures would have been invoked.

The two-thirds rule has oftentimes been the pivotal cause for the turn in important events in our national life. Many times this rule has prohibited both the minority and the majority Presidential candidates from receiving the nomination. It has brought to the front several unknowns. The first so-called dark horse was James K. Polk, who was nominated in 1844. Van Buren was the leading candidate. He previously had made the statement that outlined his opposition to the annexation of Texas without Mexico's consent. The South became infuriated, and although Van Buren had a clear majority on the first ballot, the imperialistic attitude of the delegates swung them to Polk and eventually threw the United States into war with Mexico. The two-thirds rule brought about the nomination of Franklin Pierce. The undemocratic two-thirds rule was the cause of the nomination of James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania. The convention that nominated him held spirited arguments in the resolutions committee over the slavery question. Because of Buchanan's wont to straddle the issue, the platform pretended that the slavery question had been settled by the compromise of 1850.

Raymond Clapper, noted newspaper writer, says that the two-thirds rule indirectly caused the Civil War. In 1860 the rule prevented the nomination of Douglas, caused dissension in the Republican Party, and produced the nomination of Abraham Lincoln. Douglas would have been nominated by a majority in that convention. Able historians express the belief that he would have averted the strife of civil war.

The two-thirds rule weakens the Democratic Party. For nearly 40 years, with one exception, where the convention balloted time after time and ballot after ballot, the strife of the convention left such wounds that the party and the nominee went home to certain defeat. Bitter factional strife has often foreshadowed defeat for the Democratic Party. There have been few victories when the convention was long and bitter.

Speaking of nominating unknowns, I once knew a school board who selected a superintendent whom they did not know because they did not like any of the other candidates. The board met on call of the chairman to select the superintendent for the ensuing year. The usual ballots were cast expressing the members' choice. When counted it was found that a man was elected superintendent that none of the board members knew. Each member explained that he voted for the unknown man because he did not like the other applicants.

This simple little example describes the spirit that often motivates delegates at our national political conventions when the two-thirds rule invokes dissension. Delegates become heated, and to assuage their wounds they will declare themselves, as history shows, for any unknown rather than join either the majority or the minority. This contemptible attitude has wrecked the party many times.

Friends of Andrew Jackson fell upon the two-thirds rule to keep Calhoun from receiving the nomination for the Vice Presidency. This was in 1832. The South, bitter over the question of slavery, looks upon the rule as assuring it a balance of power over the North and West.

Again I repeat that I am a Democrat. I sincerely believe in the rule of the majority. Ladies and gentlemen, the Civil War is over. The North and South are now united. The East, the West, the North, and the South are one. I am, therefore, vigorously opposed to the two-thirds rule because it will not permit a rule of the majority. I believe the Democratic Party should abolish this rule. I will not have an opportunity to present my views to the Democratic national convention in Philadelphia because I shall not attend the convention. My absence from the convention does not indicate, however, that I am taking a walk along with other Democrats who, according to the newspapers, are said to be walking. The Seventy-fourth Congress has just adjourned. Official business will keep me here a few days, after which I shall return to the good "Sooner" State of Oklahoma.

ERNEST LUNDEEN: HIS FIGHT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY—UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—OLD-AGE PENSIONS—FARMER-LABOR—VETERANS

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, I have an editorial recently published in the Minneapolis Labor Review entitled "Veterans Won't Forget LUNDEEN." The editorial states:

One man the veterans who are now receiving the bonus will not and should not forget is Farmer-Labor Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN.

When the enemies of the Patman bill and even the author himself thought it was buried forever in committee, it was LUNDEEN who resurrected it through a petition for action and who kept hammering until names enough were obtained to compel Congress to act.

So, through the determination of this Farmer-Laborite, himself a veteran of the Spanish-American War, the bonus bill was kept alive and finally passed.

The bonus bill was not a grandstand measure with Congressman LUNDEEN. It was something to be worked for in silence of oblivion as well as when the bands were playing.

Just as he worked and worked until the bonus became a reality, so LUNDEEN will work until his measure for social security for all is enacted into law.

SOCIAL SECURITY A LIFETIME INTEREST

I am sure Congressman LUNDEEN will continue his fight until social security for all is written on the statute books of this country. We are determined to continue the fight for the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill during the next Congress.

Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN's interest in social security began long before the beginning of his public career. His Carleton commencement oration, delivered at Northfield, Minn., on June 12, 1901, is a brilliant expression of the same views he holds today. Few people can view their youthful expressions of thought delivered 35 years ago and say, "I need not change a word nor take a letter back."

"THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT"

Foreseeing the rising tide of monopoly and the Money Trust, LUNDEEN stated in his college oration:

Today we are face to face with forces which tomorrow may plunge our land into the horrors of war. Capital and labor, wealth and poverty are arrayed like armored giants, chafing for the battle. The struggle is irrepressible—inevitable. The love of the much and the more, the idealizing of power have made the hearts of men as steel ringing on steel in the great conflict for victory.

We forget the shadows, we ignore the stifled cry of the burdened millions—and we fail to better their condition. We boast of the telegraph and telephone, of steamship and railroad, of cheaper clothing and a wider range of food, but, fellow citizens, how much of this do the tenement dwellers of our great cities enjoy? What great avenues of progress are open to the 140,000 coal miners of Pennsylvania whose wages average \$250 per year?

In this atmosphere of social discontent are latent forces of labor unions and strikes. Let their miseries increase a little more; let the capitalist trench himself a little more securely, heap a few more indignities and wrongs upon these bending forms, and lo, behold a revolution which no government soldiery can ever suppress. When he wills it, the brawny arm of the laboring man can destroy monarchies, dethrone kings, and banish republics from the earth forever.

The pinnacles of our educational system may reflect in golden gleams, wealth, and wisdom, but if our foundations of granite begin to crumble a rush of winds will sweep away the worthless debris and leave mankind an opportunity to build better.

PARENTS AMERICAN PIONEERS

ERNEST LUNDEEN was born on a homestead near Beresford, S. Dak. His parents were from Småland, Sweden. He early learned the toils and hardships of pioneering on the Great Plains. His mother was one of those noble, pioneer women whose sturdy build and strength of character our great American artists have, fortunately, forever preserved. His father was a farmer-homesteader and a minister of the gospel, independent and progressive.

EDUCATION

After attending the Brooklyn district country school near Beresford, S. Dak., the grade schools of Harcourt, Iowa, and high school at Dayton, Iowa, ERNEST LUNDEEN went to Northfield, Minn., where he worked his way through Carleton College. Here he participated in many activities, including debate and oratory, the football team and field sports of all kinds. In the course of his studies, his debating and oratory, his mind was made fertile with ideas of social justice. His progressive views early brought him in contact with the cooperative movement. He was a director of a cooperative boarding house at Carleton College, which was known to be very successful in furnishing good, wholesome food at unbelievably low cost to students of Carleton.

LUNDEEN's education was interrupted by the Spanish-American War, when he enlisted as a volunteer of Company B, Twelfth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry. His service in the Spanish-American War convinced him that something was wrong with the method of handling food supplies, health, and sanitation during the war.

LABOR'S LAWYER

After attending the University of Minnesota law school and being admitted to the bar, LUNDEEN soon made a name for himself as a successful, progressive lawyer of Minneapolis, where he has been practicing for 30 years. He came to the defense of labor unions in the switchmen's strike when no other attorney in the Twin Cities could be found to face the attacks of reactionary elements. Railroad labor will always remember LUNDEEN's defense of labor's rights.

MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

ERNEST LUNDEEN served two terms in the Minnesota State Legislature, 1911 to 1915, where he successfully piloted through such progressive measures as a bill to increase the value of human life from \$5,000 to \$7,500 in cases of death by wrongful act. This law paid millions of dollars to widows and orphans made dependent by accidental death of their husbands and fathers. He was an active leader in the field of workmen's compensation.

WORLD WAR DAYS

During the hectic days of the World War, when LUNDEEN first served in Congress, 1917 to 1919, his speeches and the bills he introduced show that he was a fighter for social security. Having rare ability to vision the future in spite of war hysteria, Congressman LUNDEEN had the courage and the foresight to speak out against ruthless destruction of our natural resources and the depletion of supplies needed at home. He protested to Congress and to the President against the huge exports of coal to foreign countries while our own people were in danger of freezing from the resulting shortage of coal.

SPONSORED SOCIAL LEGISLATION 19 YEARS AGO

In those hysterical days of the war and the months that followed the armistice, Congressman LUNDEEN sponsored social legislation in Congress. He introduced a resolution to create in the newly established Department of Labor a bureau of the unemployed, which was to alleviate the unemployment that far-thinking people knew would result from the war. Hearings were held by the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives on another Lundeen resolution, directing certain committees of the House to provide means of employment for veterans and the post-war army of the unemployed. This was in 1919.

The persecution LUNDEEN suffered as a result of his vote against America's entry into the World War and against conscription for foreign service only further impressed upon his mind the necessity of building an enlightened labor movement to combat the power and propaganda of moneyed interests. For many years he suffered persecution, disgrace, and poverty. He had the experience of having his home foreclosed and all his possessions, including his treasured books, thrown into the street during a rainstorm. Books in his library today still bear the mud-splash marks of foreclosure.

Experiences of this kind do not crush the spirit of a fighting American. They make his heart beat faster for those of his countrymen who suffer the same fate. They make him more determined than ever to expose the cause of such tragedies and to fight for social justice.

HISTORY OF FRAZIER-LUNDEEN SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL

With this background of active leadership in labor legislation and with these many years of personal experience in suffering hardships that spring from social insecurity, Congressman LUNDEEN came back to Washington in March 1933 demanding social security for all the people. Within the 14 years preceding his election to the Seventy-third Congress he had made two trips to Europe, visiting England, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Soviet Union, and other countries, taking special note of progress made by these countries in social security. He found that America, though a leader in other fields, was behind many countries of Europe in social-security legislation. From boyhood he had given much time

to reading, especially the works of American liberal and progressive leaders, and today he is constantly on the watch for new books, pamphlets, magazine and newspaper articles on social security.

The Lundeen unemployment, old-age, and social-security bill was first introduced as H. R. 7598 on February 2, 1934. It was again introduced the opening day of the Seventy-fourth Congress, January 3, 1935, as H. R. 2827. That session it was favorably reported out by the House Labor Committee.

The Frazier-Lundeen bill, embodying the same principles as the original Lundeen bill, but worked out in greater detail, was introduced on January 6, 1936, as H. R. 9680 and S. 3475. It provides an immediate Federal system of social insurance for all persons over the age of 18 who are unemployed through no fault of their own. The insurance is equal to prevailing local wages, but in no case less than \$10 per week plus \$3 for each dependent; nor more than \$20 per week plus \$5 for each dependent. The cost is borne by the Federal Treasury, and further funds necessary are raised by taxation on incomes, gifts, and inheritances over \$5,000 a year.

Old-age pensions and health, accident, and maternity insurance are provided in like amounts.

Hearings were held on the bill in 1936 by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. The Frazier-Lundeen bill is endorsed by thousands of labor unions, church and fraternal societies, and local and State governments. It was the first social-security measure before the American Congress, and it is the only adequate social-security measure before the American people today. I feel certain the voters of Minnesota will return ERNEST LUNDEEN to Congress, so that we may continue to work with him in our fight for real and adequate social security for all the people.

ENDORSED BY NATIONAL UNION FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

Congressman LUNDEEN has been unanimously endorsed by the National Union for Social Justice for reelection to Congress from the Third Congressional District of Minnesota. The endorsing resolution reads:

Whereas ERNEST LUNDEEN, Congressman from the Third Congressional District of the State of Minnesota, has always been a leader in the struggle for a more just economic order; and

Whereas his record in the Minnesota Legislature and the Congress of the United States over a period of years has demonstrated his sincerity and courage in the battle for justice to the common man; and

Whereas his record for social-security legislation has been such that he has won national recognition; and

Whereas Congressman LUNDEEN has approved all of the 16 points in the program of the National Union for Social Justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Third District Convention of the National Union for Social Justice of the State of Minnesota, That we recommend to our membership the candidacy of ERNEST LUNDEEN for Congressman for the said Third District and urge our members to do everything possible to secure his nomination and election.

FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL

An early signer of the petition to bring the Frazier-Lemke bill before the House for a vote, LUNDEEN has never forgotten that he was born on a farm. He votes with the great farm and farm-cooperative organizations, and he often quotes an inscription on a monument to those who lost their lives in a Minneapolis mill explosion:

Labor, wide as the earth, has its summit in heaven.

TOTAL OF APPROPRIATIONS, SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION—FUNDS FOR VETERANS, RELIEF AND EMPLOYMENT, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE PREDOMINATE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the effect on the Public Treasury of the work of the session of Congress just closed has been frequently misrepresented by many who wish, for partisan political purposes, to discredit the efforts of the National Legislature and the Democratic administration. They cite you only an aggregate of all appropriations made during the session, including those which are of a permanent character and automatically continue without annual review by Congress. They make no attempt to analyze the total to indicate what part of that aggregate is payable from postal revenues and trust-fund receipts and not therefore a charge against the general funds, nor to indicate what portion is for the fiscal year just closed and a charge against that year, nor to what portion is primarily for the fiscal year 1937, which commences July 1, 1936. They would leave the impression that the entire total represents a single year's expenditures. It does not.

The work of the session, insofar as appropriations are concerned, was affected by two momentous incidents. The invalidation of the processing taxes by the decision of the Supreme Court necessitated the appropriation of approximately \$300,000,000 for the payment of commitments and obligations that had been in good faith entered into by farmers prior to the decision of the Court and which otherwise would have been paid from processing-tax appropriations. The enactment of the Adjusted-Compensation Payment Act—soldiers' bonus—requires appropriations aggregating \$2,249,587,375, including in that total the expenses of administration and audit. These two extraordinary and unexpected amounts make a total of approximately \$2,550,000,000. The national problem of relief still continues, though the need is in lessened form, due to general improvement in business conditions. There is included for this purpose a total of \$1,425,000,000, with an additional \$308,000,000 to continue the laudable activities of emergency conservation work through the Civilian Conservation Corps.

A listing of the appropriations by the totals of the acts in which they are carried leaves the layman with little comprehension of the broad general purposes to be attained by those sums. An appropriate summary classification of all of the appropriations by their general purposes and according to fiscal years places a different understanding and light upon the aggregate.

The gross total of all appropriations for the session—being for the fiscal years 1936 and 1937 and previous years—including the revised estimate of the permanent appropriations and including estimated amounts under new indefinite appropriations, is \$10,338,938,839.69. This figure contains some estimated calculations that will be subject to future adjustment. I shall include in my statement at this point the classification of this total, broken down by fiscal years and assembled from all appropriating acts and sources, to give a general 12-point view of this aggregate. I will in this connection state that these appropriations do not include the amount of \$300,000,000 to be obtained from sales of P. W. A. securities and authorized to be used for making of grants for public-works projects. The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE A.—Classification according to major objects and purposes of expenditure and by fiscal years of appropriations made during 74th Cong., 2d sess.

Purpose	Fiscal year 1935 and prior fiscal years, judgments and audited claims	Fiscal year 1936	Fiscal year 1937	Total
Relief and work relief			\$1,425,000,000.00	\$1,425,000,000.00
Emergency conservation work (Civilian Conservation Corps)			308,000,000.00	308,000,000.00
General public works			¹ 365,410,000.00	365,410,000.00
Social-security program		² \$42,664,500.00	³ 475,253,410.00	517,917,910.00

¹ Exclusive of general public works for Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration. Includes the following: Tennessee Valley Authority, \$39,900,000; roads (Agriculture), \$68,000,000; Reclamation Service, \$54,610,000; national-park and Indian reservation roads, \$10,000,000; penal institutions, \$2,550,000; Rio Grande flood control, rectification, and diversion (State), \$3,800,000; public buildings (Treasury), \$65,550,000; river and harbor construction (War), \$120,750,000; miscellaneous, \$250,000.

² Administration, investigation, and grants to States.

³ Includes \$210,253,410 for administration, investigation, and grants to States, and \$265,000,000 for first annual premium to be paid into old-age reserve account for payment of Federal old-age benefits.

TABLE A.—Classification according to major objects and purposes of expenditure and by fiscal years of appropriations made during 74th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Purpose	Fiscal year 1935 and prior fiscal years, judgments and audited claims	Fiscal year 1936	Fiscal year 1937	Total
Veterans:				
Veterans' Administration			⁴ \$593,727,000.00	\$593,727,000.00
Adjusted compensation payments (bonus)		⁵ \$2,249,178,375.00	⁶ 409,000.00	2,249,587,375.00
Total, veterans		2,249,178,375.00	594,136,000.00	2,843,314,375.00
National defense:				
Navy		875,431.35	⁷ 528,102,532.00	528,977,963.35
Army (military activities, War Department)		4,340,000.00	⁸ 387,445,754.00	391,785,754.00
Total, national defense		5,215,431.35	915,548,286.00	920,763,717.35
Postal Service and Post Office Department		40,507,185.42	780,584,589.00	821,091,774.42
Assistance to agriculture		⁹ 304,554,552.34	¹⁰ 709,166,823.04	1,013,721,375.38
Interest on public debt			¹¹ 805,000,000.00	805,000,000.00
Public-debt retirements (from ordinary receipts)			¹¹ 580,125,000.00	580,125,000.00
Trust funds			¹¹ 152,775,393.00	152,775,393.00
All other activities and expenses of Government		¹² 19,426,286.14	¹² 563,932,632.46	583,358,918.60
Items for all agencies for 1935 and prior years—incurred expenses	\$384,412.07			384,412.07
Judgments and audited claims	2,075,963.87			2,075,963.87
Grand total	2,460,375.94	2,661,546,330.25	7,674,932,133.50	10,338,938,839.69
Less trust-fund appropriations payable from trust-fund receipts and that portion of postal appropriations capable of being met from postal revenues			¹³ 857,775,393.00	¹³ 857,775,393.00
Net appropriations chargeable against general fund	2,460,375.94	2,661,546,330.25	6,817,156,740.50	9,481,163,446.69

⁴ Includes public-works item of \$4,000,000.

⁵ Includes \$2,237,000,000 for adjusted compensation payments, \$5,500,000 for administrative expenses under Veterans' Administration and \$6,673,375 for administrative expenses under Treasury Department.

⁶ Expenses of audit of adjusted-compensation payments by General Accounting Office.

⁷ Includes public works.

⁸ Includes public works and excludes trust fund of \$799,105.

⁹ Includes \$296,882,948.54 for payment of obligations and commitments incurred prior to Jan. 6, 1936, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

¹⁰ Includes \$112,027,202 for regular activities of Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration, \$440,000,000 for carrying into effect new Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, \$109,139,621.04 for encouragement of exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products thereof, etc. (30 percent "customs duties" fund), \$48,000,000 for payments on account of reduction in interest on farm mortgages and extensions and deferrals of farm mortgages. In addition to this sum, funds are made available, under the relief appropriation, for rural rehabilitation and for loans and relief to farmers and livestock growers. Of the \$112,027,202, approximately 25 percent is of more direct benefit to the general public than to assisting agriculture but this approximate percentage amount is offset by a reappropriation of \$21,364,000 (not included in the total of appropriations) for the elimination of diseased cattle.

¹¹ Estimated.

¹² Includes all other activities of Government not classified above, comprising mainly operating expenses of the legislative branch, the Executive Office and independent establishments, Departments of Commerce, Interior, Justice, Labor, State, and Treasury, nonmilitary activities of War Department (including maintenance of rivers and harbors), and contributions to maintenance of District of Columbia government and to funds for retirement of Federal employees.

¹³ Consists of \$152,775,393 trust-fund appropriations payable from trust-fund receipts and \$705,000,000 estimated postal revenues. The remainder of above postal appropriations for 1937, \$75,584,589, is a charge against general fund of the Treasury.

It will be noted from the foregoing table A that, after deducting the trust-fund appropriations chargeable against trust-fund receipts and that part of the Postal Service estimated to be met from postal revenues, there is a resultant total for the session chargeable against the general funds of \$9,481,163,446.69. This sum segregated by fiscal years is as follows.

Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1936, and ending June 30, 1937	\$6,817,156,740.50
Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1935, and ending June 30, 1936	2,661,546,330.25
Fiscal years prior to July 1, 1935	384,412.07
Judgments and audited claims	2,075,963.87
	9,481,163,446.69

The sum of \$2,661,546,330.25 for the fiscal year which began July 1, 1935, and ends June 30, 1936, consists principally of two amounts. The sum of \$296,882,948.54 for the payment of commitments and obligations to farmers under the former Agricultural Adjustment Act and \$2,249,178,375 for administration and payments under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act constitute \$2,546,061,323.54 of the 1936 total, leaving \$115,485,006.71 for all other 1936 purposes.

The amount for the fiscal year 1937, which begins July 1, 1936, and ends June 30, 1937, is \$6,817,156,740.50. This sum

contains the new item of \$308,000,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps in carrying on emergency conservation work, heretofore financed from relief and emergency appropriations and now appearing for the first time as an annual appropriation item. There are also included for the first time on a complete fiscal year basis the necessary funds to carry into effect all phases of the new Social Security Act in the aggregate sum of \$475,253,410. The outstanding item in the 1937 total is the sum of \$1,425,000,000 for relief and work relief.

The necessity for relief appropriations is of temporary character during the emergency. It will lessen as business conditions improve and industry absorbs those whom this Government will not permit to starve when they cannot find work. Eliminating this sum of \$1,425,000,000 from the total of \$6,817,156,740.50 leaves \$5,392,156,740.50 as a sum which approximately represents the general appropriations for the fiscal year 1937, exclusive of relief.

The total of \$10,338,938,839.69 for all fiscal years at this session, stripped of the amounts for relief and work relief, the amounts chargeable to trust funds and postal revenues, the amount for the soldiers' bonus, and the amount for payment of obligations under the invalidated A. A. A., leaves a total for the session for all other purposes of \$5,509,693,123.15.

RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

The appropriation of \$1,425,000,000 made at this session for relief and work relief is not indicative of the amount that will be available for expenditure for employment purposes in the fiscal year to commence on July 1, 1936. In addition to this sum there is the item of \$308,000,000 for the employment of young men in the Civilian Conservation Corps, the sum of \$369,410,000 for general public works of the Federal Government, which will furnish employment to labor, there will also be expended in the next fiscal year approximately \$1,000,000,000 to be carried over from the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935—four billion eight hundred and eighty million act—which is obligated but not expended, and in addition there is made available the sum of \$300,000,000 for grants for public-works projects under the Public Works Administration. These sums make a total of \$3,402,410,000. To the sum of \$300,000,000 for P. W. A. grants should be added such sum as will accompany such grants as P. W. A. loans. This amount is problematic, dependent upon the ability of States and local public agencies to obtain funds at lower rates of interest than Government rates for P. W. A. loans. There is also made available to the Rural Electrification Administration for electrification in rural areas the sum of \$50,000,000 from funds of the R. F. C. to be loaned by the R. E. A. Taking all of these items into account, it is reasonable to anticipate that the total amount for employment purposes to be available in the fiscal year 1937 will be not less than \$3,600,000,000.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION WORK

The results obtained from the operations of the Civilian Conservation Corps, both as a benefit to the young men given employment and for relief to their dependents and as a distinct contribution toward the conservation of our natural resources, will win for that service a permanent place in the activities of our Government. The appropriation of \$308,000,000 for such purposes in the fiscal year 1937 will furnish funds for a total authorized enrollment in the continental United States of not to exceed 350,000, and in addition will permit enrollment of about 9,000 Indians for work on Indian reservations and care for a limited number of enrollments in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The number of camps to be in operation in forests, national parks, on soil-conservation projects, and other phases of the work, will average not to exceed 2,066 during the year. Since the inception of this activity in 1933 a total of 1,560,000 men has been given employment, and the value of their services, translated into public-conservation permanent improvements, exceeds \$600,000,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A total of appropriations for the session for this new program is \$517,917,910, of which \$42,664,500 is on account of the fiscal year just closed and \$475,253,410 is for the fiscal year 1937. This latter sum is spread among the various agencies of the Government required by law to administer the various phases of the act. Of the sum of \$475,253,410, representing a full fiscal-year program, the following are the component parts under the agencies of administration:

Social Security Board:	
Administrative expenses and investigation.....	\$18,400,000
Grants to States for old-age assistance.....	85,000,000
Grants to States for unemployment-compensation administration.....	29,000,000
Grants to States for aid to dependent children.....	35,000,000
Grants to States for aid to blind.....	8,000,000
Collection of wage-record data, old-age-benefit payments.....	12,400,000
	187,800,000
Treasury Department:	
Annual premium, old-age reserve account.....	\$265,000,000
Administrative expenses.....	31,860
Collection of taxes.....	5,801,550
Grants to States for public health assistance.....	8,000,000
Public-health research.....	1,320,000
	280,153,410

Children's Bureau, Department of Labor:

Administration and investigation.....	\$299,000
Grants to States for maternity and child-health services.....	2,820,000
Grants to States for aid to crippled children.....	2,150,000
Grants to States for child-welfare services.....	1,200,000
	\$6,469,000

Office of Education, Interior Department:

Grants to States for vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry.....	831,000
	475,253,410

ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE

The situation with respect to aid to agriculture was complicated at the outset of the session by the invalidation of the processing taxes by the Supreme Court. This decision resulted in a loss of estimated revenue from that source of approximately \$462,000,000 in the fiscal year 1936 and \$547,000,000 in the fiscal year 1937, or a total between the two years in excess of a billion dollars. It became necessary to provide new taxes to support the agricultural program and to make new appropriations for aid to agriculture to replace those which had automatically occurred under the Agricultural Adjustment Act from the funds collected under the processing taxes.

With this change in the situation, the session just closed provided a total of \$1,013,721,375.38 for assistance to agriculture through the various appropriating acts and under the permanent appropriations. This sum is divided between the fiscal year just closed and the new fiscal year. Of the total of \$304,554,552.34 for the fiscal year 1936, the sum of \$296,882,948.54 is required for making payments under obligations and commitments incurred under the Agricultural Adjustment Act prior to the Court decision on January 3, 1936. The total of \$709,166,823.04 for the fiscal year 1937 comprises some funds for the regular activities of the Department of Agriculture which are of more direct general public benefit than they are of assistance to agriculture. However, there is not included in this total an item of reappropriation of \$21,364,000 for elimination of diseased cattle which in practical effect will offset those non-agricultural activities. The items entering into the aggregate of \$709,166,823.04 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, are as follows:

Regular activities of the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of public roads.....	\$108,027,202.00
Farm Credit Administration, administrative expenses.....	4,000,000.00
New Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (to replace A. A. A.).....	440,000,000.00
Encouragement of exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products thereof (30 per "customs duties" fund).....	109,139,621.04
Reduction in interest on farm mortgages (through Federal land banks).....	24,000,000.00
Extension and deferment of principal of farm mortgages (through Federal land banks).....	24,000,000.00
	709,166,823.04

VETERANS

The amount provided for the fiscal year 1937 for regular activities of the Veterans' Administration is \$593,727,000. In addition to this sum of direct appropriation there are items of reappropriation for this Administration for the next fiscal year totaling \$42,000,000, which makes a total available sum of \$635,727,000.

The amount carried for all phases of adjusted compensation payments is \$2,249,587,375, and this sum is composed of the following parts:

Adjusted-compensation payments.....	\$1,730,000,000
Amount representing face value of bonds required to be paid to Government life-insurance fund (estimated).....	507,000,000
Administrative expenses, Treasury Department.....	6,678,375
Administrative expenses, Veterans' Administration.....	5,500,000
Auditing expenses, General Accounting Office.....	409,000
Total.....	2,249,587,375

GENERAL PUBLIC WORKS

The amounts provided under the general heading of "Public Works" are exclusive of public works carried under the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration. They include the following projects, which will furnish employment and at the same time accomplish desirable public improvement of a lasting nature:

Tennessee Valley Authority.....	\$39,900,000
Federal-aid highways and national-forest roads.....	68,000,000
Reclamation projects.....	54,610,000
National-park and Indian-reservation roads.....	10,000,000
Penal institutions.....	2,550,000
Rio Grande diversion, rectification, and flood control.....	3,800,000
Public buildings, Treasury Department.....	65,550,000
Rivers and harbors, new construction (War Department).....	120,750,000
Miscellaneous.....	250,000
Total.....	365,410,000

PUBLIC DEBT

The public debt at this date is approximately \$34,000,000,000. It should be remembered, however, that of this sum nearly \$2,000,000,000 is occasioned by the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, without which the public debt would stand at approximately \$32,000,000,000. The necessity for relief and recovery from the deplorable conditions of the depression has caused the increase in the debt. Some increase is inevitable during the coming fiscal year on account of continued need for relief and further payments on account of adjusted compensation to soldiers. There should be kept in mind in connection with this debt that there are recoverables which the Government has taken in the form of securities and investments in capital stock and otherwise which will approximate \$4,500,000,000 as a credit against the debt. The interest estimated to be payable on the public debt during the coming fiscal year is \$805,000,000. This is a large sum, but I would call attention to the fact that it is less by \$250,000,000 than our interest bill in the fiscal year 1923, when the public debt

was considerably less. When this debt is challenged as a burden upon business and the taxpayer, it is well to remember that it is less of a current burden by a quarter of a billion dollars than was the debt in the fiscal year 1923. Much of this difference in interest is due to the successful refinancing of the debt structure by the Treasury Department at lower rates of interest than those carried by the retired obligations.

THE BUDGET

The regular Budget for the fiscal year 1936 was thrown out of balance by the invalidation of the processing taxes by the Supreme Court and the enactment of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act. Had it not been for those contingencies there would have been a surplus of regular receipts over regular expenditures. For the fiscal year 1937, it is my opinion that except for such expenditures as may be necessary to conclude the payments for adjusted compensation and provide for relief, the expenditures will otherwise be within the revenues.

APPROPRIATIONS AND BUDGET ESTIMATES

I shall append as part of my remarks two other tables. Table B is a general listing of all appropriations during the session by acts, including the revised permanent appropriations and the estimated new indefinite appropriations in annual acts. Table C is a listing of all appropriations and Budget estimates by acts during the session showing in comparative form the increase or decrease in the Budget estimates considered during the session.

From table C it will be noted that the grand total of all appropriations made during the session is \$80,129,575.82 less than the grand total of all Budget estimates submitted to and considered by the Congress. This is a net decrease after allowing as credits against the Budget estimates all proper sums granted as reappropriations, indefinite appropriations, or contract authorizations, which otherwise would appear as reductions in Budget estimates or not appear as increases therein.

TABLE B.—Total appropriations, 74th Cong., 2d sess., including permanent annual and indefinite appropriations

REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS

Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation act:		
Department of Agriculture:		
Roads.....	\$68,000,000.00	
General agricultural activities.....	¹ 101,565,606.00	
Total.....	169,565,606.00	
Farm Credit Administration.....	4,000,000.00	¹ \$173,565,606.00
District of Columbia appropriation act.....		43,523,910.00
Independent offices appropriation act:		
Veterans' Administration:		
Regular activities.....	² 593,727,000.00	
Adjusted-compensation payments (soldiers' bonus).....	³ 1,730,000,000.00	
Total.....	2,323,727,000.00	
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.....	440,000,000.00	
All other independent offices, including Executive Office.....	⁴ 126,024,905.00	⁵ 2,889,751,905.00
Interior Department appropriation act.....		114,579,357.05
Legislative branch appropriation act.....		23,314,428.00
Navy Department and naval service appropriation act.....		526,546,532.00
State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation act:		
Department of State.....	17,829,550.00	
Department of Justice and Judiciary.....	41,223,925.00	
Department of Commerce.....	35,257,220.00	
Department of Labor.....	⁶ 21,784,700.00	⁶ 116,370,395.00
Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation act:		
Treasury Department.....	211,940,303.00	
Post Office Department.....	780,584,589.00	992,524,892.00

¹ In addition to this sum, there is an estimated indefinite appropriation of \$500,000 (see footnote 10) under the migratory bird conservation fund and a reappropriation of \$21,364,000 for the elimination of diseased cattle.

² In addition to this sum, there are reappropriations totaling \$42,000,000.

³ In addition to this sum, there is an estimated indefinite appropriation of \$507,000,000. (See footnote 10).

⁴ In addition to this sum there are reappropriations totaling \$7,582,861.

⁵ In addition to this sum, there are reappropriations totaling \$49,582,861 and an indefinite appropriation estimated at \$507,000,000. (See footnote 10.)

⁶ In addition to this sum, there is an indefinite appropriation estimated at \$1,675,000. (See footnote 10). This sum is exclusive of \$81,800 for Bituminous Coal Labor Board, such sum being repealed by First Deficiency Act. The total of the act includes \$275,000 for the Great Lakes Exposition under an independent commission.

TABLE B.—Total appropriations, 74th Cong., 2d sess., including permanent annual and indefinite appropriations—Continued

REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS—continued	
War Department appropriation act:	
Military activities.....	\$383, 104, 859. 00
Nonmilitary activities.....	189, 341, 985. 00
	\$572, 446, 844. 00
Total, regular annual appropriation acts.....	\$ 5, 452, 623, 869. 05
MISCELLANEOUS ACTS CONTAINING APPROPRIATIONS	
Estimated amount of appropriations carried in miscellaneous public acts and resolutions and private acts.....	3, 000, 000. 00
SUPPLEMENTAL AND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACTS	
Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936:	
Payment of obligations and commitments entered into under the Agricultural Adjustment Act prior to Jan. 6, 1936.....	\$296, 882, 948. 54
Administration and grants to States under Social Security Act, 1936.....	42, 664, 500. 00
Administrative expenses for payment of soldiers' bonus, 1936.....	12, 178, 375. 00
All other items, 1936 and prior years.....	16, 506, 639. 10
	368, 232, 462. 64
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936:	
Relief and work relief, 1937.....	1, 425, 000, 000. 00
Social Security Act, including administration, grants to States, and old-age reserve account, 1937.....	458, 633, 410. 00
Emergency conservation work (Civilian Conservation Corps), 1937.....	308, 000, 000. 00
Public buildings, under Treasury Department, 1937.....	65, 550, 000. 00
Tennessee Valley Authority, 1937.....	39, 900, 000. 00
Postal Service, 1936, account 40-hour week and increased business.....	40, 506, 250. 00
All other items, 1937 and 1936 and prior years.....	37, 827, 877. 96
	2, 375, 417, 537. 96
Total, deficiency and supplemental bills, and miscellaneous.....	2, 746, 650, 000. 60
Total, regular annual, deficiency, supplemental and miscellaneous.....	8, 199, 273, 869. 65
PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS ⁹	
Interest on the public debt.....	\$805, 000, 000. 00
Public-debt retirement funds (from ordinary receipts).....	580, 125, 000. 00
Trust funds.....	113, 382, 378. 00
Encouragement of exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products thereof, etc. (equal to 30 percent of duties from customs for calendar year 1935).....	109, 139, 621. 04
All other permanent appropriations.....	22, 842, 971. 00
	\$ 1, 630, 489, 970. 04
Total, regular, deficiency, supplemental, miscellaneous, and permanent.....	9, 829, 763, 839. 69
ESTIMATED AMOUNTS UNDER NEW INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS CARRIED IN REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ACTS	
Adjusted-compensation payments (soldiers' bonus) amount representing face value of bonds required to be paid to Government life-insurance fund.....	\$507, 000, 000. 00
U. S. Employment Service, Department of Labor.....	1, 675, 000. 00
Migratory-bird conservation fund, Department of Agriculture.....	500, 000. 00
	\$ 509, 175, 000. 00
Grand total.....	\$ 10, 338, 938, 839. 69

⁷ In addition to this sum, there are reappropriations totaling \$2,845,925.

⁸ In addition to this sum, there are indefinite appropriations (see footnote 10), totaling \$509,175,000 and reappropriations totaling \$73,792,786.

⁹ As revised by eliminating appropriations of processing taxes under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and collections under the Kerr Tobacco Act and adding the fund for encouragement of exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products thereof, etc. (an amount equal to 30 percent of 1935 customs duties).

¹⁰ Amounts estimated under indefinite appropriations in regular appropriation acts. In each of these instances indefinite appropriations were substituted for definite appropriations as requested in the Budget estimates.

¹¹ The First Deficiency Appropriation Act makes available the sum of \$300,000,000 from the sale of securities now on hand or to be received by the Public Works Administration and the use of the receipts from such sales for making grants for public-works projects.

TABLE C.—Comparison of appropriations with Budget estimates, 74th Cong., 2d sess.

	Appropriations 74th Cong., 2d sess.	Budget estimates 74th Cong., 2d sess.	Budget estimates replaced or affected by indefinite appropriations or reappropriations or contract authorizations	Budget estimates compared with appropriations (Increase (+) or decrease (-))
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS				
Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation act.....	\$173, 565, 606. 00	\$194, 389, 004. 00	\$21, 864, 000	+\$1, 040, 602. 00
District of Columbia appropriation act.....	43, 523, 910. 00	41, 765, 000. 00		+1, 758, 910. 00

¹ Comprised of \$21,364,000 of reappropriation for elimination of diseased cattle which is not included in the total of appropriations and \$500,000 indefinite appropriation for migratory bird conservation fund which is included in total of appropriations. (See footnote 12.)

TABLE C.—Comparison of appropriations with Budget estimates, 74th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

	Appropriations 74th Cong., 2d sess.	Budget estimates 74th Cong., 2d sess.	Budget estimates replaced or affected by indefinite appro- priations or reap- propriations or con- tract authorizations	Budget estimates compared with appro- priations (increase (+) or decrease (-))
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS—continued				
Independent offices appropriation act:				
Veterans' Administration:				
Regular activities.....	\$593,727,000.00	² \$633,727,000.00	³ \$42,000,000	+\$2,000,000.00
Adjusted-compensation payments.....	1,730,000,000.00	2,237,000,000.00	⁴ 507,000,000	-----
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.....	440,000,000.00	440,000,000.00	-----	-----
All other independent offices.....	126,024,905.00	133,618,766.00	⁵ 7,582,861	-11,000.00
Total.....	2,889,751,905.00	² 3,444,345,766.00	556,582,861	+1,989,000.00
Interior Department appropriation act.....	114,579,357.05	130,433,341.75	-----	-15,853,984.70
Legislative branch appropriation act.....	23,314,428.00	24,179,771.00	-----	-865,343.00
Naval appropriation act.....	526,546,532.00	549,591,299.00	⁶ 1,000,000	-22,044,767.00
State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor appropri- ation act:				
Department of State.....	17,829,550.00	18,128,652.00	-----	-299,102.00
Department of Justice.....	41,223,925.00	43,795,250.00	-----	-2,571,325.00
Department of Commerce.....	35,257,220.00	35,354,175.00	-----	-96,955.00
Department of Labor.....	⁷ 21,784,700.00	25,463,500.00	⁸ 1,675,000	-2,003,800.00
Total.....	⁷ 116,370,395.00	122,741,577.00	1,675,000	-4,696,182.00
Treasury and Post Office appropriation act:				
Treasury Department.....	211,940,303.00	217,658,300.00	-----	-5,717,997.00
Post Office Department.....	780,584,589.00	783,909,149.00	-----	-3,324,560.00
Total.....	992,524,892.00	1,001,567,449.00	-----	-9,042,557.00
War Department appropriation act:				
Military activities.....	383,104,859.00	375,025,510.00	⁹ 5,515,711	+13,595,060.00
Nonmilitary activities.....	189,341,985.00	197,673,795.00	-----	-8,331,810.00
Total.....	572,446,844.00	572,699,305.00	5,515,711	+5,263,250.00
Total, regular annual acts.....	5,452,623,869.05	² 6,081,712,512.75	¹⁰ 586,637,572	-42,451,071.70
MISCELLANEOUS ACTS CARRYING APPROPRIATIONS				
Estimated amount of appropriations carried in miscellaneous acts.....	3,000,000.00	1,264,000.00	-----	+1,736,000.00
DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACTS				
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1936.....	368,232,462.64	373,351,107.60	-----	-5,118,644.96
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1936.....	2,375,417,537.96	2,412,713,397.12	¹¹ 3,000,000	-34,295,859.16
Total, deficiency and supplemental.....	2,743,650,000.60	2,786,064,504.72	¹¹ 3,000,000	-39,414,504.12
PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS				
As submitted in the 1937 Budget and revised.....	1,630,489,970.04	1,630,489,970.04	-----	-----
NEW INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS IN REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS				
Soldiers' bonus, migratory-bird conservation fund, and U. S. Employment Service.....	509,175,000.00	(¹²)	(¹²)	(¹²)
Grand total.....	10,338,938,839.69	² 10,499,530,987.51	¹³ 80,462,572	-80,129,575.82

¹ Exclusive of \$160,000,000 for the adjusted-compensation fund in regular annual estimates which was withdrawn after enactment of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act (soldiers' bonus).

² Comprises reappropriations, \$40,000,000 of which is in lieu of direct Budget estimates of that amount, not included in total appropriations.

³ Indefinite appropriation included in total of appropriations. (See footnote 12.)

⁴ Comprises reappropriations included in lieu of direct Budget estimates of that amount, not included in total of appropriations.

⁵ Contract authorization substituted for direct Budget estimate of like amount, not included in total of appropriations.

⁶ Exclusive of \$81,800 for Bituminous Coal Labor Board repealed by First Deficiency Act. The grand total of the act includes \$275,000 for Great Lakes Exposition Commission, not estimated for.

⁷ Indefinite appropriation included in total of appropriations. (See footnote 12.)

⁸ Comprises contract authorizations of \$2,669,786 and reappropriations totaling \$2,845,925, not included in total of appropriations.

⁹ Of this amount, \$509,175,000 is included in grand total of appropriations, and \$80,462,572 comprises reappropriations and contract authorizations not included in total of appropriations.

¹⁰ Contract authorization of \$3,000,000 in lieu of Budget estimate of that amount, not included in total of appropriations.

¹¹ Budget estimates for this sum included above as follows: \$507,000,000 in the item of \$2,237,000,000 under Veterans' Administration, \$1,675,000 under regular Budget estimates for Department of Labor, and \$500,000 under regular Budget estimates for Department of Agriculture.

¹² Represents contract authorizations of \$6,669,786 and reappropriations of \$73,792,786 not included in total of appropriations, but credited against reduction in Budget estimates.

THE PEACE AMENDMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this is a report to the people of America on the progress of the peace amendment.

I deem it my duty to make this report to the thousands upon thousands of Americans who regard the peace amendment, introduced by me and known as House Joint Resolution No. 167, as the very best proposal that has been offered to keep our boys out of the slaughter pens of foreign wars.

The felicitous name "peace amendment" was given to my resolution by the magazine *Good Housekeeping*, because the editor of that magazine believes it would insure peace to America for ages to come.

There are, of course, peace proposals and peace proposals, some worthless, some with limited merit, and others highly meritorious.

After an exhaustive evaluation of all proposals, the magazine *Good Housekeeping* selected the resolution I have introduced as the most practical and meritorious of all and named it the "peace amendment." All signs indicate that the name will stick.

TEXT OF PEACE AMENDMENT

I think it is proper at this point to set forth the full text of the peace amendment. It proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States by adding a new article, as follows:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its Territorial possessions and attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum. Congress may by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

SEC. 2. Whenever war is declared the President shall immediately conscript and take over for use by the Government all the public and private war properties, yards, factories, and supplies, fixing the compensation for private properties temporarily employed for the war period at a rate not in excess of 4 per centum, based on tax values assessed in the year preceding the war.

A close scrutiny of this proposed constitutional amendment reveals its twofold purpose as follows:

1. Under its operation, unless the United States should be invaded or attacked, a declaration of war could not be made until the question has been submitted to all of the people of the country, women as well as men, and approved by a majority in a Nation-wide referendum. It is based on the philosophy that those who have to suffer and if need be, to die and to bear the crushing burdens of war shall have something to say as to whether war shall be declared.

2. The second objective of the amendment is to take the profit out of war. Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars.

WOULD KEEP OUR BOYS OUT OF FOREIGN WARS

Under this amendment, with all of the people allowed a vote on sending our boys to fight in foreign wars and with all prospects of war profits eliminated in advance, America would be on a firm and solid peace foundation. Our fine young men would be kept out of other peoples' wars. With profits gone glimmering, selfish interests would have no incentive to drag America into war. I firmly believe that with this amendment written into the Constitution, America would never enter another war except righteous wars of self-defense, if such should ever occur. At least 90 percent of the probability of our ever again becoming involved in any kind of a war would be removed.

We could then look forward to a long era of peace, when we of America may devote ourselves to a thorough job of attending to our own business; cultivating friendly relations with all of the nations of the world and interfering with none; showing once more some regard for the spiritual values; ordering our future course along lines of usefulness rather than destruction, and rehabilitating our happiness and prosperity while we strive to forget the sorrows and bind up the wounds of the last war.

The peace amendment was introduced on February 14, 1935. On June 19, 1935, elaborate hearings took place before

the House Judiciary subcommittee no. 2. And I wish every friend of peace in America could read those hearings, which are most impressive, I think, showing the character and extent of the support back of the peace amendment.

After the resolution had been held in the committee more than a year, with no signs of committee action, I availed myself of my parliamentary rights and privileges and filed a discharge petition to bring the resolution out of the committee's control and before the House for debate and action. A discharge petition does not become effective unless, or until, it is signed by 218 Members of the House, a majority of the total membership. When the gavels pounded adjournment sine die on June 20, 72 Members of the House had signed the discharge petition to bring the peace amendment before the House.

These 72 Members, while far below the required number to make the petition effective, comprise a nucleus of a magnificent fighting force to carry on for the amendment in the next, or Seventy-fifth, Congress.

What are the forces that are lined up for the peace amendment? Its supporters are numbered not by the thousands or the hundreds of thousands, but by millions.

This proposal to give the people a chance to vote on a declaration of war and to take the profit out of war has penetrated deep into the consciousness of America, and down in the lower walks of life it finds a response of tremendous warmth and fervor, indicating a determination among the poor people of this country—the class that has never had a look-in when the war lords were setting the stage for war—that hereafter their sons shall not be used without their consent as cannon fodder in foreign wars.

FOUR EX-GOVERNORS SUPPORT PEACE AMENDMENT

It is to my mind most interesting and significant that among the 72 signers of my discharge petition 4 are Members who have been Governors of sovereign States. The Governor of a State comes into contact with all elements in his State; he knows what the people are talking about and thinking about; he is singularly equipped to interpret the spirit of the masses.

The four representatives who have held the highest executive positions in their States, who signed my petition and who are with me in this fight for humanity, are ex-Gov. Ralph O. Brewster of Maine, ex-Gov. Theodore Christianson of Minnesota, ex-Gov. Walter Pierce of Oregon, and ex-Gov. James G. Scrugham of Nevada.

SOME CHAMPIONS OF THE AMENDMENT

Among the many prominent individuals and groups supporting the peace amendment are the following:

1. Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, ex-Secretary of State and co-author of the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact.
2. Archbishops Michael J. Curley, Arthur J. Drossaerts, and John T. McNicholas and numerous bishops and priests of the Catholic Church.
3. The Church of the Disciples of Christ of America, hundreds of outstanding Protestant clergymen, and church conferences and organizations too numerous to mention.
4. Rabbis Stephen S. Wise, Edward L. Israel, Max C. Currick, Morris M. Feuerlicht, and Israel Goldstein and many other leaders of the Jewish people.
5. Maj. Gen. Smedley D. Butler, who knows from experience the meaning of war and on whom has been conferred for valorous service almost every known medal, including the Congressional Medal of Honor.
6. The American War Mothers by resolutions unanimously adopted at their annual convention in Washington, D. C., in 1935.
7. Gen. James E. Van Zandt, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who says:

The legislation that you have introduced coincides in many ways with our thoughts to keep this country out of war, and as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it is a pleasure to not only thank you for your interest in this matter but to congratulate you on the initiative you have taken in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

8. The 21 brotherhoods of railroad men, comprising the largest group of organized labor in the world.

9. Fifty-six presidents of universities and colleges, including many of the country's most distinguished educators.

10. The magazine *Good Housekeeping*; *Labor*, the organ of the railroad brotherhoods; and many newspapers and periodicals in various States and cities.

11. The Federation of Womens' Clubs of the District of Columbia, the Womans' Christian Temperance Union, of Indiana, and various other States, and a great number of womens' organizations in all sections.

LEAST CONSPICUOUS OF GOD'S CREATURES

And beyond these whom I have here described are many other people, among the least conspicuous of God's creatures, people with hearts and feelings but devoid of education, who say in their letters, "This is the first time I have ever written to a Congressman, but I just had to let you know that I endorse all you are trying to do." There are times when the tongue cannot speak, and the pen cannot write, the language of the heart and many of these correspondents write falteringly, violating all rules of punctuation and spelling, but saying enough to make themselves articulate in their earnest, almost pathetic desire that there shall be no more wars and that the common people, who have to do the fighting and the suffering and the dying shall at least have something to say as to whether America shall enter future conflicts. The peace amendment already has established itself in the hearts of our countrymen as a great and righteous principle that should be recognized and vitalized in the form of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, believing that the peace amendment I have proposed would keep our fine American boys out of the shambles in foreign countries and that it would protect our people from the pain and sorrow, the grief, the moral degradation, and the insufferable financial burdens that are inseparable from war; that it would promote the spiritual power and strength of America as a Nation consecrated to ideals of neighborliness and kindness and that it would help to establish the kingdom of righteousness on earth, it is my purpose—provided I am reelected—to reintroduce the peace amendment on the opening day of the next Congress and to ask all of the friends of peace, everywhere, to rally with the enthusiasm of crusaders to its support.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS SAVED GOVERNMENT HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I feel it is incumbent upon me to give a brief account to the House of the activities of this important committee.

Some 9 years ago the House abolished about 12 small committees on expenditures and adopted a resolution providing for one Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments composed of 21 members.

While a large number of bills are referred to the committee, the chief duty of the committee is to see that the moneys appropriated by the Congress of the United States to be spent by the executive departments is disbursed as the Congress intended and not as the officials of the executive departments might desire. We have no quarrel with any officials of the executive departments, but we do feel if the laws that Congress pass are not sufficient to carry out the purpose of a legislative act to the satisfaction of the administrative officer, then it is his duty to come to the Congress and ask for amendments and not take it upon himself to override the intent of the Congress.

I doubt if any committee of Congress receives as many complaints or as much information relative to the conduct of various Government officials and Government agencies as does our committee. I regret to say a large number of the communications that bring the complaints are anonymous, and naturally the committee does not give as much attention to such communications as it does to those where the writer signs his name and address where he might be located.

As chairman of the committee, acting for the committee, I investigate all complaints that come to the committee, and

where I feel I am justified, I take action immediately, not only during the period Congress is in session but while Congress is on vacation.

The committee has taken the position that the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office were established by the Congress for the purpose of seeing that the Government agencies carry out the will of Congress.

It cannot be disputed that the Comptroller General of the United States is a representative of the Congress and not a representative of the executive branch of the Government.

The present Comptroller General, Hon. J. R. McCarl, who is just completing his 15-year term, and who cannot be reappointed under existing law, has been most helpful to the committee, cooperating in every way. His desire at all times to assist the committee when called on is most commendable. Many Government officials will rejoice over the fact that Mr. McCarl's term has expired. If they would stop, however, for a moment to realize he was only carrying out the duties imposed upon him, probably they would not be so critical in speaking of the manner in which he has conducted himself during the long period he has been in office. Mr. McCarl carried out the duties of his office without fear or favor.

The appointment of his successor is in my opinion the most important appointment President Roosevelt will have to make during his tenure of office.

It can be shown without question that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the present Congress has saved the Government of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not my purpose to review all the work that the committee has done, but I am going to call attention to two outstanding accomplishments.

Just before the convening of the present Congress, information reached me regarding Indian claims pending before the Court of Claims. These suits had resulted from Congress passing 114 resolutions setting aside the statute of limitations and permitting Indians or their representatives to sue the Government on claims growing out of treaties, acts of Congress, and Executive orders. There was no limitation, and some of these claims grow out of treaties that were ratified as far back as 1779. After making a thorough investigation of the situation I called a meeting of the committee and had the Assistant Attorney General, Hon. Harry W. Blair, who represents the Government in the Court of Claims in these suits, as well as two assistants and representatives from the Comptroller General present. The Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Blair, stated before the committee that while all the petitions in those suits had not been filed up to that date, the suits filed amounted in claims to over three and one-quarter billion dollars. In some of the resolutions the Government was permitted to offset the claim by showing gratuities and advances that had been made to the various tribes, but in the great majority of the cases this right was not extended to the Government. The Government apparently was helpless.

Our committee was told frankly if Congress did not act it would be impossible to estimate the amount that the Court of Claims would be required to allow the Indians as a result of these suits. The committee came to the conclusion that the only way the Treasury and the taxpayers could be protected was to have a law passed that would be retroactive and would extend to the Government the right to charge off gratuities and advances made to the tribes in all suits pending and in future suits unless the Congress specifically provided that such offsets should not be allowed. Acting under directions of the committee, I placed the matter before the Committee on Appropriations, and Chairman JAMES P. BUCHANAN, of Texas, of that committee, as well as many of his colleagues, both on the Democratic and Republican side, were not only amazed but alarmed over the situation. The suggestion of our committee was when the next deficiency bill was considered the Committee on Appropriations call the judges of the Court of Claims, the Attorney General, and the Comptroller General before them, who would confirm our

statement, and then add an amendment to the deficiency bill giving the Government the right to set off the claims of the Indians by showing gratuities and advances that had been made to the tribes. The Appropriations Committee followed this procedure, and as a result we now have the law on the statute books, and while, no doubt, the Indians will recover some money from the Government, the amount will be very small in comparison with the amount of the claims.

Since that amendment was adopted several of the cases have been tried and the court allowed gratuities and advances as a set-off and rendered judgments in favor of the Government. This has resulted in individual resolutions and bills being introduced amending the original Jurisdictional Act which would deny the Government the right to charge off the gratuities and advances. Many of those resolutions and bills passed the Senate without debate and were favorably reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House. I called this to the attention of the members of our committee and was directed to oppose the passage of these bills when they were called up in the House. Acting under the instructions of the committee, I have stopped the passage of the bills, with the assistance of many members of my committee, as well as the assistance of many members of the Appropriations Committee, notably, Hon. JAMES P. BUCHANAN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; Hon. JOHN TABER, of New York; and Hon. ROBERT L. BACON, also of New York. We were likewise assisted by Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan; Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio; and Hon. JOHN M. COSTELLO, of California.

As an example, here is what happened in the last 2 days of the Congress:

The California Indian claims bill was passed, but before it was passed I insisted upon two amendments. One sentence which struck out only four lines in the bill which appeared to be perfectly harmless would have cost the Government, according to the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States, \$15,000,000. This was stricken out, together with an entire section which would also have cost the Government many millions of dollars, if the bill were allowed to pass in the form it passed the Senate.

A second bill called up Saturday was defeated by my objections, and that bill would have extended to the Cherokee Indians certain privileges that would have cost the Government untold millions of dollars if it had been allowed to pass.

In both cases the Court of Claims has already acted upon the matter, as well as has the Supreme Court, and they have ruled against the Indians; but if the jurisdictional acts were changed as the bills provided, a new suit would have been instituted and there would have been nothing that the judges could have done but render an opinion in favor of the Indians and against the Government.

Our committee's contention is when these suits have once been tried and acted upon by the Court of Claims and the Supreme Court they should not be allowed to be returned to the courts.

I also want to emphasize the fact that our committee has taken into consideration the report of the Director of the Budget, who is the President's representative; and when he has opposed the bills, stating their passage would be in conflict with the President's financial program, we take it for granted he is speaking for the President in opposing the passage of resolutions and bills.

Special attention has been given by our committee to the Private and Consent Calendars.

Throughout the last session, a day or two before omnibus claim bills were passed, I briefed for the membership of the House the important measures to be voted upon. Many bills listed as unfair to the taxpayers were defeated and every bill the President vetoed, claims bills, had been opposed by me.

Take the so-called Russian shoe claim for \$960,000 as an example. When the Congress sent that bill to the White House over my objection I sent a long letter to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget, calling their attention to the bill and proved beyond question by the

reports of the State Department and the Comptroller General there was no moral or legal obligation to require the taxpayers to reimburse the claimant. Further, I was the one who advanced the argument that the same principle was involved as was involved in the suits against the Government growing out of the revaluation of the gold dollar.

I called at the Treasury and insisted an opinion be secured from the Attorney General. This was done and was included in the report when it was submitted to the President. The President vetoed the bill for that very reason and when the House sustained that veto only four members voted to override the veto. There is no reason why the Committee on Expenditures should be required to do this work, but someone must do it, and our committee felt it was a proper function for us to perform.

Every member of the committee of which I am chairman is entitled to just as much credit as I am in saving the Government hundreds of millions of dollars by stopping the passage of these bills, and they are likewise entitled to credit for the passage of the law which gave the Government the power to charge off gratuities and advances made to the Indians.

On scores of occasions, acting for the committee, I have called attention of executive officials of the various departments as well as to the President of the United States, to various cases where our committee felt the intent of Congress was not being lived up to in connection with the administration of various laws, especially appropriation laws. The committee's letters have resulted in action immediately and in almost every case proved beneficial to the Treasury and the taxpayers.

I am not going to take up any more time enumerating the work of the committee but in conclusion I want to take this opportunity to thank every member of the committee, Democrat and Republican, for their kindness to me as well as the whole-hearted cooperation which they have always given me, and I repeat that they are entitled to just as much credit as I have been given for protecting the Treasury and taxpayers of the country.

The membership of the Committee on Expenditures is as follows:

John J. Cochran, Missouri, chairman.
Allard H. Gasque, South Carolina.
Riley J. Wilson, Louisiana.
Will M. Whittington, Mississippi.
Glenn Griswold, Indiana.
Randolph Carpenter, Kansas.
Ben Cravens, Arkansas.
James L. Quinn, Pennsylvania.
John M. Houston, Kansas.
Simon M. Hamlin, Maine.
James A. O'Leary, New York.
Aubert C. Dunn, Mississippi.
Raymond S. McKeough, Illinois.
Don Gingery, Pennsylvania.
Merlin Hull (Progressive), Wisconsin.
Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts.
Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania.
John B. Hollister, Ohio.
Philip A. Goodwin, New York.
Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan.
B. W. Gearhart, California.
Frank M. Karsten, clerk.

LIBERALIZING THE DISCHARGE RULE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a movement of much more formidable character than it is generally believed to be is now under way looking toward a liberalization of the so-called discharge rule.

By "discharge rule" I refer to the parliamentary device under which a bill that is being smothered in committee may be retrieved from the committee pigeonhole and brought to the House for debate and a vote on its merits.

Under the discharge rule now in operation a discharge petition does not become effective unless, or until, it is

signed by 218 Members, or a majority of the Members of the House. Formerly the number of signers required was only 145, and it was much easier then to bring a bill out of an unfriendly committee and before the House for its judgment than it is under the terms of the existing rule.

During the last few days, just prior to the adjournment of Congress a liberal group has been organized in the House whose principal policy is to make it possible in the future for 145 Members to bring a bill or resolution out of Committee for the action of the House. The chairman of this group is Representative GERALD J. BOILEAU, the brilliant, able, aggressive, young Progressive from Wisconsin. The secretary of the group is Representative CHARLES G. BINDERUP, of Nebraska, a Democrat and a fine type of public servant. The organization began its existence with 68 Members, but the indications are that its membership will substantially increase about the time Congress reconvenes, when the fight will be on in earnest for amendment of the discharge rule.

Impartial students of legislative procedure are impressed by the arguments in favor of liberalizing the discharge rule. The necessity of doing this if popular government is to be exemplified in our lawmaking body is stressed and emphasized by reason of the fact that without the discharge rule there is now no provision whereby a bill or resolution shall be automatically reported to the House after it has lain in committee a certain length of time.

Many of our House committees are graveyards where worthy measures sleep the sleep of death simply because there is now no adequate machinery to bring these bills and resolutions out of committees for the judgment of the House. I, myself, have felt the injustice of the existing system. On February 14, 1935, I introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a referendum vote on a declaration of war and to take the profit out of war.

Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars. The referendum part of my proposed constitutional amendment would give all of our people—women as well as men—a right to decide by their votes whether our boys shall be hurled into the hell pits of foreign wars. It is based on the philosophy that those who have to suffer and, if need be, to die, and to bear the crushing burdens and costs of war, shall have something to say as to whether war shall be declared.

I sincerely believe that my proposed constitutional amendment, if adopted, would keep America out of foreign wars, which it has no business to enter, and that it would keep America out of all wars except righteous wars of self-defense.

Millions of people all over America approved my peace amendment, believing it to be by all odds the best proposal that has been advanced to keep America at peace with the world and to protect our boys from being used as cannon fodder in foreign conflicts, and yet, although it had back of it the heart interest of millions of human beings, I did not succeed in getting it out of the committee. When Congress adjourns today it will have been in the committee 16 months and 6 days. Does not the history of that resolution vividly illustrate the necessity of some provision to bring bills out of committees that are determined to smother them?

If there had been some provision whereby a resolution must be reported adversely, if not favorably, after a certain length of time an opportunity would be afforded for the House to pass its judgment on my resolution, but there is no such provision. A committee is supposed to be but an instrumentality of the House, yet the existing system makes every committee a graveyard, where a small group may bury every bill and resolution that does not receive its approval.

Who is there in all America that will say that the righteous war referendum and anti-war-profits resolution I introduced was not entitled to receive the judgment of the House, whether that judgment be favorable or otherwise? I filed a discharge petition but Members became indifferent when they viewed the hopelessness of securing as many as 218 signatures and many frankly said to me:

If I thought there were any prospect of getting 218 signatures I would help you, but there is no such prospect.

Just one more instance showing how the existing discharge rule operates to kill worthy legislation. On February 5 last, Representative COCHRAN, of Missouri, introduced a bill to repeal the act creating the Federal Register.

That publication is absolutely worthless, but it costs the taxpayers \$263,000 a year, or more than \$1,000 every time it is issued. It is responsible for the creation of a bureau which increases our already top-heavy bureaucratic personnel and adds \$38,000 a year to the Federal salary roll—and just that much additional distress to the taxpayers. Copies of the Federal Register are sent free to Members of Congress and other officials, and usually are dumped into wastebaskets without being removed from the wrappers.

The congressional committee to which Mr. COCHRAN'S repealing bill was referred had 5 months and 15 days to act on this meritorious measure before Congress adjourned, and when the session ends today it will take its place in the congressional graveyard. Meanwhile the taxpayers, groaning under their enormous burdens, are being soaked to the tune of \$263,000 a year to pay for a worthless publication.

I am not one of those who believe in a discharge rule so wide open that small groups and blocs may continually harass the House leadership and unnecessarily consume the precious time of the House by dragging out of committee all sorts of freak measures and panaceas to be voted on, and possibly a rule giving that power to 145 Members is too lax.

Perhaps 165 Members would be nearer to the correct number. But one thing that is certain is that as long as committees can constitute themselves as censors to kill bills and resolutions that are sound in principle and supported by a great body of public opinion, just that long there will be an insistent demand that the discharge rule shall be liberalized.

I predict that when Congress reconvenes Mr. BOILEAU and his associates will make things exceedingly interesting for the Tories and Bourbons who believe that every committee should maintain a spacious graveyard and that all bills that are disapproved by the ruling powers should be killed in committee without benefit of clergy.

REGULATION OF MANUFACTURE, SALE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for over a year there has been considerable agitation among the so-called professional drys of the United States for the return of prohibition, and, as one who advocated the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, I want to refer briefly to the situation that confronted us during the period of prohibition, as well as the situation that faces the country today.

While we have disposed of prohibition for the time being, I feel that anyone who has given serious thought to existing conditions cannot but agree with me when I say that it would be better for the Nation as a whole if we had stricter regulation of the liquor traffic.

It is my candid opinion, and I express it frankly, that unless there is stricter regulation we are going to see another battle waged in this country to reenact the eighteenth amendment.

We did progress, so far as this National Congress is concerned, during the session which has just closed, because we enacted legislation that will better protect the dry States of the Union. It is the duty of the Federal Government to see that the States that do not want liquor sold within their borders are fully protected. However, insofar as the traffic of alcoholic liquor in the States where it is permitted to be sold is concerned, the duty rests with the State and local officials to regulate and enforce the laws relative to the sale of intoxicants. The Federal Government has no control over the distribution of liquor in the so-called wet States. Its only power is the taxing power. That rests with the city and State officials, as well as the various State legislatures.

It seems to me it would be well for the various States to thoroughly investigate the enforcement of the liquor laws in all the States of the country with a view to enacting legislation that would be uniform after it had been disclosed what was the best method of sale and distribution.

Billions of dollars in taxes have accrued to the cities, States, and Federal Government since the repeal of the

eighteenth amendment. The loss in revenue to the Federal Government alone during the prohibition period was approximately \$8,200,000,000. The records of investigating committees showed that over a period of years the dry spent \$150,000,000 to bring about the enactment of the eighteenth amendment.

I am going to quote some official statistics to show just exactly what happened:

The complete statistical record of national prohibition enforcement, compiled from reports of the United States Treasury and the Department of Justice, covering nearly 14 years, shows:

Illicit stills and distilleries and liquor-making equipment seized.....	1,988,802
Number of persons arrested for violation of Federal prohibition laws.....	831,204
Number of persons permanently branded as criminals by conviction.....	761,320
Number of days of prison sentences imposed.....	65,673,520
Number of automobiles seized.....	86,573
Number of boats seized.....	1,615
Value of all property seized.....	\$18,114,110.16
Gallons of distilled spirits seized.....	15,576,439.03
Gallons of malt liquor (beer) seized.....	70,261,665.35
Gallons of wine, cider, and pomace seized.....	50,103,896.72

In 1930 the United States Department of Justice officially estimated the quantity of unlawful liquor made in that year was:

Distilled spirits.....gallons..	73,386,718
Malt liquor (beer).....do.....	684,476,800
Wine.....do.....	118,476,000

Thus, we see that in more than 13 years the Federal Government, at a direct cost of about \$700,000,000 in appropriations for all enforcement activities, and a loss of \$7,500,000,000 on the basis of present alcoholic beverage revenues, actually captured the equivalent—

Of one-fifth of the illicit distilled liquors made in the one prohibition year of 1930.

A little more than one-tenth of the illegal beer made in 1930.

And much less than one-half of the illegal wine—to say nothing of cider—made in 1930.

One Federal prohibition administrator had the honesty to admit to a Senate committee that prohibition agents captured not more than 1 illicit still in 10 in actual operation.

On the basis of his estimates then there must have been 20,000,000 illicit distilleries and other liquor-making equipment in operation during the prohibition era.

Result:

An increase in arrests for drunkenness in 502 cities and towns from 276,691 in 1920—the first prohibition year—to 705,544 in 1928, 711,526 in 1929, and 683,442 in 1930.

The crime, corruption, hypocrisy, and general demoralization wrought by prohibition cannot be reduced to statistics, because the enormous extent of it will never be known.

To achieve and perpetuate the constitutional amendment which produced these direful and amazing results, the professional prohibition organizations spent \$150,000,000, and entailed upon the Government a combined direct and indirect expense of \$8,200,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want this situation to return, but the beer and liquor industry should see the wisdom of enacting in the various wet States of the Union model laws for the sale and distribution of intoxicants. The sale and distribution of intoxicants should be taken out of politics; the youth of America should be protected as well as those who engage in overindulgence.

The fight to repeal the eighteenth amendment was based upon the desire for temperance and that can only be achieved by properly regulating the manufacture, sale, and distribution of intoxicating liquors. I cannot see how anyone can deny but that there is a great deal yet to be done before this objective is achieved.

BLOCK BOOKING AND BLIND SELLING—A REPORT

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest in the Pettengill-Neely block-booking and blind-selling bill and for the information of the many thousands of

our citizens who have sponsored it, I wish to make a brief report on its legislative history in this Seventy-fourth Congress.

The Pettengill bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that committee ordered public hearings to be held by a subcommittee beginning March 9. The subcommittee was composed of myself as chairman, Mr. SADOWSKI, of Michigan; Mr. PEYSER, of New York; Mr. TERRY, of Arkansas; Mr. COOPER, of Ohio; and Mr. HOLMES, of Massachusetts.

The hearings continued up to March 26. Everybody was given full opportunity to be heard for and against, and a volume of 526 pages of testimony was the result.

Thereafter the subcommittee went into executive sessions on the bill and reported it favorably to the full committee, with the exception that the paragraph on blind selling was not recommended.

A majority of the subcommittee felt that with block booking prohibited, so that exhibitors would not be compelled to buy films in a block before they were produced, the paragraph on blind selling could be omitted on the theory that exhibitors would then have an opportunity, in many instances, to see a preview of films before becoming bound to produce them.

I did not favor the elimination of the blind-selling feature. I am simply reporting what the majority did.

This brought the bill before the full committee. I made an earnest effort to have them report it favorably. The opposition toward its consideration at this Congress was, however, too great.

A somewhat similar report can be made about the Neely bill in the Senate, which was identical with the Pettengill bill in the House. There also a subcommittee was named which considered hearings. The subcommittee reported it favorably to the full committee, and I am informed the full committee reported it favorably to the Senate. This gave us ground to hope the Senate would pass the bill and get it over to the House, but, in the rush of closing, it, with many other important bills—for example, the pure food and drugs bill—failed of enactment.

I wish a better report could be made. However, the resistance to the bill was formidable. It might be said also that important legislation seldom is enacted the first session it is introduced.

If I am returned to Congress, the bill will be reintroduced. The battle will go on. The matter of better movies and community freedom of choice is too important to be lost in the first engagement.

"We will fight it out on this line if it takes all summer."

Disappointing as is the situation to myself and the splendid men and women who gave their time, their effort, and their means to this struggle, we can, nevertheless, take comfort in two things: First, we did our duty by our country and our children as we saw it; and, second, the mere introduction of the bill and the battle that was made for it has unquestionably had a good effect on the motion-picture industry. That is apparent from common observation; and, second, it is testified to in private conversation by men prominent in the industry—even among those who fought the bill's passage. The proprieties forbid me to state names, but this is the fact.

The motion-picture industry is not unlike many others. There are men in it who may not wish any supervision or regulation by Government yet are fully aware of the men and practices which have given it a bad name and themselves wish to see improvement in the conditions under which films are produced and marketed.

The struggle for the enactment of the Pettengill-Neely bill has strengthened the hands of those in the industry as well as those outside it who recognize that it cannot defy public opinion and succeed.

"Say not the struggle naught availeth." It has already accomplished much good. The history of the movies, however, is that promises of self-regulation are a frail reed to rely upon.

I am happy to give credit to the fine support which the bill received. Among the 46 witnesses who personally appeared

before our subcommittee were Congressmen Connery, of Massachusetts; Culkin, of New York, and White, of Idaho; Mr. Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange; Stephen J. Cabot, Henry R. Atkinson, and Miss Katherine Lyford, of Boston, representing the Motion Picture Research Council; Miss Agnes G. Regan, executive secretary of the National Council of Catholic Women; Miss Jeannette Willensky, of Philadelphia, and P. J. Wood, of Columbus, representing independent groups of exhibitors; Mrs. Mary T. Bannerman and William H. Bristow, of Washington, representing the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Miss Helen Atwater, of the American Home Economics Association; Miss Mary Winslow, of the National Women's Trade Union League; Canon W. C. Chase, of the International Reform Federation; Abram F. Myers, of Washington; H. A. Cole, of Texas; Sidney Samuelson, of New Jersey; and H. M. Richey, of Detroit, representing Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors, and many more. Mr. E. L. Kuykendall, president of the Motion Picture Theatre Owners of America, of Mississippi, did not defend block booking or the evils which have grown up under it, but felt that the remedy was a more liberal cancellation clause. In fact, while the bill was under consideration many conferences took place within the industry looking toward ways and means to meet the evils which the bill seeks to cure.

In addition, many thousands of letters and telegrams reached the members of the committee from all parts of the United States favoring the bill. Among the national organizations backing the bill are the following:

- American Association of University Women.
- American Federation of Teachers.
- American Home Economics Association.
- American Baptist Publication Society.
- Board of Temperance and Social Welfare, Disciples of Christ.
- Catholic Boys Brigade of the United States, Inc.
- Catholic Central Verein of America.
- Catholic Daughters of America.
- Catholic Order of Foresters.
- Committee on Moral and Social Welfare, Lutheran Church in America.
- Council of Women for Home Missions.
- United States Daughters of 1812.
- Editorial Council of the Religious Press.
- Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.
- Girls' Friendly Society of the United States of America.
- Knights of Columbus.
- Motion Picture Research Council.
- National Board of Young Women's Christian Associations.
- National Committee on Education by Radio.
- National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
- National Council of Catholic Women.
- National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches.
- National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations.
- National Education Association.
- National Grange.
- National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
- National Women's Trade Union League of America.
- The National Sentinels.

It is impossible to call the long roll of those fine citizens who have stood beside Senator NEELY and myself in this fight. Space simply does not permit.

But among the hundreds of communications which have come to me that I prize most highly are the following:

[National Council of Catholic Women, Department of Lay Organizations, N. C. W. C. Episcopal chairman, Most Rev. John F. Noll, D. D. National headquarters, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Agnes G. Regan, executive secretary; Margaret T. Lynch, assistant executive secretary]

JUNE 17, 1936.

The Honorable SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL, M. C.,
House Office Building, Delaware Avenue and B NE.,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: I had hoped before the adjournment of Congress to call and say a word of appreciation to you for the courtesy extended during the hearings on the Neely-Pettengill bill.

I sincerely hope that the time is not far distant when this measure, which you have been instrumental in introducing, will come to a successful issue.

Very sincerely yours,

AGNES G. REGAN,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1936.

HON. SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PETTENGILL: In behalf of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, may I assure you of its appreciation of the invaluable service to the cause of child welfare which you are contributing in sponsoring legislation to abolish compulsory block booking and blind selling of motion pictures.

For the hearings recently held before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are chairman, we are especially grateful. In many respects these hearings were by far the most satisfactory of any we have ever attended on the subject of motion pictures. The time given, the interest manifested by each of the members of the subcommittee, the revealing information elicited through adroit questioning and the complete fairness and courtesy to all witnesses were subjects of favorable comment, not alone by the representatives of our organization but by those of all of the civic, educational, and religious groups who testified in support of the Pettengill bill.

The effect of these hearings is already being manifested in deeper interest and wider endorsement of this measure which cannot but portend ultimate success of its passage.

With high regard, deep appreciation, and all good wishes, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

MARY T. BANNERMAN,
National Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

The struggle for better movies has just begun.

WILLIAM D. THOMAS

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our estimable colleague, WILLIAM D. THOMAS, was a shock to us all, and again we realize that in the midst of life we are constantly faced with the probability of the long journey to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler has returned.

During his brief life period BILLY THOMAS had earned the love and respect of that great multitude he had the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. Though handicapped by a physical ailment, he performed his duties with a degree of care and thoughtfulness that assured his people they had chosen wisely and well in selecting their Representative.

Throughout the period of his illness he never lost courage, and his cheery greeting and pleasant smile were ever present. The host of boys and girls who paid their respect to his memory the day of his funeral service realized that they had lost a real friend, for one of his chief joys in life was to lend a helping hand to the young folks.

He had devoted a great portion of his life to fraternal work, and his brethren will regret the passing of one whose life had been dedicated to the service of stressing the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. To the Members of Congress he had particularly endeared himself. He had fixed ideas as to governmental policies and held firmly to them. He had unbounded faith in the supremacy of principle over expediency, and when the choice had to be made he hewed to the line of his faith. In so doing he left us all a legacy of great worth if we but follow that policy.

To his immediate family and friends we extend our heartfelt sympathy, and we trust that the blessed hope of immortality may lighten the sorrow and assure them of joining him some day in that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

NEW W. P. A. REGULATIONS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, the first deficiency appropriation bill recently approved by the Congress and the President of the United States carried an appropriation for continuing the Works Progress and Public Works programs and laid down certain regulations governing the wages and conditions of employment of relief workers.

As a result of these regulations, new instructions have been issued by the Works Progress Administrator relating to rates of pay, hours of labor, monthly earnings, and conditions of employment.

Under the new ruling preference in employment is given to all persons certified as being in need of relief by a public relief agency approved by the Works Progress Administration authorities, and this, therefore, removes the limitation previously imposed whereby only persons who had been receiving aid between the period from May 1 to November 1, 1935, were eligible for W. P. A. employment. This is, indeed, a great proclamation of emancipation for those who have long been denied work relief because of this restriction. I have had many cases where applicants had applied for aid the latter part of October 1935 and were ruled ineligible for work relief because actual welfare assistance was not rendered until after November 1. Only recently many persons have been suspended or dismissed altogether because a search of the records brought to light the fact that they missed out by a day or two in complying with the requirements in this connection. The new ruling will be of great assistance to the needy persons in my congressional district.

Another new ruling of the Administrator establishes hourly wage rates not less than the prevailing scale effective July 1. The regulation with regard to rates of pay reads as follows:

It shall be the responsibility of the several State Works Progress administrators to establish according to occupational titles hourly wage rates (which shall be not less than the prevailing hourly wage rates) for persons employed on projects, and to make such rates effective for all pay-roll periods beginning on or after July 1, 1936. Wage rates so established shall not be applicable to persons employed in supervisory and administrative positions and owner-operators of teams, trucks, and equipment.

Veterans who are employed on work relief projects under this new ruling will not be dismissed or suspended because of receipt of adjusted-service bonds or checks in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate—bonus. Veterans who are eligible for work relief and have received their bonus bonds or check in payment of same will not be denied the privilege of employment under this regulation.

The new appropriation for work relief projects prohibits the Works Progress Administration from knowingly employing aliens who are in the United States illegally.

Other provisions limit the hours of work so that monthly earnings will conform to the schedule now in effect, and continues the maximum hours of work, limiting project workers to 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week, and 140 hours a month.

SUMMARY OF REPORTS ON WAR DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate and fitting that the Committee on Military Affairs summarize its extended activities under the authority of House Resolution 275 of the Seventy-third Congress and House Resolution 59 of the Seventy-fourth Congress. The investigation is not entirely complete, and during the fall season I will resume the investigation, with certain valuable assistants from the General Accounting Office and the Chief of Finance of the War Department. I cannot speak too highly of the services of the gentlemen who have heretofore been detailed to this committee to assist in carrying on this investigation.

The testimony taken in the course of this investigation during the two Congresses covers many thousands of pages of testimony and vast volumes of documentary evidence sufficient to fill many large boxes. At least two of these boxes, believed to contain valuable data, have not yet been opened.

The first preliminary report was filed on May 7, 1934, as House Report No. 1506, by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. ROGERS, chairman of the subcommittee on aviation. The next report was filed on June 14, 1934, by myself, as chairman of the full committee, by House Report No. 2005, and related to the contract between the War Department and the Mercur Corporation for the operation of the Port Newark Army Supply Base. As a result of that investigation, suit has been instituted against the Mercur Corporation for an accounting, and the Congress has passed an act authorizing the sale of this Army base to the city of Newark, N. J.

The next report was filed on June 15, 1934, as House Report No. 2060, by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ROGERS], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, and related largely to facts concerning the purchase of aircraft by the War Department. The result of that particular phase of the investigation has been highly beneficial and has resulted in inducing the War Department to comply strictly with the provisions of section 10 of the act of July 2, 1926, as evidenced by the most informing letter from the Secretary of War to myself dated August 15, 1935. That letter was included in the report of the Secretary of War to the Congress for the year 1935 and has heretofore been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Upon the coming in of the Seventy-fourth Congress, by authority of the committee I filed a report on January 3, 1935, as House Report No. 3, relating to the Port Newark Army supply base contract. That phase of the investigation and the two reports concerning same are epoch making and are sure to have a very great influence for a long time in the future upon any contracts that may be made by the War Department concerning real estate in its possession.

On January 3, 1935, as chairman of the committee, I also filed a report, being House Report No. 4, on behalf of Subcommittee No. 3, and reference to same is respectfully invited for information concerning a most important phase of the entire investigation.

On August 22, 1934, as chairman of the full committee, I filed House Report No. 1884, summarizing our activities to that time and forecasting the probable direction for the future investigation.

On February 25, 1936, by the authority of the committee, I filed House Report No. 2063, relating to the investigation of Brecot Co.

Again on March 31, 1936, I filed House Report No. 2289, upon another phase of the investigation, to wit, Newbury Manufacturing Co.

On May 19, 1936, I filed another report as House Report No. 2680, upon still another phase of the investigation, to wit, the cases of Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman and Lt. Col. William R. Gruber.

On June 17, 1936, by direction of the committee, I filed House Report No. 3010, relating to still another phase of the investigation, namely, the Brimley Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, it is no pleasure to recite the shortcomings of others. But we think that Army officers ought to be above suspicion as to corruption in financial matters, and we think that practically all of the Army officers are honorable, high-minded, and efficient gentlemen, and therefore they are vitally interested in having the dishonorable and corrupt officers exposed and expelled from the Army. We did not publish the testimony nor detailed report concerning our investigation into the conduct of Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman. However, we submitted that report, covering about 200 pages of typewritten matter, to the Secretary of War. It appears that an investigation was held by the War Department into the conduct of Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman in 1933 as a result of certain testimony introduced at the instance of the Honorable THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, during the hearings before the subcommittee on the War Department appropriation bill. That investigation of the War Department concluded that there was no improper conduct on the part of Colonel Hoffman. However, as a result of our investigation and the submission of our report to the Secretary of War, another investigation was conducted by the War Department which in substance held that Colonel Hoffman was guilty of highly improper conduct and, but for the fact that the statute of limitations had run against the conduct complained of, he doubtless would have been court-martialed. The result was that he suffered a very severe reprimand. There is a way to eliminate such officers from the Army without court martial, and that is by classifying them in class B and ordering their discharge. Certainly the statute of limitations could not avail Colonel Hoffman as against class-B proceedings. The letter of the Secretary of War to me concerning the investigation and the letter of

The Adjutant General relating thereto are herewith published for the information of the country and as a warning example to all officers in the Army against the temptation to engage in business transactions, especially where the interests of the Government are so vitally concerned as buyer or contractor from the corporation in which the officer is a stockholder and for which he is an officer.

As compared with the average civilians, Army and Navy officers are well cared for economically, because they not only receive fairly good salaries, which increase with the increase of age and the increase of family responsibilities, but they also have the benefit of the best medical and hospital care, including medicine and nurses, for themselves and for the members of their families. There is no need to blink the fact that the economic situation of Army and Navy officers is relatively good. They themselves well know it, though they may not admit it. The highest proof is the fact that they wish their sons to become officers and their daughters to marry officers. Of course, the love of and pride in the service is a factor, but the economic situation and all the incidental benefits and pleasures connected with the service are the principal factors. I know the brothers and sisters of too many Army officers—and I know their economic situation, and how their fortunes rise and fall with the fluctuations of business and economic conditions—not to realize the contrast in favor of Army and Navy officers. All through the years of terrible depression, when the well-to-do suffered indescribable agony through losses of their life savings, Army and Navy officers continued to receive their monthly checks without interruption.

I call these facts to the attention of the Congress and the country because it demonstrates conclusively that there is no excuse for Army officers to try to be making money on the side out of business transactions, and especially where they seek to represent the Government as a buyer and also at the same time represent their corporations as a seller. This dual relation is bound to be corrupt. There is some legislation on the books against conduct of this kind, and more legislation will result from this investigation. I propose to go into the entire matter fully and frankly with my final report to be filed in December of this year. Army and Navy officers have lifetime offices and incomes if their conduct is such as not to bring on court martial and dishonorable discharge or discharge by the class B route. They occupy something of the status of Federal judges. As the Honorable HATON W. SUMNERS said in his address to the United States Senate upon the trial of Judge Ritter, of Florida, "They have taken the veil." By that he means they have put the business world behind them. They have become the wards of the Government. They are insured of ample subsistence. They have no need to economize and save a considerable part of their incomes. For them there is to be no rainy day. They are a privileged and protected class. They do not suffer any economic anxieties such as afflict us civilians. In return for this protection Army and Navy officers should render most conscientious, undivided, and scrupulously honest service to the Government and the people.

Here follow the letters from the Secretary of War and The Adjutant General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 8, 1936.

HON. JOHN J. McSWAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McSWAIN: Reference is made to letter from this office dated March 9, 1936, and your reply of March 11, concerning a re-investigation the Inspector General had been directed to make of the alleged improper relationship between Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman, Air Corps, and the Triangle Parachute Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

This re-investigation has been concluded and has received careful and thorough consideration by the War Department. The following conclusions and recommendations of the investigating officer, in which I concur, are quoted for your information and for the information of your committee:

"CONCLUSIONS

"a. That Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman, Air Corps, did, in 1927, materially assist in the promotion and organization of Safe Aircraft, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio, for his personal benefit financially.

"b. That during the period July 1927–July 1929, while acting in the capacity of aeronautical engineer, detailed with the Department of Commerce, and placed on duty with that Department with Safe Aircraft, Inc., he actively directed important business affairs of that company and participated in its operation.

"c. That he continued those activities with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co. after his return to military duty at Wright Field, Ohio, in July 1929, at which time he was assigned as chief of the parachute unit of the matériel division of the Air Corps at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

"d. That the connection of Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co., particularly during the period July 4, 1929, and February 7, 1930, with especial respect to the receipt of money by him from those companies during that period, was not only highly unethical and prejudicial to good order and military discipline but constituted an apparent violation of section 113 of the Criminal Code, as well as a probable violation of section 41 of that code.

"e. That in 1930 and 1933 he misled and deceived his superior officers by his replies in official communications to questions specifically asked him by his military superiors with the purpose of ascertaining his true relationship to the Triangle Parachute Co. and its predecessor, Safe Aircraft, Inc.

"f. That in 1931 he attempted to influence the award of a Government contract, but without success due to the vigilant supervision of the head of the engineer section of the matériel division of the Air Corps at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

"The evidence in support of this conclusion is insufficient to warrant trial by court martial even were such trial not barred by the statute of limitations.

"g. That he gave deceptive and misleading testimony in 1933 to Maj. Gen. John F. Preston, who at that time, under orders from the War Department, made an investigation of Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman's connection with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co., and thereby prevented the real situation from becoming known at that time.

"h. That Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman's concealment of his relations to Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co. was unethical and in derogation of the high moral standard which governs officers of the Army.

"i. That his actions and conduct in all these matters were below the standard to be expected and required of officers of the Army.

"j. That by reason of the lapse of time Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman's trial for these offenses is barred by the statute of limitations.

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"a. That Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman, Air Corps, be reprimanded by the Secretary of War for concealing from his military superiors his connection with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co. by misleading and deceptive replies to the chief of the matériel division, Air Corps (Brig. Gen. H. C. Pratt, Air Corps), and to the inspector general (Maj. Gen. John F. Preston).

"b. That the provisions of section 24b of the National Defense Act, as amended, be invoked against Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman, Air Corps."

Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman has been advised of the foregoing conclusions only and has been reprimanded for his conduct in connection with this case. A copy of the reprimand is inclosed herewith.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. H. DERN, Secretary of War.

JUNE 2, 1936.

RESULT OF REINVESTIGATION

To: Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman, Air Corps.

Through: Commanding Officer, Maxwell Field, Montgomery, Ala.

1. On April 7, 1933, The Adjutant General transmitted to you a letter giving you the results of an investigation made by the Inspector General into allegations that you had had improper business relations with the Triangle Parachute Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, in which investigation you testified in your own behalf.

The conclusions then reached were:

"That there is nothing in Major Hoffman's relationship with the Triangle Parachute Co. in violation of law, Army regulations, or announced policies of the War Department.

"That there has been no improper expenditure of Government funds in connection with parachute development, and that no funds have been expended for the benefit of the Triangle Parachute Co."

2. On March 9, 1936, new evidence was brought to the attention of the War Department clearly indicating the exoneration ensuing to you as the result of the investigation of 1933 had been wholly unwarranted. As a result a re-investigation was at once made and you again testified in your own behalf.

3. As a result of that re-investigation the following conclusions were reached:

"That Lt. Col. Edward L. Hoffman, Air Corps, did, in 1927, materially assist in the promotion and organization of Safe Aircraft, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio, for his personal benefit financially.

"That during the period July 1927–July 1929, while acting in the capacity of aeronautical engineer, detailed with the Department of Commerce, and placed on duty by that Department with Safe Aircraft, Inc., he actively directed important business affairs of that company and participated in its operations.

"That he continued these activities with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co. after his return to military duty at Wright Field, in July 1929, at which time he was assigned as the

chief of the parachute unit of the matériel division of the Air Corps at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

"That the connection of Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co., particularly during the period July 4, 1929, and February 7, 1930, with especial respect to the receipt of money by him from those companies during that period, was not only highly unethical and prejudicial to good order and military discipline but constituted an apparent violation of section 113 of the Criminal Code, as well as a probable violation of section 41 of that code.

"That in 1930 and 1933 he misled and deceived his superior officers by his replies in official communications to questions specifically asked him by his military superiors with the purpose of ascertaining his true relationship to the Triangle Parachute Co. and its predecessor, Safe Aircraft, Inc.

"That in 1931 he attempted to influence the award of a Government contract, but without success, due to the vigilant supervision of the head of the engineering section of the matériel division of the Air Corps at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

"That evidence in support of this conclusion is insufficient to warrant trial by court martial even were such trial not barred by the statute of limitations.

"That he gave deceptive and misleading testimony in 1933 to Maj. Gen. John F. Preston, who at that time, under orders from the War Department, made an investigation of Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman's connection with Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co., and thereby prevented the real situation from becoming known at that time.

"That Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman's concealment of his relations to Safe Aircraft, Inc., and the Triangle Parachute Co. was unethical and in derogation of the high moral standard which governs officers of the Army.

"That his actions and conduct in all these matters were below the standard to be expected and required of officers of the Army.

"That by reason of the lapse of time Lieutenant Colonel Hoffman's trial for these offenses is barred by the statute of limitations."

4. The Secretary of War has approved these conclusions and has directed they be conveyed to you in this manner as an expression of his complete disapprobation of conduct on your part which seriously compromises your character and standing as an officer, the full and proper penalty for which you now escape solely because your trial is barred by the statute of limitations.

By order of the Secretary of War:

P. T. HAYNE,
Adjutant General.

OLD-AGE SECURITY

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, one result of the depression has been the focusing of attention on the question of old-age security. The problem is, of course, not a new one. Ever since civilization began man has asked himself, How can I be protected from want in my last days. The development of great life-insurance companies, of savings and investment institutions, has been a partial answer. However, the recent economic disaster throughout the world has swept away millions of savings. The machine age is constantly placing the older worker at a disadvantage in securing industrial employment.

Humanity demands that every possible effort be made to make old age happy and secure. An overwhelming majority of our people favor some reasonable and adequate pension. The fact that the two great parties are committed to this doctrine shows that the people have finally become old-age-pension conscious. Now is the opportune time to secure workable, forward-looking legislation on this subject. Cold reason, however, demands that the legislation be written in the atmosphere of calm debate rather than in that of wistful wishing. We must not be misled by extravagant promises. The experience of other countries, together with that of many corporations, churches, and fraternal organizations in our own country, points out many pitfalls to be avoided.

Considerable attention has been given to the Townsend old-age-pension plan. This program would pay \$200 a month to each citizen not already possessed of such an income. The payments would be financed by a transaction tax, estimated at 2 percent. For example, when the farmer sold the wheat, 2 percent of the sale price would be paid to the Federal Government. On each transaction thereafter until the wheat finally reached the consumer in the form of a loaf of bread an additional 2 percent would be collected. The cost to the consumer of any given article would be the cost of production, transportation, and distribution of each ingredient making up that article plus an added and pyramided 2 percent on each transaction which figured in its production, transportation, or distribution. The plan further provides

that each recipient must spend in the United States the \$200 so received within 30 days after receiving it.

A careful analysis of this plan will show its disadvantages to many groups of people. In the first place, it would be very difficult and expensive to enforce. Every farmer, every businessman, every person who sold either goods or services would be required to make regular reports to the Government. It is admitted that the licensing and regulation of millions of people would be necessary.

Secondly, the plan would be unfair to millions of people now entitled to receive aid from the Government. The Townsend plan is offered as a substitute for the Economic Security Act passed in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress. It makes no provision for crippled and dependent children or for the blind, who are provided for by the act now in force.

We may well question the justice of any plan which would pay approximately 40 percent of the entire national income to 7 percent of the population and leave uncared for the crippled and the blind, who are equally entitled to the consideration of the Nation.

The Townsend plan would be very unfair to the working people of the country, because on them the burden of the payment would fall. A few figures will make this clear. According to the last census there are over 11,000,000 persons in America over 60 years of age. It is estimated that 8,000,000 would be eligible for a pension. This would require an annual payment of \$19,200,000,000 to be paid by means of a transaction tax. Almost every transaction has to do with the production, transportation, or distribution of something the average person uses as food, clothing, shelter, or services. In other words, it is proposed to raise the cost of living by \$19,200,000,000. According to the 1930 census the population is 122,775,046. The average to each person in increased cost of living would therefore be \$156. An average family, consisting of father and mother and two children in school, having a total income of \$1,200 per year, would pay \$624 in increased cost of living. It is claimed, however, that the forced spending of \$19,200,000,000 would create a great volume of new business, out of which this added cost could be paid. This might be true if the new business came entirely from some new source, as, for example, if money now being hoarded were put into circulation. However, such is not the plan. It would simply put an undue share of the money now being earned and spent in the hands of a relatively few people to spend.

The Townsend plan would also be detrimental to the independent merchant. By eliminating many of the transactions from producer to consumer, the mail-order house and the chain store—in many cases owning the sources of production and transportation—would have an advantage over the small merchant. Tardy efforts are now being made to eliminate monopoly and to encourage the small businessman. The transaction tax would have the effect of fostering monopoly and thus creating more unemployment.

The problem of old-age security is not to be solved simply by putting a pension law on the statute book. Whatever plan may be adopted, we must remember that all money paid for old-age pensions must be paid from one source—the earnings of the people. The necessary funds cannot be raised by any financial sleight of hand. We must, therefore, strive for a greatly increased national income, widely and fairly distributed among those whose efforts contribute to it. In the last analysis, adequate old-age security demands the following:

First. A policy in industry, agriculture, and finance which will insure profitable employment to the largest number of people.

Second. A policy of thrift on the part of the people which will insure the maximum amount of saving by the individual.

Third. A policy of economy on the part of the Government which will not take from the individual in taxes the money which he has saved.

It is difficult to see how any pension system can long endure which does not put upon each generation the duty to earn

and save collectively for its own old age. In other words, we should adopt a policy of "pay as you go."

In the adoption of any pension plan many problems of administration present themselves. We must have the active cooperation of the Federal Government, the State, and the citizen. Given the three, however, there is no reason to doubt our ultimate success.

STATES' RIGHTS AND FARMERS' RIGHTS

Mr. EICHER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the West will be flooded this summer and fall with loud claims that a real regeneration occurred at Cleveland; that the Republican chrysalis sloughed off its drab coat of reactionary and special-privilege leadership and emerged as a beautiful butterfly of liberal and progressive convictions. To high finance has been given the knowing wink of assurance that the sun-flower scenery is for vote-getting purposes only, and that Republican success would promptly restore the "happy days" of deflationary concentration of more and more property in fewer and fewer hands. From behind the bucolic mask peeks the same old sour visage of monopoly, seared by the same old ugly lines of gouging and exploiting practices.

By purveying the conveniently meaningless slogan of the "American way", the Republican leadership apparently hopes that it will be swallowed by the voters as a promise of all ways to all men. But the American people will not forget the one way which the policies of our administration have definitely barred—namely, the path that has been so freely followed by the financial racketeer while despoiling our savings and robbing us of our equal opportunities. The closing of that road explains the animus of the Tory opposition to our legislative accomplishments. The pitiful cry of the special interests that our party has strayed from the teachings of Thomas Jefferson will deceive no one. All the red herring that Liberty League money can buy will not obliterate the Jefferson and Lincoln trail that we are successfully reblazing toward government of, for, and by the people and away from the Hamiltonian road of Hooverism that led to government of, for, and by the rich.

Straight political thinking requires that we check our mental bearings often enough to keep constantly in mind the vital cleavage between the fundamental philosophies of Hamilton and of Jefferson. Hamilton espoused government by the rich and well-born, as he called them, frankly contending that ordinary folks lacked sufficient intelligence to govern themselves. "The people; they are a beast", was his caustic comment. Jefferson, on the other hand, urged the greatest possible degree of popular participation in the processes of government, believing that the surest guaranty of a successful, self-governing society lay in the honest ascertainment and enforcement of the popular will. The rights to life, liberty, property, the pursuit of happiness, and to self-government he considered inherent in every individual, transcending every obligation to government itself, and subject only to the obligation that those rights be not abused in their exercise to the injury of the equal rights of one's neighbor. In the beginnings of our Nation it was considered by the Hamiltonians that they could best achieve their objectives by the maintenance of a strong central government, while the Jeffersonians strove to retain the reservoir of governmental power closer to the people and in the respective States, and delegating to the Nation little more authority than was essential to it in its capacity as a member of the family of nations.

In the light of this background, is it not more than passing strange that the critics of our administration, direct political descendants of Alexander Hamilton that they are, should now evince such a tender regard for the States' rights doctrine of Jefferson? Let us see if an analysis of objectives will not disclose the answer.

A truer Democrat than Jefferson never lived—nor than Lincoln. He who believes that Jefferson favored the dominance of State authority merely because it was a State does scant justice to the statesmanlike quality of his mind and heart. The most casual study of Jefferson's life and works convinces that his controlling passion was love for and faith in the common people—those ordinary folks whom Lincoln

said the Lord must have loved because He made so many of them. Lincoln found no intellectual difficulty in hurdling the constitutional obstacle of States' rights when he decided to end physical slavery of human beings, even in the face of the Supreme Court's solemn pronouncement that the Constitution contained no warrant for such action. Is it thinkable that Jefferson, if living today, would fail to support with utmost energy the efforts of this administration to end the economic slavery of millions of our fellow human beings, for whom, without fault on their part, but solely through the operation of the Hamiltonian doctrines of special privilege, the primary guaranties of life, liberty, property, happiness, and self-government have become nothing but a hollow mockery? Jefferson's consummation of the Louisiana Purchase in the face of warning that the Constitution gave the National Government no such express power concretely demonstrates what he held to be the true interpretation of the doctrine of implied powers under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution.

History makes it clear that Jefferson's advocacy of minimum power in the Federal Government and the maximum in the States was inspired by the belief that local government would be more responsive to the needs and welfare of the plain man; that it would afford him greater protection against the continuing efforts of the wealthy few to use the powers of government for their own aggrandizement than would a powerful central government far removed geographically from many of the people. Under then prevalent conditions he was absolutely right. Commerce among the States was comparatively inconsequential. New York was farther from the National Capital than it now is from London. Interstate communication and commerce was small in volume. Except for their foreign trade, the producers and manufacturers of each State found their markets largely within its own borders.

Keeping in mind Jefferson's objective—the welfare of the rank and file of the people—who will be so bold as to contend that, if living in this day, he would still be fighting for so-called States' rights? There is certainly nothing sacrosanct or of popular benefit in States' rights considered merely as an end in itself. Jefferson never indulged in the quixotic and vain sport of fighting windmills. Our critics disregard the plain truth that our political struggle of today, like Jefferson's, is to restore equality of opportunity to the little man and to break down the governmental discrimination that has grown up in favor of the privileged few. Blind adherence to past methods that under present-day conditions are ineffective obviously would be futile.

Jefferson's ideal for America was a nation preponderantly composed of independent, home-owning agricultural and seafaring people. He warned repeatedly against the evils of an industrialized order, characterizing great cities as an economic pestilence. During recent generations in our national history, however, Hamilton's theories attained the ascendancy in our governmental counsels, determining those very trends in our development as a Nation that Jefferson decried. As a result we have become, in gross, the wealthiest Nation on earth, but how about the distribution of that wealth? Do the statistics of the Department of Agriculture declaring that 60 percent of our population are forced to live on an inadequate allotment of diet and clothing afford us any reason to point with pride?

Even in his day there existed the danger to a democracy of undue concentration of wealth and economic power, and Jefferson broke it down wherever it showed its ugly head. Wealth then was chiefly agricultural, and he succeeded in preventing entails in Virginia and in repealing the law of primogeniture, which theretofore had permitted concentrated ownership in practical perpetuity of great landed estates. When he died he thought he had destroyed for America the dragon of great wealth and concentrated economic power, especially of the kind that was exercised with other people's money. But he reckoned without the host of the modern corporation which came into full flower during the nineteenth century, aided and abetted by the power of the respective States to create these artificial perpetual entities, and by the

fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, which, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, have permitted some of them to become veritable Frankensteins whose antisocial activities neither the National Government nor the creating State governments can adequately regulate and control in the public interest.

The fifth amendment, among other things, provided that the National Government should not deprive persons of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and the Supreme Court obligingly interpreted the word "persons" to include the purely artificial and impersonal corporation. The fourteenth amendment, adopted to freeze into organic law Lincoln's emancipation of the slaves, placed identical inhibition upon the States, and the Supreme Court gave the word "persons" in this amendment the same extended application to corporations. The result has been the untrammelled use of the corporate form to accomplish the amalgamation of business into larger and ever larger units, with increasingly expanded economic power concentrated in fewer and ever fewer hands, to the culmination of the widespread monopolistic strangle holds over producers and consumers that bring joy to the heart of the financial racketeer.

A recent manifestation of the twilight zone of nonexistent power to regulate that has been created by the Supreme Court's loose construction of the fifth and fourteenth amendments and strict construction of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution is contained in its decision overriding the New York State minimum-wage and maximum-hour law for women. In effect, the majority of the Supreme Court solemnly declare that a widow with hungry children who can feed them only by working inhumanly long hours for a pitifully low wage in a Bowery sweatshop enjoys a freedom of contract under the Federal Constitution which no State legislature may impair. Just as solemnly, and because the garment-making work of this widow constitutes production within a State, even though every garment she may make is sold and shipped to customers in other States, the same majority has held in the Guffey coal case that the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution gives Congress no power to remedy the admitted evil for the reason that control over production is within the reserved powers of the States.

And yet the endeavors of our administration to lay down an effective national policy for the correction of evils that are clearly national in their influence, and to do so under the authority of and within the framework of the Constitution, are vociferously condemned by the mouthpieces of the gouging interests as a deliberate effort to change our form of government and to subvert our fundamental institutions.

The Republican Party platform adopted at Cleveland, as amplified by Governor Landon's gold-standard telegram, hints at favoring a constitutional amendment to enlarge the powers of the States "if necessary." This, obviously, is the idlest of gestures. Under the protection of the interstate-commerce clause every producer and manufacturer in every State in the Union has the entire Nation as a potential market for his goods. All business, therefore, is highly competitive among the States. All socially beneficial legislation, such as old-age and retirement pensions, and mandatory minimum wages and maximum hours, adds to costs of production. It follows that unless all States should set up exactly the same standards—which is beyond hope, as witness the failure to date by the requisite number of States to ratify even the child-labor amendment—the factories in the high-standard States would be compelled to remove to the backward, non-progressive States as a matter of mere self-preservation.

I do not believe we should jump headlong toward such a change in our Federal Constitution as might unwittingly result in altering the basic character of our Government as a Federal Union of sovereign States. The dual sovereignty of the States and the Nation should by all means be preserved to the fullest extent that the States in their control over the purely local concerns of their citizens can adequately respond to the changing necessities for the public weal. But the alarming tendency of recent years toward centralized economic power with its resulting monopolies, wielded by the few lords of high finance and largely with other people's

money, must be curbed in the public interest. It threatens to become more powerful than government itself. Experience is convincing that the States separately cannot cope with the problem. Some degree, therefore, of centralized governmental power and authority is indispensable if we hope to hold in check the antisocial excesses of centralized economic power. Until that war for the liberty and freedom of the little man is won we dare not demobilize the only effective force that is available to the people.

These purposes can be attained without any rephrasing of our governmental charter. Loose construction versus strict construction of the Constitution by both Congress and the courts was the fighting issue between Hamilton and Jefferson in the early days of the Republic. The objectives of those two schools of political thought were the same then as they are now, but today the contending forces have exchanged weapons. Adherence to the mere dogma of States' rights today means surrender to the forces of private greed and entrenched wealth. The corollary of States' rights is States' responsibility. Unfortunately, however, the States in this era are helpless to meet their reciprocal obligation to protect the individual citizen against the Nation-wide ravages of predatory interests who would destroy his birthright.

To be sure, Jefferson said: "That government is best which governs least", and his present-day enemies quote it with glee. But they always fail to include his appended statement that enough government is necessary to preserve the rights of the individual against the efforts of others to take them away from him.

A broader interpretation and application of the interstate commerce clause to comport with the actualities of the present day nationally knit social and commercial order will meet the call. It is not a legalistic necessity, but only an outmoded political and social philosophy entertained by one or two human minds that stands in the way. Curbing the power of the Supreme Court does not sound feasible, even if it could be made effective without constitutional amendment, which is, to say the least, doubtful. We need an umpire in our tripartite system of government—someone with the last word. The checks and balances wisely provided by our founding fathers should not be lightly discarded, even though recent performance would appear to have been all checks and no balances.

In attaining our hoped-for results we have yet to explore the full constitutional possibilities of the powers conferred upon Congress by the interstate-commerce clause. Among them is the device of requiring Federal incorporation of all corporations engaged in interstate commerce. Such a requirement, imposed as a condition to the transaction of interstate business, would give the Federal Government plenary regulatory power in the national public interest, and would make possible the effective control that the States, acting independently, are impotent to exercise over their own creatures. When these constructive efforts have been made—as they will be—and the remedy still proves disappointing to liberal and progressive public opinion, it will be time enough to insist upon the then necessary changes in our organic law.

FARMERS' RIGHTS

After years of lip service by the Republican Party to "equality for agriculture with industry", the Democratic Party when it came into power in 1933 brought about substantial performance of that sine qua non of national recovery. The memory of the zero-approaching levels to which agricultural prices were driven by the Hawley-Smoot tariff and the other deflationary policies of the Hoover administration is too fresh in the minds of all my listeners and readers to require restatement by me now. Under the A. A. A. the farmer's purchasing and debt-paying power was given a wonderful impetus toward normalcy, and the billions of dollars it added to his annual income have played no small part in priming the Nation-wide business recovery that we are now enjoying, and in reemploying the 5,000,000 more men than were at work in March 1933.

A development that has impressed me greatly is the better understanding that is permeating Congress and the country generally of the interdependence of farm and city. As a

way of life, it is true, the average farm home, with its debt burden reasonably amortized, would afford a self-contained subsistence level for the family that the average city dweller could never hope to maintain. But our industrialized order has brought higher living standards to the farm, and if we would keep and raise those standards the farmer must receive for his products a large enough cash return to meet his overhead and to leave an adequate surplus with which to buy those products and services of industry that furnish the comforts and satisfactions of life. In turn, it has become crystal clear that the industrial employee is utterly dependent upon the vast consuming capacity of our agricultural population. The farmer is in fact a double consumer, because, in addition to the personal needs of himself and family, his requirements in the way of machinery, equipment, and supplies in his farming operations are enormous in volume. If the gross agricultural income could be doubled within the next year, there can be not the least doubt that within the same interval our still distressing unemployment problem would "fold up its tents like the Arabs, and silently steal away." There is eternal truth in the words that are carved in the stone facade of the Union Station here in the Capital City:

The farm—best home of the family—main source of national wealth—foundation of civilized society—the natural providence.

And so it is no mere alliterative twist that I intend when I stress farmers' rights as being of far greater importance in the national economy than is the mere historical abstraction called States' rights. The majority of the Supreme Court in their decision outlawing the A. A. A. determined that national control of agricultural production was an invasion of a power that the Constitution reserved to the States. But without a nationally effective program of production control Congress must sooner or later inquire how else can the farmer hope to maintain himself on a basis of equality with industry in the open-market price that he shall receive for his products. His capital investment and constant overhead, and the vicissitudes of wind and weather, compel the farmer to operate his plant at farmerlike capacity. If crop failure comes, he has to grin and bear it. If a world-wide good crop comes, the immediate surplus places him at the mercy of a glutted market. What to do? The industrialist, on the other hand, can and does accommodate the volume of his production to the fluctuations in his market and, by and large, thus saves himself from loss. The farmer, therefore, is the only businessman of consequence who is utterly without control over his income.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1936 is a sincere effort legally to fill the gap that the invalidation of production control under Federal authority has left in the administration's farm relief plans. The degree of success as a market stabilizer that may attend its operation will remain undetermined pending a crop year or two of experience. The subsidy encouragement for crop rotation in soil-rebuilding legumes will, of course, be a welcome addition to the individual farmer's income from his open-market sales. But it has long been my earnest conviction that subsidies out of the Federal Treasury and limitations upon the production of any necessity of life are at best merely temporary remedies, unnatural in their effects, and resembling more an attempt to treat symptoms than to get at the root cause of the economic inequality that constitutes the disease. Given a fair start in an open field, the farmer would ask no odds of any man in the race of life. But with so many barriers set up against him in the way of tariff preferences and various social costs that are added to the price of the things he has to buy, and of speculators' profits and manipulated markets for the things he has to sell, small wonder it is indeed that patience has not sooner ceased to be a virtue.

Equality for agriculture with industry! With the possibility of production control as a market stabilizer lost to him, how, then, can Government help attain for the farmer that legitimate goal of equality which is likewise so essential if we would promote the general welfare? A correspondent from

Colorado recently wrote propounding the following questions:

In the belief that the uncertainty surrounding the ultimate, permanent solution of the agricultural problem in the United States is still the greatest obstacle to the complete restoration of employment and economic recovery, the writer submits the following inquiries and would appreciate your comments:

1. Is it not possible to restore parity between agriculture and industry by a much less complicated plan than either party has proposed or put into effect up to this time?

2. Is it necessary for a proper solution of this problem that the farmer should submit to collectivism, regimentation, or the surrender of the individualism so highly prized by him?

3. What are the objections to a Federal corporation with power to handle the exports and imports of all agricultural commodities and the products thereof?

4. Could not such a corporation fix the domestic price of all agricultural commodities, of which a surplus is produced, at the price such commodities will bring in the foreign market, with the tariff on such commodities added thereto?

5. Would this not make the tariff effective for the producer to the extent of the domestic market for such commodities?

6. Could not an impost on all primary transactions in such commodities, to be paid by the producers thereof, be devised to produce sufficient revenues to reimburse the corporation for losses sustained by it on exports of surplus commodities to the end that such losses would be equitably distributed among the producers growing such surplus commodities?

7. Could not such a corporation so regulate imports of such commodities as are not produced in sufficient quantities to meet domestic requirements as to insure the domestic producer a profitable return for such product?

8. Would this plan not have a tendency to stimulate the production of non-surplus crops and to contract the production of burdensome surpluses in the other?

9. Would not such a plan promote free competition in agricultural products?

When my correspondent wrote the foregoing letter he had not seen my bill, which I first introduced in the House of Representatives in January 1935. Even a casual reading of his intelligent questions shows that he has been doing some constructive thinking. My bill, which I shall incorporate herein at the close of my remarks, makes favorable answer to all of his questions except 4, 5, and 6. To supply the factors contemplated in those three questions my bill sets up much less complicated machinery that will automatically and progressively attain and maintain agricultural and industrial equality. I again commend this bill to the careful consideration of my colleagues, especially those on the Democratic side. I do this for two important reasons: First, it puts into simple and workable legislative form the promise that was made to the country in the farm plank of our 1932 party platform—that we would effectively control agricultural surpluses and would assure the farmer prices in excess of cost; and, second, it operates clearly within the limitations upon the constitutional powers of Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce that are laid down by the majority of the Supreme Court as now constituted.

Let me summarize its provisions:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture shall each year estimate the probable production of each surplus-producing crop.

Second. He shall estimate the amount thereof required for domestic consumption.

Third. He shall ascertain and proclaim what was its average cost of production over the preceding 5-year period on the average-sized farm reckoned as a business unit.

Fourth. This average cost as a minimum shall be paid by all dealers and handlers for the domestic-consumption percentage of each delivery presented for shipment in interstate commerce.

Fifth. The remaining or export percentage of each delivery shall be receipted for to the producer and turned over to a Government export agency, which shall dispose of same to the best advantage in the world market and then account to the receipt holder for the proceeds pro rata.

Sixth. Pending world market disposition, the producer may borrow on his receipt at any post office up to 90 percent of the world market value.

Seventh. To encourage the recovery of lost world markets for American-processed agricultural products, such as tex-

tiles, livestock products, and so forth, the export agency shall supply raw materials to manufacturing exporters at debenture prices.

Eighth. Local committees shall be maintained to advise with the Secretary of Agriculture in the ascertainment of costs of production.

Ninth. Even in the remaining narrow field of solely intrastate movement from producer to consumer, the minimum pegged price would be legally effective under the exercise by Congress of the power to regulate the value of money in commodities.

Tenth. Compliance by purchasers with the minimum pegged price is made mandatory under penalty.

It will be observed that no control over production is involved and that the only impingement of Federal power is when the products of the farm enter commerce. Five of the present members of the Supreme Court upheld the New York law fixing prices for milk, Justice Roberts writing the opinion. Four of the members recently upheld the price-fixing provisions of the Guffey Coal Act, but Justice Roberts was able to avoid participation in that holding through the elimination of that issue in the majority opinion, which was made to rest on the alleged inseparability of the price-fixing from the labor provisions. That Justice Roberts by his precedents is bound to uphold congressional power to fix prices of such necessities of life as agricultural products that move in interstate commerce is as certain as it is that night follows day. Therefore the Supreme Court, through five of its members, is definitely committed to the validity of my suggested bill.

The consumer will benefit through the resulting stabilization of his costs and the elimination of the now too frequent series of speculative profits that are added to the price of the commodity on the way from the producer to the consumer's table and wardrobe.

By reckoning costs each year on the basis of the past 5 years' experience, a fair and just ratio will continuously be maintained between the farmer's income and the cost of the things he must buy. As to all surplus crops except cotton, the farmer could well afford to donate his surplus, if he had to, as a selling commission for the fair price he receives for the domestic-consumption percentage, for by this bill the American market would be effectively preserved for the American farmer. The cotton surplus, handled as it will be by a Government agency in conjunction with the administration of our reciprocal-trade agreements, will enjoy constantly enlarging foreign markets that individual negotiation is finding it extremely difficult to restore.

The simplicity and noncomplexity of the program is one of its most appealing features. It will require a much smaller Government personnel than did the individual-contract system of the A. A. A. or than does the subsidy provision of the Soil Conservation Act. It can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of any open mind that, by reckoning costs of production of any crop on the average-sized farm taken as a business unit, the variation in costs in different sections of the country is very slight. For example, by giving weight to all factors of investment, taxes, and overhead costs, it will be found that the average cost of producing a bushel of corn on the average Iowa farm varies less than a cent per bushel from the cost of producing a bushel of corn on the average North Dakota farm.

The encouragement we are giving to soil conservation is fine and should be continued as a national policy. But farmers must not permit themselves to be deluded and satisfied by the sop of compensating tariff benefits. Suppose the Hope-Landon bill were in effect, under which the farmer is offered tariff-equivalent certificates of 25 percent to supplement his open-market return on the domestic consumption percentage of his production. Then suppose that the open-market price of hogs sinks again to 2 cents per pound—as it might any year without production control. The farmer would then be assured under that munificent plan the tremendous total return of 2½ cents per pound.

Following is the text of my bill, and I invite your careful study of its provisions, to the end that it may be given intelligent and sympathetic consideration by the Seventy-fifth Congress:

A bill to restore and stabilize agricultural buying power by regulating interstate and foreign commerce and the value of money in agricultural commodities, of which there is an exportable surplus, by establishing a minimum cost of production price for the domestic consumption percentages thereof and by providing for the orderly marketing of the export percentages thereof, debentures for processed and manufactured agricultural products for export, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of assisting him in carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall organize committees of farmers residing in the respective governmental subdivisions for which they are selected. There shall be a committee for each State, and for each county or parish, and for each township, to be known as State, county, or parish, and township advisory committees, respectively, and the membership of each committee shall be not less than three nor more than five. The members of the State committees shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the members of the county or parish and township committees shall be elected by the bona-fide farmers residing within such county or parish and township, under such rules and regulations as may be promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, obtain reports from said committees on conditions in their respective jurisdictions that are pertinent to the decisions he is required to make under this act and shall arrive at such decisions after he has the benefit of the statistical and other informative matter contained in such reports and after conference with national officers of the national and representative farm organizations.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall annually ascertain the average cost to farmers, considering average yields and production during the preceding 5-year period, of the production of each agricultural commodity produced in the United States having an exportable surplus. All items of cost shall be considered and calculated in accordance with the formula and method commonly used in the manufacturing industry. He shall consider the individual farm as a business unit and shall include compensation to farm operators for management and for labor of themselves and their families and hired help equal to the compensation paid for like services in industry, together with adequate allowance for depreciation of soil, improvements, equipment, stock-breeding animals, work animals, and buildings, and also for taxes and other overhead charges. He shall also determine the investment value of the property devoted to the production of such commodities, using the official census data so far as pertinent, such determination to be at the normal level of values between inflations and depressions reckoned over such period of time as will make possible the accurate ascertainment of such normal value, and upon the property investment value as so determined there shall be calculated and allowed a capital return of 4 percent. He may also ascertain and allow an equitable differential against variations in (1) transportation costs to different markets, (2) actual costs for hired labor, and (3) all other conditions affecting the cost of production, and may establish such zones or classifications as are appropriate and necessary therefor.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall annually determine and designate the beginning and ending of the appropriate marketing period for each of said agricultural commodities, and shall also annually estimate the volume of production of each commodity for the current calendar year of each such commodity that will be marketed. Prior to the marketing period for each such commodity he shall also estimate (1) the percentage thereof required for domestic consumption and (2) the percentages thereof remaining for export.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall thereupon make public proclamation and announcement of the cost of production figures and the domestic consumption and export percentages aforesaid and of the date when and the period for which the same shall be controlling as provided herein upon the sale and purchase of each such commodity, and upon request he shall furnish detailed information to all dealers, manufacturers, millers, elevators, processors, packers, butchers, ginners, compressors, and other agencies dealing in or handling the same. After such effective date all said dealers, manufacturers, millers, elevators, processors, packers, butchers, ginners, compressors, and other agencies shall pay to the farmers not less than the cost of production price determined and proclaimed as aforesaid for such percentage of each delivery of such commodity in interstate commerce or otherwise as is not estimated for export. If in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture the objectives of this act, including the furtherance of orderly marketing, require such action, the Secretary shall proclaim such reasonable variations in the allowable minimum as may be necessary to attain such objectives, and also to govern such marketings by producers as may not have been completed during the designated marketing year. For the percentage, if any, of each such delivery thereof as has been estimated for export as aforesaid there shall be issued and delivered to the farmers a receipt, countersigned by such agency as the President of the United States may designate, which receipt shall show the grade of the commodity. Sales from one farmer to another for feeding,

breeding, or seeding purposes shall not be subject to the provisions of this act. For the purpose of this act a transaction in respect to any commodity shall be considered to be in interstate commerce if such commodity is part of that current of commerce that is usual in the industry or industries engaged in the handling of such commodity whereby such commodity (and its products) are sent from one State with the expectation that they will end their transit, after purchase, in another, including, in addition to cases within the above general description, all cases where purchase or sale is either for shipment to another State, or for manufacturing, milling, processing, packing, slaughtering, ginning, compressing, or in any manner handling such commodity or any part thereof within the State and the shipment outside the State of the products resulting therefrom. Articles normally in such current of commerce shall not be considered out of such current through resort being had to any means or device intended to remove transactions in respect thereto from the provisions of this act.

Sec. 5. At such reasonable time as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, the said dealers, manufacturers, millers, elevators, processors, packers, butchers, ginners, compressors, and other agencies dealing in or handling such farm products shall deliver to such agency as the President may designate all of the percentage of said commodities estimated for export in the kind and grade as received or in processed form as hereinafter provided. If and when authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, bills of sale evidencing storage of such exportable percentages on farms under seal will be accepted by such agency in lieu of the physical delivery of the property. In the case of livestock and poultry, the packers and also the butchers, after processing the same subject to Government inspection, shall make delivery of the percentage estimated for export in the form of livestock and poultry products: *Provided*, That the butchers may deliver their percentages through packers, and the said agency shall pay the reasonable cost of processing; and the same provision shall apply to milk and the processors thereof. If unable to make reasonable and satisfactory arrangements for such processing, then such agency shall purchase or acquire by condemnation or construct the proper equipment and facilities. Such agency shall provide by rental, purchase, or construction, or by condemnation in State or Federal courts, the necessary storage and terminal facilities for handling the export percentages, and shall remove same entirely from the domestic market, except for emergency purposes, and shall hold and dispose of the same to the best advantage in any world market, and through the Postal Service shall redeem the receipts in the net amount realized for each product after deducting all costs and expenses of handling and disposing of the same. On the direction of the President such agency shall hold in storage such portion of the said exportable percentages as it may deem advisable as a reserve against emergencies, droughts, and crop failures, and any portion thereof that is undisposed of on settlement date shall be held for such purpose. Settlement shall be made in full not later than the end of each designated marketing period and each farmer shall have the option to accept in full the net world price at the time of settlement for the percentage withheld for emergencies, or he may accept a credit of 90 percent thereof upon his receipt and await the final disposal for any balance that may be realized, or, if he has received a 90-percent loan as hereinafter authorized, he may continue the same without interest until such final disposal. The said agency is directed to estimate the cost and expense of handling each of said commodities and to estimate the probable world price and through the Postal Service to make loans to any farmers upon the security of their receipts up to 90-percent of the net value thus estimated.

If in any State the demand for domestic consumption is greater than the national estimated percentage, the said agency is authorized to supply the deficiency out of the exportable surplus from any other convenient State at the cost-of-production price plus transportation, storage, and handling charges, and it shall maintain a national balance by purchasing upon the same terms, like amounts from the percentage estimated for domestic consumption in States where the demand for domestic consumption is less than the national estimated percentage.

If any farmer at any time is unable to sell his products in the regular markets, the said agency is directed to accept and receipt for the exportable percentage of his production as herein provided for, and to purchase from him the percentage of his production for domestic consumption at the cost-of-production price and is authorized to resell such domestic consumption percentage in the domestic market at the same or higher price.

If the percentage estimated for domestic consumption should be insufficient to supply the domestic demand, the said agency is authorized to supply such shortage out of the exportable percentage at the cost-of-production price, plus storage and expenses.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to advance, from time to time, to the Postmaster General such sums as are shown to be required for the handling and redemption of the receipts as provided herein, and for the making of loans thereon, and for the expenses of the Post Office Department in connection therewith. At the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Postmaster General under such regulations as he may prescribe shall require the employees of the Post Office to perform, without extra compensation, such fiscal-agency services as may be desirable and practicable in connection with the handling, safekeeping, and redemption of said receipts, and the making of loans thereon.

Sec. 7. The said agency is authorized to use the resources and facilities of the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Sec. 8. By the enactment hereof the Congress declares and invokes its constitutional power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and to regulate the value, in agricultural commodities, of all authorized money.

Sec. 9. Any person, dealer, manufacturer, miller, elevator operator, processor, packer, butcher, ginner, compressor, or other agent dealing in or handling such farm products, who violates the provisions of this act by paying less than the cost-of-production price provided for herein shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

Sec. 10. The said agency is directed to protect all foreign markets for the exportable surplus of agricultural products now being held or hereafter acquired by cooperative organizations, and for that purpose is directed to furnish the necessary products, when available, at the net price to farmers as herein provided; and said agency is further directed to furnish to processors and manufacturers, under bond or other adequate guaranty of performance, from the exportable surpluses coming into its possession, any raw materials to be processed or manufactured and exported, and to do so at debenture prices that will permit such processors and manufacturers to meet competition with their products in foreign markets upon fair and reasonable terms, which products shall include textiles, wheat products, corn products, oat products, livestock products, dairy products, compressed cotton, canned fruits, and canned vegetables.

Sec. 11. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Commerce are directed to cooperate in exercising their lawful powers, through the medium of foreign-trade agreements, and through other appropriate measures for restriction or expansion of imports of competing agricultural commodities, their byproducts, and/or competing substitutes, to maintain the prices to farmers for the domestically consumed percentages of all agricultural commodities as nearly as may be within a range not exceeding 10 percent above the proclaimed cost-of-production price level.

Sec. 12. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person, circumstance, or commodity is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act and the applicability thereof to other persons, circumstances, or commodities shall not be affected thereby.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AID ACT

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Federal Highway Aid Act is particularly gratifying to me as a representative of an agricultural section of the country because of a new feature which it inaugurates in providing for the construction of farm-to-market roads with the assistance of Federal appropriations. As a member of the Committee on Roads I have been especially anxious to secure favorable consideration of this item, and judging from the support given this feature of the law, it would appear that this marks the beginning of a new era in practical road building.

The law, as finally passed, authorizes a total of \$338,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and a similar sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939. It is necessary to authorize these sums considerably in advance so that the legislatures of the various States may make the necessary arrangements for matching these funds as required by law. For general road-building purposes there was authorized \$125,000,000 for each year. Of this amount, Iowa will receive approximately \$3,230,000 per year. Section 8 of the law authorizes \$50,000,000 per year for the elimination of railway grade crossings, which amount need not be matched by the States. The apportionment is based one-half on population, as shown by the latest decennial census, one-fourth on the mileage of the Federal-aid highway system, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and one-fourth on the railroad mileage, as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission. On this basis Iowa will receive approximately \$1,400,000 each year. This is in addition to the 113 highway grade separation projects which it is estimated will be financed from the \$200,000,000 allocated by the President under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

Section 7 of the law provides:

In addition to any other authorizations which have been made, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the several States to be apportioned and expended under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938; the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939: *Provided*, That the sums herein authorized shall be applied to secondary or feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail roads, and public-school bus routes.

Under this section it is estimated Iowa will receive approximately \$650,000 per year.

The first Federal Aid Highway Act, passed in July 1916, provided for authorizations for 5 years ranging from \$5,000,000 the first year to \$25,000,000 the fifth year. Since that time, through the combined efforts of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the various State highway commissions, a coordinated system of roads has been built. The total mileage in the United States is estimated at 3,068,919 miles. There are 226,000 miles in the Federal-aid program, most of which are now fairly well improved. The mileage of county roads is 1,071,530 and local or township roads aggregate 879,630 miles. A very small percentage of these roads are adequately improved.

While Congress has appropriated large sums for road building, it is interesting to note that during that same period the Federal Government has collected an ever larger amount in taxes traceable directly to motor-vehicle traffic. Between the date of June 30, 1917, the beginning of Federal aid, and January 31, 1936, the Federal Government has collected in excise taxes on motor vehicles and in gasoline taxes \$2,033,922,673. During that time the Government spent in road contributions \$1,986,655,477.

Practically every State now finances its road-building program in part at least from a gasoline tax and a tax on the registration of motor vehicles. The gasoline tax in the various States ranges from 2 to 7 cents per gallon. The average registration fee per motor vehicle ranges from \$3.17 in Georgia to \$22.21 in Connecticut. The average in Iowa is \$15.05. The average of both gasoline tax and registration fee per vehicle for all the States in 1934 was \$34.89. Iowa was among the 20 States below this average, with an average payment of \$31.93.

The Federal Government first began appropriating money for primary road building on the theory that a network of interstate highways was in the national interest. In this connection some consideration was given to the value of highways from a military standpoint. There are also sufficient reasons for the use of Federal money in the development of a farm-to-market program. In the first place, a large part of the gasoline tax collected by the Federal Government is paid by users of farm-to-market roads. The desire on the part of most States to match the Federal funds available for primary roads has resulted in a substantial reduction in the State funds available for local roads. In some instances money has been diverted to paving parallel roads and to the building of expensive cut-offs and diagonal roads, which might better have been used to get the farmer out of the mud. A passable road for the many should have consideration over a perfect road for the few. Many miles of local roads are used by the Post Office Department in the delivery of rural mail. The improvement of these roads will save the Government millions of dollars each year and will give the farmer the delivery service to which he is entitled.

In the development of our present Federal-aid system the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway commissions of the various States have rendered a splendid service. In the development of the farm-to-market road program the local road authorities should play an important part. No one knows what local roads should be improved and the specifications adapted to the local needs as well as the county supervisors and the county engineer. The actual building of the farm-to-market roads should be largely in their hands.

WILLIAM D. THOMAS—TRIBUTE TO A FRIEND BY A FRIEND

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in announcing to the House the death of WILLIAM D. THOMAS, the minority leader, Mr. SNELL, said:

His genial personality and his friendly manner won for him a warm spot in the affections of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Those who knew Mr. THOMAS realize the absolute accuracy of this statement. This was no perfunctory tribute. It was not only sincere but true. Although a comparatively new Member in this body, his courteous and kindly deportment attracted men to him, and underlying his innate modesty was a reserve that denoted forcefulness and strength of character.

Also, in him was recognized a man of convictions, of principles, which he would not compromise at any price. Yet, withal, he respected others whose viewpoints differed from his own. This was an attribute of tolerance and forbearance. He was singularly calm and unperturbed in spirit, not given to ostentation nor to disputation, believing that mediation solves more problems than agitation. Therefore—

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up,
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

The House of Representatives with uncanny precision and accuracy appraises its own Members and finds the proper niche for each of them. This body, sooner than usual, appraised WILLIAM D. THOMAS as a self-contained, self-controlled, quiet, dependable, and industrious legislator, one whose counsel was wise and just, and whose example of wholesome, clean living and thinking was worthy of emulation.

But, Mr. Speaker, as one who was perhaps closer to him in bonds of true affection than any other Member of this House, I need not the testimony of others, however faithful to this man's character it may be, to enable me to mirror the innermost recesses of the guileless soul of my beloved colleague and friend, for I was yoked to him by those hooks of steel that cement friend to friend in indestructible bonds which even death cannot rend asunder. I knew him so well. We were neighbors and neighborly. We lived in adjoining counties. We had much in common and in mutual confidence. We understood each other, our faults as well as our virtues. We were confidants, mutually forbearing and helpful. We could enjoy each other's company in silence and shed a sympathizing tear one for the other in sorrow. Such friendship is rare. But it existed between BILL THOMAS and me, and his passing has left an aching void in my heart. He was my dear pal, my buddy in this life, and I have faith to believe that this beautiful relationship is unbroken in death. I shall look forward expectantly to the great adventure of a reunion with him beyond the rim of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that it was vouchsafed to me to know and to have the loyal and faithful friendship of BILL THOMAS. It is my most precious heritage. To me it is as a sweet benediction and a fragrant memory.

Solomon was indubitably right when he said:

There is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.

Such to me was my friend BILL THOMAS—closer than a brother. We were as willing vicarious sacrifices for each other on the altar of friendship as were those mythical characters Damon and Pythias. But still a better parallel may be found in the actual lives of those two young men of ancient Biblical times, of whom it was written:

The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul.

And with the passing of my friend, my pal, BILL THOMAS, I can say, with David, from the ground of a heart filled with poignant anguish, when he learned of the death of his friend Jonathan:

I am distressed with thee, my brother; very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it most appropriate to insert in the RECORD as a further tribute to my friend BILL THOMAS, who exemplified the definition of a friend as set forth therein, the following monograph written by former Senator Harry B. Hawes, of Missouri, entitled:

IN THE MATTER OF FRIENDSHIP

All that can be expected of any man is to make the best use of the things that are within his power. Only the contented man is rich; so we must look for the things that bring contentment. And first of these is to find a friend; and if you find two friends, you are indeed a lucky man; and if you find three friends—real friends—then you are a rich and a powerful man. In prosperity it is easy to find a friend, but in adversity it is most difficult of all things. No matter how small a man's means may be, if he gives of what he has to his friend, it is the same as if it was a great amount. A man's pleasures are insured by sharing them with a friend, and his griefs are reduced by securing the sympathy of a friend. The

counsel of a friend is the best counsel, because it will be true advice; for, when received from a mere acquaintance, it may be so filled with flattery that its value will be destroyed; and faithful and true counsel rarely comes excepting from the true friend. It is said that in youth we have visions and in old age dreams, and the vision and the dream may give us an ideal of perfection; but experience and large contact with men compel us to accept the man who measures in his virtues only to the substantial average. If we view a man as a whole and find him good as a friend, we must not be diverted from the happy average—the everyday, human average—by using a magnifying glass upon his faults or frailties. We must, in order to have and hold a friend, accept him as he is, demanding but one thing in return for our affection—his fidelity.

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A BETTER DEAL FOR THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a resolution prepared by myself and submitted to the platform committee of the Democratic national convention at Philadelphia on mining and my statement to the committee in support of the resolution:

To the Democratic Committee on Resolutions, for inclusion in the Democratic national platform:

MINING

"We recognize the importance of the mining industry, which is second only to agriculture in supporting the Nation's general business prosperity.

"We advocate a Government policy and a legislative program to foster and assist the development of our mining resources and insist on a policy of administration of our national forests which will promote the development and utilization of our mineral deposits located within national-forest boundaries."

Proposed by Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE COMPTON I. WHITE, FIRST DISTRICT OF IDAHO, IN SUPPORT OF THE MINING RESOLUTION FOR INCLUSION IN THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM ON JUNE 25, 1936

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Democratic convention, in presenting this resolution for your approval, let me bring to your attention the importance of the mining industry to the Nation's business and its contribution to the general prosperity. It is one of our great basic industries, second only to agriculture. Today, as in the golden era of our country's development, when nature so generously rewarded the pioneers who penetrated the mountain fastnesses and opened her storehouse of mineral deposits, the western mining States still offer unlimited opportunities and rich rewards for those who will develop our still untouched mineral deposits. If there ever was a time in the Nation's history when an active and prosperous mining industry is needed to energize and support general business prosperity, it is now. When we consider what the mining industry is contributing to business recovery and general prosperity of other nations, it is apparent that we are overlooking and neglecting the most important industry which can do more for business recovery than any other basic industry.

Mining has brought such a degree of prosperity to the Union of South Africa that the surplus in the treasury of that country has increased from \$3,000,000 to \$14,000,000 in the last year. With tax money received from this mining income the Government is using the proceeds to pay old-age pensions and reduce the customs duties on many of its imports so that its people may more easily secure articles of foreign manufacture such as radios, typewriters, and automobiles.

Coming closer to home, we find that Canada, by its liberal and constructive policy, in assisting those engaged in developing mining resources, is rapidly leaving us behind in restoring prosperous business conditions.

We learn the Canadian metal-mining industry is producing \$1,000,000 in new wealth each working day and is providing an annual pay roll of more than \$88,000,000 to some 73,000 workers, who receive \$51,000,000 annually in wages, or an average of \$1,500 per year. It is stated that still greater progress is expected and that the Government and industrial leaders are confident that mining will do more for Canada in defeating the depression than any other industry.

Members of the Democratic convention, let me say to you that with the rich and immense mineral deposits still awaiting development in this country it is vitally necessary to our national prosperity that our Government do what Canada, our neighbor on the North, is doing to assist the development of its mining industry by adopting a liberal and helpful policy to assist those engaged in the work of opening up new mineral deposits, and by a legislative program modify and liberalize the rigid rules now in force which prevent the investment of capital needed to finance the development of this industry.

We have it on the authority of the Federal Government that many mining districts of our Western States contain numerous and extensive mineral deposits awaiting development. In the district that I have the honor to represent, which has produced \$300,000,000 in placer gold since the advent of the early pioneers, there is, according to the head of the Bureau of Mines, one of the greatest undeveloped gold fields in the United States containing

gold-bearing lodes and veins from which erosion washed down the rich placer deposits mined by the pioneers.

Now, with the price of gold increased by legislative enactment from \$20.67 to \$35 an ounce, the day is at hand when these rich deposits are ready for development.

Money must be invested and machinery brought in to put these mining properties into production. Unfortunately, most of these deposits are miles from transportation, located in rugged mountain fastness of the national forest, entirely dependent on the Federal Government for the construction of the necessary road to have access to smelters and market. The time has come when necessity requires that we open up and utilize our store of precious metal contained in these deposits, and with all seriousness, and with all the earnestness at my command, I urge that you, the members of the convention, support the resolution with your vote.

This resolution had the approval of many of the Democratic leaders, including Chairman Farley. However, in conforming to a plan for a short platform limited to general issues, this and a number of important but special subjects were omitted by the committee in drafting the national platform.

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN THE NEW RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM?—IF NOT, WHY NOT?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the President, at the request of the Congress, launched an effort to foster extension of electric service into unserved rural areas, and set up a temporary Rural Electrification Administration (R. E. A.) to administer the program. So successful was the undertaking during the first year, and so thoroughly did the emergency R. E. A. demonstrate the feasibility of electrifying a much larger percentage of American farms, that the Congress this spring passed legislation making rural electrification a permanent function of the Federal Government.

Under this new program the Federal Government will lend money, under certain conditions, both to build facilities to provide electric service in rural areas and to finance the purchase and installation of wiring, electrical equipment, and plumbing.

This program is particularly applicable in the Sixth District of Alabama, where only 2.3 percent of the farms—less than 1 in 40—have electricity, according to the 1930 census. I urge my constituents to investigate the possibility of joining in this program, and pledge my own efforts to help you realize its benefits.

While in many sections rural electrification has been undertaken successfully and adequately by private utility companies with or without R. E. A. loans, the Federal program gives preference to applications from municipal plants, farmers' cooperatives, and similar public or nonprofit agencies. In many cases it will be found that the farmers' cooperative offers the best means of bringing electricity to a rural area.

The formation of a farmers' cooperative is neither difficult nor expensive. It requires only a little intensive effort on the part of a few public-spirited leaders in calling meetings, canvassing the neighbors, and carrying on correspondence. Until the preliminary organization work has been completed, there is no need to employ any legal or engineering assistance. R. E. A. will help you get started.

Briefly the procedure in organizing a cooperative to bring electric service is this:

First. Hold a mass meeting or a series of mass meetings to familiarize the people in the territory with the R. E. A. program and the opportunities it offers.

Second. Select a committee to canvass the neighborhood to find out how many people want electric service and what they will use it for. It is not necessary to sign anything nor to pay any money to join the cooperative.

Third. Prepare a map showing the proposed lines and prospective customers and submit the information so collected to R. E. A. As soon as R. E. A. specialists have examined the application, it will be necessary to organize a more formal association and then employ legal counsel and engineering assistance, but only after the preliminary work has been done.

As your Congressman let me strongly urge my farmer friends to avail themselves of the opportunity above mentioned. Hold a mass meeting, canvass your neighborhood,

prepare map, and write me so that I may help you secure the benefits promised.

If any of my constituents wish assistance in forming an electric cooperative, I will be glad to see that they get the full benefits of the R. E. A. facilities. Just a line to me or a letter of inquiry to R. E. A. at Washington will bring an immediate response and complete information about the program.

PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONAL UNION FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving numerous inquiries from members of the National Union for Social Justice in my congressional district concerning my views on the 16 principles of the National Union for Social Justice.

In order that the beliefs advocated by the National Union and my views on them may be set forth for the edification of those interested, I am giving herewith a summary of my opinion on the individual principles:

Principle 1: I believe in liberty of conscience and liberty of education, not permitting the State to dictate either my worship to my God or my chosen avocation in life.

This country was founded on religious freedom and I am very much in favor of continuing this happy condition. I shall always do my utmost to uphold this essential right. The principle has my support.

Principle 2: I believe that every citizen willing to work and capable of working shall receive a just, living, annual wage which will enable him both to maintain and educate his family according to the standards of American decency.

The laboring man has come into his own and his demands are heard with great respect by both major political parties. Two important labor bills were passed by the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, just closed—the Government contracts and investigation of interference with collective bargaining acts. Certainly this is not a country of millionaires. The Du Ponts and the Morgans make up a very small percentage of our population and an Al Smith cannot climb from poverty to riches every day. The great majority of Americans are middle class and proud of it—work for a living and glory in it—and these are the ones who will control the political destiny of 1936. Certainly principle 2 has my approval and support.

Principle 3: I believe in nationalizing those public resources which by their very nature are too important to be held in the control of private individuals.

Although the "public resources" mentioned in the principle above are not defined and the language of the pledge is rather vague, I can safely say that I am not adverse to public control in those spheres where private regulation has shown to be blatantly unsuccessful and injurious to the public interest.

Principle 4: I believe in private ownership of all other property.

Of course, I am in accord with this belief, since it follows closely the statements set forth in an explanation of my views on principle 3.

Principle 5: I believe in upholding the right to private property, but in controlling it for the public good.

Any governmental regulation of private enterprise, when necessary, must, of course, be reasonable. I heartily endorse the principle of upholding the right to private property.

Principle 6: I believe in the abolition of the privately owned Federal Reserve Banking System and in the establishment of a Government-owned central bank.

I am in favor of this provision.

Principle 7: I believe in rescuing from the hands of private owners the right to coin and regulate the value of money, which right must be restored to Congress, where it belongs.

I agree with this belief.

Principle 8: I believe that one of the chief duties of this Government-owned central bank is to maintain the cost of living on an even keel and arrange for the repayment of dollar debts with equal-value dollars.

If such a condition could be brought about, then I am very much in favor of it, since it would go far to eliminate the inflation calamities which brought many depressions.

Principle 9: I believe in the cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

It is very true that we cannot expect prosperity until the farmer has found economic equality. He is entitled to a living wage that will permit him to support his family in comfort and according to the standards of American workers. This administration has done much to help the farmers secure restoration of their purchasing power, and I believe that re-establishing foreign markets for agricultural products will help the production problem to a very large extent.

Principle 10: I believe not only in the right of the laboring man to organize in unions but also in the duty of the Government, which that laboring man supports, to protect these organizations against the vested interests of wealth and of intellect.

Of course, I believe in the right of the laboring man to organize in unions and am very much in favor of the Government protecting these organizations against the vested interests of wealth. As evidence of this I call attention to my vote on the Wagner labor disputes bill. The movement to establish the National Labor Relations Board had my wholehearted endorsement, since I believe that labor controversies should be settled by established methods of arbitration. I am very much in favor of this principle and have always supported the provisions set forth therein.

Principle 11: I believe in the recall of all nonproductive bonds and therefore in the alleviation of taxation.

I favor this proposal.

Principle 12: I believe in the abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

I agree, since the abolition of tax-exempt bonds would help the financial situation of the country.

Principle 13: I believe in broadening the base of taxation according to the principles of ownership and the capacity to pay.

I am opposed to oppressive taxation of lands and personal property and favor a just and equitable taxation for all. Certainly the capacity to pay should be taken into consideration in all matters of taxation.

Principle 14: I believe in the simplification of Government and the further lifting of crushing taxation from the slender revenues of the laboring class.

Reorganization of Government activities would doubtless lead to increased efficiency. Governmental bureaus are of necessity composite and involved. However, any consolidation of operations that could be arranged should be adopted.

As stated in the foregoing principle, I believe the capacity to pay should be taken into consideration in taxation matters and the laboring classes should not be called upon to carry any undue burden.

Principle 15: I believe that, in the event of a war for the defense of our Nation and its liberties, there shall be a conscription of wealth as well as a conscription of men.

I firmly approve of this proposal.

Principle 16: I believe in preferring the sanctity of human rights to the sanctity of property rights; for the chief concern of Government shall be for the poor, because, as it is witnessed, the rich have ample means of their own to care for themselves.

I am very much in favor of protecting both human rights and property rights. Sometimes it is extremely difficult to discriminate between them.

I was one of the 218 signers of the petition to discharge the Agriculture Committee from further consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill, since I believe in the right of every piece of legislation to be given the privilege of fair and impartial debate in the Congress. I voted for the discharge of the committee in this connection.

I give you herewith my views on the proposals set forth by the National Union and my interpretation of those proposals. It may be that my interpretations are at variance with others. However, I shall be glad to have the comments of any of the members of the National Union if my representations are not clear or do not rightly cover the meaning of the principles which they are pledged to support.

MY LEGISLATIVE RECORD FOR THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the time when the people of all congressional districts will be confronted with the opportunity of selecting and voting for candidates to represent them in the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Entrusted with responsibilities and duties as your Representative in the Seventy-fourth Congress, I am submitting

for your approval a record of my stewardship of the trust you placed with me. Disregarding party affiliations, I have always supported and voted for legislation that would eliminate the distress of those who were dispossessed of their resources, jobs, and in many cases their homes by a depression created and brought about by political maneuvers of the former administrations by their utter disregard of enacting legislation for the benefit of the masses and their untiring efforts of enacting legislation for the interest and privileges of the sinister financial wizards who were permitted to play the game of "Heads I win, tails you lose" until they had the resources of the American public absorbed in worthless and unsound securities, resulting in bank failures, stock market crashes, foreclosures, and a loss of confidence in their Government, realizing that my duty was to assist in enacting legislation to protect the public instead of measures for the exploitation of their resources.

I strenuously opposed legislation setting forth high rates of interest on loans and actively supported and worked for legislation to refinance mortgages on the homes and farms of the Nation through Government agencies at a rate of interest not to exceed the cost of negotiations for such a loan. I refer specifically to the Frazier-Lemke bill, and offer the following letter I received from the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE commending me for my active cooperation on this measure:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1936.

HON. THEODORE L. MORITZ,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I wish to congratulate you on your legislative record in the Seventy-fourth Congress.

Your active support and vote on measures that were beneficial to the masses rewards the trust that they imposed with you in 1934.

Your cooperation with me on liberal legislation enacted during the Seventy-fourth Congress, namely, soldiers' bonus, Frazier-Lemke bill, social-security bill, all labor legislation, and many bills too numerous to mention, obliges me to appeal to your constituency and request of them your reelection in November.

Trusting that I may have the privilege of working and cooperating with you in the next Congress, I remain,

Very truly yours,

WM. LEMKE.

I supported and voted for legislation to adequately provide for the aged, the blind, mothers' and widows' pensions, unemployment insurance, whose comfort and happiness are issues confronting the present Government for solution. I offer a letter from the Honorable ERNEST LUNDEEN, one of the foremost Congressmen in the House of Representatives for the promotion of security legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1936.

HON. T. L. MORITZ,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The record you made as a Member of Congress shows that you were a most consistent and valuable supporter of legislative measures beneficial to aged, farmers, and particularly legislation benefiting the laboring class of people.

I commend you to labor and the friends of labor in your congressional district. I sincerely hope that they will rally to your support and that you will be reelected to Congress.

With best wishes for success, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST LUNDEEN.

I actively supported and voted for legislation for the protection of labor, mindful of the fact that the recovery of this Nation from the depression is predicated upon the protection, as well as the production, of labor. I received the following endorsement from the Honorable WILLIAM CONNERY, chairman of the Labor Committee, in recognition of my support on labor legislation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

HON. THEODORE L. MORITZ,

1622 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORITZ: I congratulate you on your legislative accomplishments as a new Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

I, as chairman of the Labor Committee, especially commend you for your untiring effort in cooperating, in promoting, and in voting for legislation that will benefit labor. Most particularly I commend you for your support of the Guffey-Snyder coal bill, of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, of the Unemployment, Old Age, and Social Security Act, of the railroad retirement pension bill, and many other bills too numerous to mention.

Judging by your reaction to these bills is an indication to me that you will always be 100 percent for organized labor, and that you

have the interests of the masses foremost in your heart when confronted by an issue. You have been branded as a liberal, and I agree that if fighting for those who are in need and for those who are being exploited by unscrupulous employers is liberalism, then you came by your title honestly.

I assure you that it has been a pleasure to work and cooperate with one who is always ready to fight for the interest of his constituency, even to the extent of jeopardizing his political future.

I trust it will be my privilege to continue with you in this fight for the common people.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR.

I supported and voted for the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' bonus, the regulation of the public-utility holding companies, the vocational education bill, and many other bills too numerous to mention that would eliminate our present distress and provide direct relief for those in need. I opposed legislation that would retard the progress of the Nation, namely, the "gag" rule, unheard-of appropriations in peacetime for the Army and Navy. I am submitting herein some of the many letters I received from my colleagues commending me on my liberal legislative accomplishments during the Seventy-fourth Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1936.

THEODORE L. MORITZ,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Now that we have completed our first term together in the House of Representatives, I desire to express to you my profound admiration for your work in this Congress. You have stood with the progressives always, and no doubt you now appreciate what I said on the floor in the very beginning of the session: That on fundamental issues there was no difference between the Republicans and the Democrats. The following major issues prove this assertion:

1. Unheard-of appropriations in peacetimes for the Army and Navy.
2. Opposition to a decent plan of refinancing of the farm debt.
3. Opposition to an old-age-pension system that shall make the aged of this country other than abject objects of charity.
4. Opposition to taking the power to issue and regulate money away from private interests and restoring that power to the Congress, where it belongs.

I am pleased to know that you are willing to go down the line for the people of this country and are willing to sever the ties of the two-party system that is responsible alone for the situation the distressed millions are in today. In your independent candidacy for reelection you have my every sympathy and whatever of influence I can offer in your battle for reelection.

Sincerely yours,

USHER L. BURDICK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1936.

HON. THEODORE L. MORITZ,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Before we separate and go our ways I want to express my appreciation of the support you have given the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, embodying the Townsend plan, in the Seventy-fourth Congress, and your cooperation in all efforts to promote this legislation.

I can recall no instance in which you have failed to help our cause during this Congress. If your record should ever be called in question, you may feel free to call on me at any time.

With all good wishes and kindest personal regards, believe me to be, always,

Faithfully yours,

JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY.

THE TEACHERS CARRY ON

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, now that the depression is definitely passing, notice should be given to the fine service of the public-school teachers of the Nation during these difficult years.

Children from millions of homes have had their hope and morale, if not, in fact, their physical health and energies, sustained by the cheer and courage of their teachers. For the latter it has been a period of added work, more pupils, and less pay, but they have carried on.

When the history of the depression is written I hope the writer will be able to adequately appraise the service rendered. Certainly it has meant much to the Republic that 26,000,000 children enrolled in our schools, a quarter of our total population, have had these daily contacts with their 870,000 teachers.

The Federal Government has helped to carry the load for municipalities which had reached the end of their credit and tax reserves. Thirty-two national organizations joined forces to form the national committee for Federal emergency aid for education, with James H. Richmond, chairman.

This committee, with the aid of the Congress and the executive departments, has worked unceasingly to provide ways and means to carry on. Schools have been kept open, teachers' pay rolls have been provided to close the gap of shrinking revenues, and under P. W. A. appropriations hundreds of new buildings and improvements and extensions to existing buildings have been constructed. These will stand as a lasting credit against the increase of the national debt.

Not only the teachers but also the school nurses, playground directors, and the medical and dental professions have helped to maintain a remarkable degree of health among these 26,000,000 children. The children's health is the Nation's wealth.

When we are told that the American system has broken down it is worth while to recall that with only 7 percent of the world's population and its children, we in America, during the worst year of our worst depression, spent more money on our public schools than all the rest of the world together spent on its public schools. I am for making necessary improvements in the American system to keep pace with the advance of science, invention, and technology, but am unwilling to scrap that system for any other on earth—none of which, on the testing grounds of actual experience, have ever proved as good.

One of the new and added responsibilities of our teachers in this modern age is to safeguard their pupils from traffic hazards, and to teach them habits of carefulness of lasting value when they no longer go to school.

Last year 36,000 of our people went to their graves as a result of traffic accidents. That is one every 15 minutes. In addition, countless thousands more were permanently maimed. If these were the casualties of war and not of peace the Nation would be up in arms. Any foreign foe which took 36,000 American lives would be repulsed without thought of cost.

Here, again, the teachers are our first line of defense. They are probably more important than any other force in preventing these casualties from being larger than they are.

The Federal Government is taking a sincere interest in the war against accidents and for uniform traffic regulations. The Bureau of Public Roads has printed a very useful pamphlet on accident prevention which deserves better publicity and a wider reading.

THE PROBLEM OF OLD AGE

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have spoken in favor of legislation to provide security for old age. I have stated that the objective must be a sum necessary to provide reasonable comfort on the one hand and one that will not impose a crushing burden of taxation on the other.

The problem has been too long neglected, but the depression and the loss of lifetime savings in closed banks, building and loan associations, failure of income, unemployment, and the shrinkage of real estate and security values has made it acute.

How to do justice between the old who receive and the young and middle aged who must pay is where differences arise. But we must give it our earnest attention. It is of great importance now and is going to become of more importance in the future.

The average life span has been moving up and the industrial deadline has been moving down. Both tendencies are almost certain to continue. That creates the problem and the necessity to solve it.

Let us look at the cold statistics. They come from the actuaries of great life-insurance companies whose business it is to record the past and read the future as accurately as is humanly possible. Per 100 of population they are:

	1880	1930	1980
Persons 50 and over.....	16	23	38
Children 0 to 20.....	48	39	30
Middle aged, 20 to 50.....	36	38	32

From the above you will note the increasing number of persons over 50 and the decreasing number of persons

under 20. You will note further that in 1980 it is estimated that there will be more over 50 than those under 20.

In other words, in the not distant future those in the working period of life will find that their heaviest burden will be to provide for their parents rather than their children.

This is probably the most astonishing change of population trends since the world began.

It is due to two things in the main—a declining birth rate and an increasing life span. Fewer babies are born, but of those who are born an increasingly larger proportion survive the diseases of childhood and youth and live into middle and old age.

First, the declining birth rate: Of 1,000 women of child-bearing age, we have, for the years noted, the following number of children under 5 years of age:

1810.....	1,006
1840.....	835
1870.....	638
1900.....	531
1930.....	246

In 120 years—1810-1930—the number of children under 5 years of age for each potential mother has declined from 1,006 to 246, or nearly 76 percent.

Second, the conquest of the diseases of childhood and youth, which permits more and more people to live into the upper age levels. Medical science has won its greatest victories for childhood and youth. In the few short years from 1900 to 1934 the death rate from summer complaint per 100,000 of population has been reduced from 133 to 18, or 86 percent; in diphtheria the reduction has been 92 percent; in scarlet fever, 80 percent; in typhoid, 91 percent; and in tuberculosis, 72 percent.

The result is that in 1870, 150 in every 1,000 were past 45; in 1930, 230 in every 1,000 were past 45 years of age, or 80 more than in 1870.

For the age 65 the figures show that in 1860, only 27 in 1,000 were past 65; in 1930, 54 were past 65; and in 1970, it is anticipated that 100, or one-tenth of our population, will be past 65.

So we have more and more of our people living to be older than 45, 50, 60, and 65, and at the same time the industrial dead line or age when people can no longer find employment is moving into the lower age levels. The age level moves up, the dead line moves down. Even in prosperous times there are many industries—steel mills, railroading, and others—where a man past 45, and in some cases 40, cannot hope to find a job, especially if he has never engaged in the particular occupation before. This is a byproduct of the machine age and not a happy one.

Another trend is the shift from rural to urban life. In 1880, 71 percent of our population was rural; today it is about 43 percent; that is, living on farms or in small towns and villages of not more than 2,500 people. This adds to the problem, because in the old days there were chores, gardening, home crafts, and other useful work that could be done by elderly men and women on farms or in small villages. But in the cities where is there work for them to do?

These figures may seem dull and uninteresting to some, but to me they are vital and significant. In them is wrapped up the future of our country. They must demonstrate to all fair-minded men and women, whether rich or poor, urban or rural, that America has a tremendous problem on its hands which must be approached with sympathy and understanding.

The old virtues of thrift and saving and self-help are perhaps more necessary than ever because the "night cometh" now much earlier than formerly when self-sustaining work becomes harder to find. Moreover, any tendency to become wards of society is full of danger.

Nevertheless it is apparent that the problem in countless cases is beyond individual or family solution alone. When a breadwinner 45 or 50 years of age is displaced from the pay rolls of industry by a new labor-saving device and his special skill, acquired by a lifetime of work, can no longer be sold at the employment window despite every effort, and the free

land of the West is no longer there to move to, his problem and that of his wife and small children becomes, in part, at least, the problem of society.

The march of science and invention knits us closer and closer together and makes us more and more "our brother's keeper."

I do not think there is only one panacea for the problem. There are many partial remedial measures which, added together, as one builds a house brick by brick, approach a complete solution. There is the movement for a shorter working day and working week. There is the effort to strike a new balance between profits and wages—a more equitable distribution of the wealth created by men and machines. There is adult vocational education to fit men and women for new occupations. There is the greater interest in life insurance, another word for thrift. There is the dismissal wage. There are private and public pension plans such as we have been learning to build up for persons in the civil service—such as postmen, firemen, policemen, school teachers, and so forth, as well as workers on railroads, and many industries.

There is, too, the great necessity of making savings safe when once acquired, to guard more and more against bank failures, building and loan failures, losses from the sale of worthless securities, losses from the fluctuating value of the dollar with inflation and deflation wiping out the savings of a lifetime. There is work to be provided by the States and the Nation—useful, dividend-paying work—reforestation, flood control, soil conservation, fish and game preserves, National, State, and municipal parks and playgrounds, road building, and so forth, to remove some of the pressure of young men on older men for jobs.

Others could be named. To them we must devote our energies, our sympathies, and our resources. The House of Have, by taxation or otherwise, must share with the House of Have Not, more especially when it is not the fault of shiftlessness or dissolute habits.

But over and above these I have named, to supplement them but not to supplant them, must be added some plan of national scope, the central government coordinating the work of the 48 States.

In the same way as provision is made for depreciation of machinery and the amortization of buildings, industry must provide for its "human obsolescence." By workmen's compensation acts we have provided against the hazards of accident and occupational disease. We must extend these principles to the hazards of growing old. As Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said in the railway pension case:

What sound distinction, from a constitutional standpoint, is there between compelling reasonable compensation for those injured without any fault of the employer, and requiring a fair allowance for those who practically give their lives to the service and are incapacitated by the wear and tear of time, the attrition of the years?

We have made an approach to this in the Social Security Act. I will not discuss it at length. I do not regard it as perfect. But it is a beginning—the first Nation-wide approach to our problem since the beginning of the Republic. Thirty-six States out of forty-eight are already sharing in its benefits. Twenty-six million wage earners will be brought under its provisions. Imperfect as it is, the administration which brought it into being will be recognized for all time as the pioneer in a movement as significant to our future as the conquest of the West by our fathers has been to us. I am glad to have helped lay the foundation stones.

As conditions improve I do not doubt that the benefits under it will be extended and a just and fair balance struck between the necessities of those beyond the working years and those whose toil alone supports both age and youth.

JUSTICE TO THE VETERANS

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, over \$2,000,000,000 has been paid just lately by the American Government to the surviving veterans of the World War—a so-called bonus—which was and is no bonus at all, but reimbursement that should have been placed in the hands of the ex-soldiers years ago.

One of my proudest accomplishments is my work to obtain the enactment of the adjusted-compensation law. So bitter were our opponents, so reluctant were some Congressmen, so fearful and hesitant were others, and so misinformed were many in Congress and out, that it required a hard and bitter struggle to get this law written on our statute books. The curious part of it was that several men in high office who had been against America's participation in the World War and who regretted to see life, blood, and tears sacrificed without necessity or rightfulness were the strongest champions of the bonus. We wanted no war. We wanted peace, reason, and neutrality. But after the Nation entered that ghastly orgy we considered it an inescapable obligation to pay the boys who went "over there" something more than a cheap and tawdry dollar a day. We remembered the profiteers who pocketed thousands and millions. We thought that the lads who waded in trenches and were tormented and tortured in the most barbarous brutality of the ages ought to get as much money as the men who fought on parlor carpets and in swivel chairs, clipping coupons from dividends, and living lives of ease and selfishness. We finally won; and the bonus is today a reality—insufficient as it is.

Not very long ago registered packages were given to veterans containing bonus payments of \$1 for every day they served in the Army in this country and \$1.25 for every day served overseas—except for the first 60 days in each category, for which no payment was made. The average veteran received about \$550. In some cases payments were as low as a few dollars. In others they were as high as \$1,500. The amount depended on how long the former service man had been under the colors; also on whether he had borrowed on his adjusted-service certificate. About 38,000,000, \$50 bonds were distributed to the 3,500,000 veterans on the bonus pay day. And that day will go down in history as a red-letter day of social justice.

While our Government was providing this belated compensation to the ex-soldiers, Dean Carl W. Ackerman, of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, was flinging abuse at the recipients of the bonus. No meaner and no more unjust language was ever used than that of Ackerman when he called the veterans "privilege-hungry groups" threatening America's democracy and peace.

If I recall correctly, Ackerman was ardently in favor of the war. At that time he was urging another type of privilege—the privilege of going to Europe to be shot, gassed, blinded, gnawed by rats in the mud and mire, or imprisoned in the jails of another country. He thought that the soldier boys should consent to such a privilege without objection. He believed that it was "theirs not to reason why, theirs to do and die." Now, after they did their bit so bravely and uncomplainingly, he begrudges them the insufficient compensation they are getting far too late—and that some, who have gone to the Great Beyond, do not get at all. I have no patience with such reasoning. It is not reason. It is unreason. It is the stupidity of a man who does not know what he is talking about, or the selfishness of a man who vilifies the boys of 1917-18 by stigmatizing them as "privilege-hungry groups."

Can you imagine a more absurd statement or a more abominable misstatement of the truth than the assertion that "the payment of a three-billion bonus to those who served in the World War is a great national wrong"?

As a friend of the veterans, a friend of peace, and a foe of unnecessary wars, I brand such a remark as an insult to every American who served in that terrible conflict. The boys of nearly two decades ago did not seek purchase and they did not ask it. They went, for the most part, because they had implicit faith in the demand of their Government—except for a few who, equally honestly, believed that the World War was a tragic mistake and that they could be better citizens by suffering the penalties of resistance. The lords of money, the captains of industry, the barons of finance, stayed back here in America and accumulated mountains of dollars. It was they who wanted to be purchased. They were not purchased after all. By the legal trickery possible in such a period, they stole their profits—

to the everlasting sorrow of our America and to the everlasting disgrace of the profiteers.

Adjusted compensation should have been authorized and paid the day after the armistice. It took us who pioneered in the fighting for it nearly 18 years to have it paid in any form and at any time. We are glad that we succeeded eventually. And again, let me say, we have had enough of wars, grafters, the heroes of Hog Island, and the kaisers of all lands. If we ever participate in a war again, we shall try to be very certain that it is not a case of having the youth of America hurled into a hideous hell of butchery for the greed and gain of alien imperialists.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, JOSEPH WELLINGTON BYRNS, to whom we pay tribute today, was one of the truly remarkable men of his time, which time was, perhaps, the most epochal of our history—a singular, striking, and marvelously gifted man. Language is inadequate to portray him. Those of us who were fortunate enough to know him through years of strenuous service in this hallowed Hall can recall him in memory only. His boundless energy, his unremitting industry, his unrelenting spirit, the breadth and depth of his sympathies and tolerance, the scope and the power of his intellect may be recounted; but there was something more—that inimitable, indefinable personality, JOE BYRNS—which neither language nor the brush can adequately reveal. It is difficult to recognize that he has passed beyond the reach of human help or harm.

His life from youth to manhood and from manhood to a premature grave was one long incessant battle for his deep convictions and for his high ideals. He lived in a great epoch, as I have suggested, and his name is blended with its glories and achievements, its reverses, and its disappointments. Men have differed and will differ as to the soundness of his policies and the worth of his views, as is natural in a bipartisan government, but nobody who knew him could doubt his sincerity or challenge his purity of purpose. To inferior intellects many of his combinations appeared impossible, his plans quite impracticable, but in his hands simplicity marked their development and success vindicated their adoption.

Our departed friend was not born to a life of ease. He was born and reared on a farm in his native State, and by much self-abnegation, as we are told, he was graduated from the law department of Vanderbilt University. Thus he is another outstanding example of how unfavorable environment may not subjugate one with the stature of character of sufficient magnitude to single him out from the masses. He extended the area of his influence not only by gaining a place in circles of civic distinction and political achievement and by his close association with others most prominent in other worthy undertakings but also by a familiarity with the present-day needs and conditions of the humbler masses of our people and by keen and accurate observation of the trend of their movements and impulses. In the din of political strife he taught by precept and example that the country, as well as his district, had an imperative claim upon superior American activity, and that accumulation of wisdom was charged with an inexorable trust. He taught that frivolity and extravagance tend to the undermining of patriotic sentiment; he taught the equality of American citizenship, the independence of American enterprise, the honor of labor, and the wickedness of neglecting or in any way degrading free and intelligent suffrage.

Such teaching and influence have not been ineffective; but death has made them more solemnly impressive and has added a kind of consecration to the lofty example which we have too listlessly seen builded in our midst. If we may hope that this teaching and example have been endued by death with new potency, as forces creating better and purer citizenship, and with graver import as instrumentalities in the development and stimulation of patriotic ideals, and if we may hope that our countrymen will with sincerity heed the way of duty they point out, we may not only be doubly assured that our dead is not lost to us but may confidently

renew our faith in the American people as custodians of their scheme of free government.

Mr. BYRNS was well grounded in the fundamental principles of government; groomed in the traditions of the fathers and inspired by the teachings of Washington and Jefferson, he was an aggressive advocate and a dangerous antagonist. A clear and forceful speaker, he never approached a subject but that, given adequate time, he exhausted it. He was well equipped for his important task by temperament, studies, and political experience. Cool, cautious, deliberative, he was capable of prolonged concentration in intellectual work, which resulted in convictions securely based in profound study and adequate reflection. His mental equilibrium was not upset by gusts of passion, and he had no aptitude for attempts to sway others by tempestuous eloquence. He sought to convince, and he became formidable in debate because he was thorough in preparation and precise in statement. With his regard for the processes of reason, there was no acerbity in his disposition, and there was a notable absence of any assumption of undue superiority. Exceptionally modest, he was tolerant in spirit, temperate in speech, and conciliatory in action.

He was a devout Christian but hated religious intolerance. There was no duplicity in his make-up. He detested hypocrisy and loathed deception. Demagogy to him was despicable. He spurned pretense and despised sham. Candor, courage, and conviction were the dominating qualities of his matchless character. Truly may it be said of him also:

If treachery had come near him, it would have stood abashed in the presence of his truthfulness, his manliness, and his confiding simplicity.

In all the reaches of the earth there is no place just like this Hall. Those who rise to the headship of this House are few in number, and those who climb the heights to reach that headship compose a galaxy of jeweled characters, unsurpassed in any other assembled group in all the world. Students of history and lovers of country who are yet to be will visit here or read of these illustrious characters who have played such mighty roles in molding American history and shaped her course in every epoch of her journey. What a galaxy of stars to brighten the firmament of the past and light the Nation's future.

In the passing of the kindly soul of JOSEPH WELLINGTON BYRNS the Nation and this House have lost one of the most brilliant and beloved Speakers who ever occupied that transcendent office.

There is fresh in my memory that day many years ago when he first came here to represent his district. "Stovepipe" John W. Gaines had preceded him, and, therefore, the House as a whole was eager to meet the newcomer who had defeated that powerful Member.

Mr. Gaines was perhaps one of the greatest parliamentarians the House had ever known, although the charge was frequently made, and it was on this point that the election in his district hinged, that he took up too much of the time of the House by prolix discourses on procedure, precedents, and parallels between our Congress and the English Parliament.

The attention JOSEPH W. BYRNS attracted from the rest of the House because of his defeat of "Stovepipe" John stood him in good stead from that time. He came to know more Members than is generally the good fortune of a new Representative.

In the Sixty-first Congress he evoked the admiration of a great many of us when, in the fight against Uncle Joe Cannon, then Speaker, he remained steadfast and loyal to the small Democratic majority in the struggle to liberalize the rules of the House. Some, unfortunately, deserted the ranks of their fellow Democrats. Little did he sense at that time that a future day would herald his own advance to the exalted office of Speaker, with its unimaginable responsibilities.

His unflagging, assiduous, and intelligent activities were rewarded by membership on the powerful Committee on Appropriations, and later he became its able chairman. In that capacity he rendered services so outstanding as to elicit

the praise of all the members, and under his wise leadership the committee assumed a distinction it had never previously enjoyed.

When Speaker Garner became Vice President of the United States Mr. BYRNS' many friends thought he should be a candidate for the Speakership. As his lifelong friend and admirer, it caused me deep personal regret that I could not support him. Together with other Members I was anxious to retain him as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, where he had made his services so invaluable. But a few years previously the House had entrusted to that supercommittee the task of passing on all appropriations, and the splendid manner in which the difficult work was handled by Mr. BYRNS brought him the merited commendation of the entire House, regardless of political affiliations.

It so happened that at that time a truly distinguished Member from my own State, Illinois, was a candidate for the Speakership, and I, with others, felt that his long and honorable record unmistakably gave him first call upon our support. Moreover, the claim of the Middle West to that office was generally recognized as a fair one. I therefore supported this Member, the late Henry T. Rainey.

After consulting some of my colleagues, I approached WILLIAM BANKHEAD and urged that he become a candidate for the majority leadership.

At that time one of the most able and affable Members, the Honorable John McDuffie, was a candidate for the Speakership. I later learned that he had been campaigning for months and had the pledges of nearly a majority of the Democratic Members and the support of some of the leaders of the incoming administration. Mr. BANKHEAD, honor and duty bound to support Mr. McDuffie, came to me and frankly stated his position. This caused a complete change in strategy, and it was finally decided that we would, in the interest of Mr. Rainey's candidacy, have to abandon our hope of keeping Mr. BYRNS at the head of the Committee on Appropriations. With that end in view, we urged Mr. BYRNS to become a candidate for the majority leadership, to which he ultimately agreed. Thereafter the elections of Mr. Rainey as Speaker and Mr. BYRNS as majority leader were assured.

After the untimely death of Speaker Rainey, although many able Members were mentioned to succeed him, there was never any thought in my mind but that the commendable record of Mr. BYRNS, his exceptionally successful party and committee leadership, and merited popularity should attract the exalted honor.

On that sad day when Speaker Rainey was laid to rest at Carrollton, Ill., there being those who felt that the representation accorded to the great Midwest should not be lost, I was urged to become a candidate for the office which to my mind is second to the Presidency of the United States only. Nevertheless I strongly felt that JOSEPH W. BYRNS was the one man who should have that office; and in a conference that was called later that evening in St. Louis I urged him to yield to the widespread demands of his party that he become a candidate for the Speakership.

For 28 years I had known JOE BYRNS, but never was I more impressed with the sterling character of the good man than on that day. Even then, in the face of persistent urging, he modestly shrank from accepting the honor, arguing that others, too, were entitled to careful consideration in that connection. At length, however, he yielded, and, although some opposition naturally arose, long before the vote was taken it was conceded that he would be elected by unanimous vote of the Democratic Members, as he was.

I need not remind you how strenuous these last few years have been for him. You have seen him day in and day out, carrying a tremendous burden, helping the administration and the party to effect their great program for the amelioration and betterment of the conditions of our people.

JOE BYRNS always took the side of progress. Others might see obstacles in the path, might laboriously weigh the chance of defeat; this son of Tennessee pioneers saw always the promised land. "Forward" was ever the word. This was much more than a hopeful attitude; it was a happy instinct

for underlying realities, a recognition that progress is the law. He accurately sensed the predominance of good, of intelligence, and of kindness in the world.

Of course, our departed friend had a genius for friendship. The ability to see the best in men gave him a key to hearts. His happy, modest informality knew no barriers.

His long service for the public weal, beginning with membership in the lower house of the Legislature of Tennessee and going on to the second office within the gift of a free and enlightened electorate, seemed to him chiefly a record of warm, animating friendships. His work as Speaker meant much to him as an opportunity for wider, warmer contacts, and for effective, quickening strokes on the side of genuine progress. Such qualities, such purposes must march on.

In conclusion, let us realize our obligation to make safe and secure the government by the people which has been entrusted to our keeping. Let us remember that it can thrive and grow only in the atmosphere of popular devotion and unselfish attachment, and, above all things, let us open our hearts to such influences and teachings as emanate from the life and death which we today memorialize.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS HAVE DONE FOR THE VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I wish to call attention to some of the things that have been done for the ex-service men during this administration.

I presume no one who is familiar with my record or who has served with me in this House will question my devotion to the veterans' cause. If there be any who have such doubts, I refer them to the veterans themselves, and especially to those disabled men who are entitled to our first consideration, as well as to the widows and orphans of the ones who have passed away.

Conscious of the responsibility that rests upon me in the position I occupy, I do not hesitate to say that our veterans and their dependents are better cared for, better satisfied, and more contented today than they have been at any time since the close of the World War.

Those carping critics who attempt to stir up prejudice among the veterans by trying to create the impression that the Democrats are unfriendly to them are so overwhelmingly answered by the crushing facts of the records as to render them not only ridiculous but pathetic.

The veterans of the World War are now receiving pay for their adjusted-service certificates. On January 27 of this year a Democratic Congress voted overwhelmingly to pay this 18-year-old debt to the veterans and passed a law to pay the face value of their adjusted-service certificates and to cancel the interest after October 1, 1931.

Approximately 4,000,000 veterans are now enjoying the proceeds of this legislation, which finally passed the House by a vote of 325 to 61. Voting for it in the House were 250 Democrats, 65 Republicans, 3 Farmer-Laborites, and 7 Progressives.

The measure finally passed the Senate by a vote of 76 to 19. Voting for it were 57 Democrats, 16 Republicans, 2 Farmer-Laborites, and 1 Progressive.

The last Congress, which was also overwhelmingly Democratic in both Houses, restored all benefits to Spanish-American War veterans that had been taken away by the so-called Economy Act. This measure to restore these benefits is known as Public, No. 269, and was approved by President Roosevelt on August 13, 1936.

Certain Spanish-American War veterans who had directly service-connected disabilities were also given increases in pensions under the World War rate, which they still enjoy. Therefore, the Spanish-American War veterans are receiving more benefits than they enjoyed prior to the passage of the Economy Act.

The World War veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities have also been restored to their former rates enjoyed prior to the Economy Act, and the presumptively service-connected World War veterans have been restored to 75 percent of their former rates.

I think I ought to point out here that when what was called the Rankin bill to advance the presumptive period for World War veterans to January 1, 1930, was passed by Congress it was vetoed by President Hoover. Then the disability allowance bill was passed, leaving out the widows and orphans of the disabled men. In other words, it provided a certain amount of pay for the presumptively service-connected veteran as long as he lived, but when he died his widow and orphans were turned away without a penny, so far as compensation was concerned. That bill was rushed through under suspension of the rules, and we were denied any opportunity whatsoever to amend it. It not only cut to the minimum the compensation of the men we were trying to take care of but it invariably hastened his demise and added additional pangs to his death, in the consciousness that when he passed away his compensation would entirely cease and leave those dependent upon him unprovided for.

Besides, there was no provision in any veterans' law prior to the last Congress to take care of the widows and orphans of service-connected veterans who died from causes other than the ones for which they were drawing compensation. For instance, we had the case of a blind veteran who was groping his way across the street and was run down by an automobile. Although his eyes had been shot out on the western front, under the law his widow and orphans were denied compensation because he did not die of the disability for which he was drawing compensation. If a veteran who had his arm or leg shot off, or who was shell-shocked, or otherwise disabled, died of pneumonia or some other disability or cause other than the one for which he was drawing compensation, his unfortunate dependents were turned away without a penny of compensation at the hands of the Government he served.

During the Seventy-third Congress I introduced a bill to take care of the widows and orphans of the disabled World War veterans who die from causes other than the ones for which they were drawing compensation. It passed both Houses and was signed by President Roosevelt. This legislation brought to those unfortunate dependents a measure of justice they had been denied ever since the war closed.

During the session of Congress that has just closed our committee reported a bill, which I introduced, extending the provisions of this law to the widows and orphans of those veterans who had presumptively service-connected disabilities, but who died of other causes, and wiped out the vicious misconduct clause insofar as it applied to these dependents. That bill passed both Houses of Congress and was approved by the President.

I think I ought also to call your attention to the fact that during the previous Congress President Roosevelt, by Executive order, gave us one of the most complete programs for the construction and improvement of veterans' hospitals that has ever been put into effect at any time, setting aside more than \$20,000,000 for that purpose.

We also passed a measure to safeguard the estates of incompetent veterans and to protect them against the misuses of their funds by dishonest or incompetent guardians.

Hospitalization was restored to veterans of all wars and even to peacetime veterans, who were receiving compensation as result of disabilities incurred in the service.

We also provided compensation for World War veterans, Spanish War veterans, peacetime veterans, and nonveterans who were injured in the Florida hurricane, and for the dependents of the ones who lost their lives in that disaster, in accordance with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

I give you these facts to let you know that we have not been derelict in the care of our veterans who fought the Nation's battles in times of war, or in the discharge of our obligations to the dependents of the ones who were killed, wounded, or otherwise disabled as result of their services to their country.

It has been said that prosperity is a state of mind. Shakespeare once said that it is better to be with the dead "than on the torture of the mind to lie in restless ecstasy." What the disabled veteran wants is peace of mind, so that he may enjoy the years that are left to him without suffering those

agonies of uncertainty and disappointment to which I have referred.

I have devoted my time and efforts to try to prevent their unnecessary disturbance, to try to see to it that they are permitted to enjoy that peace and contentment to which their services entitle them, and that their dependents are reasonably cared for. Typical of the flood of letters I am receiving is the following one from a little woman in Miami, Fla., who writes as follows:

DEAR MR. RANKIN: In a cozy little home in this city two children slept while the widow of a veteran listened to your comments on the Democratic platform.

For the first time I learned how I might reach the originator of the Rankin bill.

I do not know if you ever hear from anyone who is benefiting by your bill, but I do want you to know that you are directly responsible for the family of a peacetime veteran who was not able to prove his wartime illness living like human beings for the first time since their provider lost his health.

He left us a short time ago for the long journey, and without the pension which your bill makes possible I shudder to think how I would raise and educate my children.

I also want you to know that a fervent prayer went up last night for success in your every venture.

Therefore it is a source of gratification to me at the end of 4 years of service as chairman of the Veterans Committee in the House under a Democratic administration to be able to say to the world that our veterans of all wars and their dependents are better cared for and more contented today than they have ever been at any time within the last 18 years.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM D. THOMAS

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, warm hearts and human sympathies know no party lines, no credal distinctions, no sectional separations.

Every Representative who knew WILLIAM D. THOMAS, of New York State, from the Twenty-ninth District of that great Commonwealth, felt honest affection for him. His death grieved us all.

Congressman THOMAS belonged to the Republican faith and I was not in accord with his position on many points. But I came to know him as generous, sympathetic, sincere, and earnest. With me he was a member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. In our sessions I found no trace of partisanship or pettiness in him. He joined hands with the rest of us in trying to do the best possible for the employees of the postal system. As a resident of a farming section, he knew, as I know, the burdens and sacrifices of the rural mail carrier. BILL THOMAS cooperated unselfishly and freely at all times in our efforts to raise the standards of living for carriers and for star-route contractors.

While adhering to the conservative program of the Republican Party, Mr. THOMAS had none of the jingoism and militarism so often found in G. O. P. ranks. He preferred peace and he deprecated bloodshed—as all humane citizens must.

We deeply miss this genial, kindly, lovable colleague in the House of Representatives.

I am more than glad to have the opportunity to pay a tribute to a Republican who was so democratic and so helpful as the late Representative WILLIAM D. THOMAS.

THE UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that has to do with the United States Soldiers' Home, located in the northeast boundary of Washington, I have looked into the operation of this institution during the last few years.

I want to take this opportunity to commend all who have anything to do with this home. I feel sure if all Members of Congress would visit this home several times, they would be as enthusiastic about its splendid services to our disabled soldiers and its economic management as I am.

Some weeks ago Congressman JOHN H. HOEPEL, of California, inserted an extension of remarks in the RECORD and embodied some figures and statements that were not in keeping with the real basal facts relative to the operation of this institution.

Being a member of the Committee, I know that certain statements in Mr. HOEPEL's extension of remarks were in error, and, therefore, I have gone into the details of the set-up of the United States Soldiers' Home, and at this time I am giving a compilation of some of the outstanding features of this wonderful institution.

JUNE 18, 1936.

(Memorandum for the Honorable JOHN B. SNYDER, M. C.)

The United States Soldiers' Home Reservation consists of approximately 500 acres, utilized as follows:

Two hundred acres occupied by buildings, grounds maintained as park, etc.

One hundred and seventy-five acres maintained as farm land for the benefit of the members of the home.

The remaining acres are left in their natural state of woodland as an attractive natural feature for the pleasure and benefit of the members.

The dairy herd of Holstein cattle, rated as the first accredited herd of the United States by the Department of Agriculture, produces approximately 300 gallons of milk per day, all of which is consumed for the needs and uses of the home. The cost of milk per gallon is approximately 33½ cents for the highest type of grade A milk, classified in the same grade as certified milk for invalids and children. Milk of equal quality is valued wholesale at from 65 to 75 cents per gallon. It has always been considered that the members of the home should receive the highest grade of milk obtainable, provided the cost was reasonable; and, while it is true that milk of a quality considered suitable for hospitals and other institutions can be purchased perhaps at about 2 cents less per gallon, the superiority of the product produced at the Soldiers' Home has always been considered well worth the slight increase in cost, as it adds to the health and contentment of the members.

The golf course maintained at the Soldiers' Home, at no cost whatsoever to the members of the home and maintained entirely by voluntary subscription, is open and available to any and all members of the home who desire to avail themselves of its advantages. No member of the home has ever been denied, criticized, or discriminated against for availing himself of the facilities of the course, and no member of the Soldiers' Home has ever been discharged, disciplined, or criticized for utilizing the course.

Attention is invited to the attached enclosure of an article which has just appeared in the Army and Navy Journal, setting forth a brief history and record of the origin and manner of conducting the United States Soldiers' Home.

Civilian employees of the home are hired for positions to which members of the home are not suitable, but employment with compensation is offered to approximately all members of the home who desire work within their physical capacity to perform skilled or manual labor.

[Enclosure]

THE UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME
HISTORY

The United States Soldiers' Home is the outgrowth of the dream of a great soldier, Gen. Winfield Scott, a dream in which he visioned an institution that would live and, while it would perpetuate the gratitude of a nation for faithful service, it would be a self-sustaining institution, thereby removing any burden of taxation from the people for its maintenance.

In February 1848 General Scott transmitted to the Secretary of War a draft for \$100,000 as part of the tribute levied by him on the City of Mexico for the benefit of the Army, and he expressed the hope that it might be allowed to go to the credit of an Army asylum. Again, in November 1849, in another letter he says, referring to the same matter:

"The draft was made payable to me, and in order to place the deposit beyond the control of any individual functionary whatever, I endorsed it 'The Bank of America will place the within amount to the credit of the Army Asylum subject to the order of Congress.'"

This \$100,000, with \$18,791.19 remaining from the same levy, together with an unexpended balance of some \$54,000 which remained in the Treasury from an appropriation made by Congress in 1847 for returning wounded and invalid soldiers of the War with Mexico to their homes, was appropriated in the organic act entitled "An act to found a military asylum for the relief and support of invalid and disabled soldiers of the Army of the United States", an act which was passed on March 3, 1851. Thus, through the untiring efforts of Gen. Winfield Scott, was founded an institution for the benefit of Regular Army soldiers that for the past 85 years has been a living memorial to the wisdom and foresight of this great and beloved soldier.

More than 99 percent of the operation and maintenance costs of the home since 1851 have been derived from the pay of the enlisted men of the Regular Army; further, with the one exception of the \$54,000 mentioned above, the funds disbursed for the support and maintenance of the home have never been taxpayers' money.

MANAGEMENT

In the organic act mentioned above the management of the home was vested in a board of commissioners composed of the principal officers of the United States Army. Though the composition of the board has been changed from time to time by legislative enactment, the basic idea of having the home administered by officers of the Regular Army has not changed in the least.

Today the board of commissioners is composed of high-ranking officers who have had long service.

Functioning under the board of commissioners is the governor of the home, who is assisted in the everyday running of the home by a deputy governor, secretary and treasurer, a chief surgeon, and a quartermaster. The governor and his assistants are retired officers of the Army.

INCOME

The act of March 3, 1851, provided funds for the initial establishment of the home and for its maintenance, as follows:

(a) Any unexpended balance of the appropriation of March 2, 1847, for the benefit of discharged soldiers disabled by wounds. Under this clause the sum of \$54,136.03 was provided for the initial fund.

(b) The sum of \$118,791.19 levied by the commanding general of the United States forces in Mexico.

(c) All stoppages of fines adjudged against soldiers by sentence of courts martial.

(d) All moneys, not exceeding two-thirds of the balance on hand, of the hospital and post funds of each military station. (This has been inoperative for many years.)

(e) All moneys belonging to the estates of deceased soldiers and unclaimed for 3 years.

(f) Twenty-five cents per month deducted from the pay of all soldiers of the Regular Army. This amount was reduced to 12½ cents per month in 1859 and in 1908 is was discontinued altogether.

(g) The income of the home today is derived from interest (3 percent) on money known as the Soldier's Home permanent fund (trust fund) deposited in the Treasury of the United States; stoppages and fines noted in (c) above; and the unclaimed estates of deceased soldiers of the Regular Army, noted in (e) above.

Other than the amounts noted in (a) and (b) above, there has never been a dollar appropriated by Congress for the Soldiers' Home. The soldiers of the Regular Army have provided the funds for the development and maintenance of the home, as indicated herein, i. e., contributions, fines and forfeitures, and unclaimed estates.

BENEFITS

The enlisted man of today may wonder why he is being required to contribute 25 cents a month to the trust fund of the home. The reason dates back to the soundness of General Scott's idea in establishing the home. General Scott loved his profession. Deeply implanted in his affection was the steadfast loyalty of the soldiers who shared with him the hardships of campaign and battle. He realized, as do the Regular officers of today, that all too often is the Regular soldier viewed by the man in the street as one paid to fight (which he is) in the defense of his country, and so, having fought a good fight, he is soon forgotten. The policy of the United States has ever been to depend on a small, highly trained Regular Army, augmented in times of national emergency by the National Guard, Reserves, volunteers, draftees, etc.

Those who become veterans of a national emergency become a political factor of such power that their services are remembered. Volunteer homes, veterans' facilities, pensions, etc., are established for their care. In the eyes of the people these things are but their due. After a long era of profound peace the expense to the taxpayer of these benefits will fade from the picture. But during this long period of peace the Regular Army is still in existence and in order that those who serve therein during this era of peace may be assured of care and comfort when disease, accident, or old age has rendered them unable to earn a livelihood, they have maintained, by their contributions a home to which they can go. It is their home in which they have bought an equity at little expense to themselves. They are not beholden to the taxpayers of the country. They themselves have insured their future comfort and security.

What will the enlisted man who has contributed to the home find there when, for one cause or another, he wishes to enter the home?

He will find awaiting him:

The handsomest home of its kind in the world located right in the heart of the National Capital, a dignified residence in which every good soldier may well swell his chest and be proud to call his home.

Clean, sanitary quarters with every convenience.

The best of food, excellently prepared and served in a spotless mess hall.

Neat, well-fitting clothing.

A cleaning and pressing establishment and laundry at his service.

Such amusements as the movies, radio, band concerts, a large well-equipped billiard and pool hall.

A fine library.

Beautiful grounds with well-kept roads and paths.

Hospitalization under a staff, expert and understanding. If tubercular, he will be sent to Fitzsimons General Hospital for care and treatment. If insane, he will be sent to St. Elizabeths for care and treatment. If he dies while in the home, he will be buried with full military honors.

There is no restriction on individual activities other than that necessary for the welfare of all.

Above all, he will be under the care of officers who have served long in the Regular Army and who know and understand the soldier.

The insignificant premium for such insured security must appear more than reasonable. Even though the enlisted man pays this for 30 years, he has but invested \$90 for future comfort and independence that today costs the home \$1.50 per day per member.

More than this, should the enlisted man the day after enlistment in the Regular Army be kicked by a mule or be otherwise so injured as to be incapable of earning his own livelihood, he has the right to enter the home because he has contributed to it, be it

only a fraction of the 25 cents. He will be cared for there until he is able to earn a livelihood. If the injury is such as to make him permanently incapable of earning a livelihood, the home is his so long as he desires to remain there, provided he conducts himself in a seemly manner.

As a prominent patriot often says, "Let us now take a look at the record." The original fund, as you have seen, consisted of \$118,000 that General Scott had levied on the City of Mexico for the benefit of the Army, plus \$54,000 of an appropriation for the benefit of disabled soldiers of the Mexican War. This sum, together with the income provided for in the organic act of 1851, was set up as a trust fund, known as the United States Soldiers' Home Permanent Fund, Trust Fund.

In the first 30 years there went into this fund, from all sources of income, the sum of \$4,969,367.89. In the same period there was expended for the purchase of land, equipment, and maintenance of members the sum of \$4,957,644.90, leaving a balance to the credit of the home of \$11,722.99. The peak of the permanent fund was reached in 1923 when it was, in round numbers, \$4,220,000. Since then the fund, due to the repeal of the 12 cents per month, has gradually decreased. From 1931 to March 31, 1936, receipts for the permanent fund amounted to \$2,133,511. Withdrawals from the trust fund for the maintenance of the home during the same period amounted to \$3,455,432, so that the average yearly decrease in the fund has been \$264,384. The permanent fund on March 31, 1936, was \$2,394,474.82. It is, therefore, easy to see how short a time this fine institution could continue to function with such adverse conditions prevailing. With the 25 cents a month now contributed by the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army to the permanent fund, and the possibility of some increase in one or more of the other sources of income, the permanent fund will again be on a sound basis and able to take care of increasing costs of maintenance due to the gradual increase in membership.

Can anyone conceive of a finer security insurance at such a low cost to the one benefited? There is probably no other such institution in existence, with the possible exception of the United States Naval Home in Philadelphia, Pa., which is maintained by the naval personnel.

The United States Soldiers' Home has been built and supported by money derived from the pay of enlisted men of the Regular Army. Congress makes no specific appropriation for its support out of public funds. The members of the home, feeling that it belongs to them, take pride in keeping it for themselves.

The management of the United States Soldiers' Home cordially invites the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army in and near Washington and any who may come to Washington to visit the home, that they may see what the home will mean to them personally, should they ever, through accident, disease, or old age, become incapable of earning a livelihood. They will never have to depend on the charity of relatives.

JUNE 9, 1936.

THE EDITOR, THE ARMY AND NAVY JOURNAL,
1701 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

SIR: The board of commissioners and the officers of the United States Soldiers' Home, who are entrusted by law with the management of the home, believing that the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army, your constant readers, would be much interested in learning through the medium of your valuable paper just what their monthly contributions to the fund of the home may mean to them personally, have had the enclosed article prepared.

The article has been carefully prepared from the records of the home, which date back to its establishment in 1851. In its 85 years of existence it has grown from an extremely modest beginning into an institution of which the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army may well be proud. This was made possible by General Scott's untiring efforts and by the steadfast adherence to his principle of having the Regular Army own and manage the home. For 85 years the basic principle in the management of the home has been "what is for the best interest of the soldier of the Regular Army."

You are at liberty to make such use of the article as you may deem best.

Sincerely,

J. P. WADE,
Colonel, United States Army, retired,
Secretary.

SPEAKER JOSEPH W. BYRNS

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, no death in recent years, unless it be that of ex-President Coolidge, has caused such profound grief and sorrow as that of the sudden and unexpected death of the late Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH WELLINGTON BYRNS, of Tennessee.

Seemingly in good health, active in the performance of his duties, racing forward toward adjournment of the Seventy-fourth Congress, which he so successfully led, he laid down his gavel on the Speaker's stand at 5 o'clock, June 3, 1936, only to fall asleep into the arms of death at 12:15 the same night.

There is no necessity for me to try to recite the educational and legislative achievements of JOSEPH W. BYRNS. That splendid record is written for all time in the annals of the Congress of the United States.

When I was first a candidate for Congress he was chairman of the congressional committee and as such contributed much to my election. When I first came to Congress he was among the first to greet me, and he gave me the aid, advice, and assistance, which is so greatly appreciated by new Members. Perhaps no Member of this or any other Congress ever gave more time to counseling and training new Members than Speaker BYRNS. That is why he was so universally loved by his colleagues and associates.

I had the delightful pleasure and privilege in the Seventy-third Congress of trying in part to repay him for his services by aiding in his election as majority leader; and again in the Seventy-fourth Congress in pledging my support to him as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Occupying the third highest position in the Government, JOSEPH W. BYRNS led a gallant and successful fight for the principles of his chief, the noble President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As majority leader in the Seventy-third Congress under his predecessor, the late Speaker Henry T. Rainey, he bore mutually with Speaker Rainey the great responsibilities of putting through Congress the largest collection of laws for social justice ever recorded in two Congresses in the history of the American Nation.

It is not too much to say that his labors in the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses, together with the burdens he bore, are indirectly, if not directly, the cause of his sudden demise. Virtually he gave his life for his country as much as any soldier on the field of battle, because the scene of his last 4 years was a battlefield for human rights and liberty for the great masses of the common people. No greater love hath any man than that he lay down his life for his friends and country.

He left us when he had perhaps reached the peak of his ambition and the zenith of his power and glory. He had satisfied what Arnold has called "the highest earthly desire of the ripened mind, the desire of taking an active part in the great work of government." He had achieved standing, influence, and power not only from his colleagues in the House but from the whole American people. He had won what men call success because of the fine character and arduous labor placed into his work. Yet the joy of the race ends with the goal. Although we may get little consolation from reflecting upon the thousands of mortals who have paid the debt of nature, yet if we realize that death is as normal as nightly sleep, then perchance our own fears may be allayed and our grief softened for one who has been called before us. But if death be sleep, shall we awake? That is the tragic question of the ages? No orator, no scholar, no philosopher, no statesman has ever answered that question with logic supported by the cold facts, which we group under the name of science. Yet, all through the ages man has relied upon something within himself; call it instinct, intuition, soul, or whatever you will; it confirms his faith in a supreme power. From faith, the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, springs the eternal confidence that if a man die he shall live again. Certainly there must be change, but into what shape we know not; but unbounded shall be our hope, supreme our faith, that somehow, somewhere, we shall live again. That was the faith and the hope and the courage of JOSEPH W. BYRNS.

He was the center of a happy family circle to whom we can only give sympathy and condolence. The bitter anguish of kindred, who loved the dead, cannot be assuaged by another's pity. Yet, if the burden of their sorrow can be lightened, even in small degree, by the knowledge that others, too, are grieving, my sincere hope is that these words may help toward that end. More confident, however, is our hope that when time, the healer, has dulled the agony of loss, and when memory becomes a solace and a pride, that these eulogies pronounced for our late Speaker will encourage the bereaved to let gratitude for a life outweigh grief for a death.

Though he has left us, may we with the poet say:

There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call death.

He has joined the ranks of other great Tennesseans; the intrepid soldier and statesman, Andrew Jackson; the leader during the Mexican War, James K. Polk; the conqueror, Samuel Houston; and the courageous Andrew Johnson. In his day and generation JOSEPH W. BYRNS contributed as much as they to American life and government. Honor and peace to his memory.

DEMOCRATS OPPOSE AND REPUBLICANS FAVOR ANTILYNCHING LAW

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of this session of Congress tonight there will be recorded a failure to enact an antilynching law.

It is deplorable that all the earnest and sincere effort that has been made to procure the passage of such legislation at this session of Congress is now doomed for failure. Indeed, it seems almost unbelievable that this legislation, which seeks to protect our colored citizenship from the outrages of mob violence and provide to them that measure of justice guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution, should not even be permitted to come before Congress for consideration and a vote. To some it might seem that such a thing could not happen in America, with its boasted representative form of government, yet that is what has happened during the present session of Congress, and for this unfair and un-American treatment of our colored citizens the Democratic Party is solely responsible.

DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF CONGRESS

Since March 4, 1933, there has been a Democratic President in the White House, and both Houses of Congress have been under the complete control of the Democratic Party. The overwhelming majority of Democrats in both Senate and House made it possible for the Democratic Party to do anything and everything it wished to do. It could have passed antilynching legislation if it had desired to do so.

The power of the Democratic Party to pass such legislation is clearly evidenced by the fact that in the present House of Representatives there are 315 Democrats and only 103 Republicans.

In the Senate there are 70 Democrats and only 23 Republicans. The Judiciary Committee of the House, to which was referred the proposed antilynching laws, consists of 18 Democrats and only 7 Republicans. These Democratic majorities in Senate, House, and committee leave no doubt that there could have been enacted antilynching legislation, if the Democratic Party had desired to do so. They had the votes and the strength to pass it, but they refused to do so. They turned a deaf ear to the thousands of appeals addressed to Congress by individuals, groups, and organizations, both white and colored, who were interested in the passage of antilynching legislation.

DEMOCRATS PREVENT CONSIDERATION OF ANTILYNCHING BILL

Furthermore, the determination of the Democratic Party to prevent not only the passage but even the consideration of such legislation on the floor of the House is clearly demonstrated by the refusal of Democratic leaders to recognize, by any action upon their part, the petition signed by 218 Members, more than a majority of the entire House, that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the proposed bill and the House thereby be permitted to vote upon its enactment.

If the Democratic Party is such a good friend of the colored people as it is now striving to have them believe, why has it buried all antilynching legislation in committee? Why has it not permitted the bill to come before Congress? Why has it not been willing to let the Members of Congress vote for its adoption? The answer is plain. The Democratic Party is not now and never has been in favor of the adoption of antilynching legislation.

REPUBLICANS SUPPORT ANTILYNCHING BILL

The antagonistic attitude of the Democratic Party as well as the friendly attitude of the Republican Party toward such legislation was demonstrated the last time such a bill was before Congress. At that time, on recommendation of a Republican President, it passed the House. There were 221 Republicans who voted for it and only 8 out of the 115 Demo-

crats did so. The legislation was killed by the Democratic Members of the Senate. And when the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill came up in the Senate at the last session of Congress, it was defeated by a filibuster conducted by Democratic Members.

In face of facts that demonstrate the need for antilynching legislation, it is difficult to understand how any political party can feel justified in refusing to give full-hearted support to its enactment or treat it with such evident disrespect as characterized the action of the Democratic administration during this session of Congress.

NEED FOR ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Testimony and records submitted in committee hearings showed that from 1889 to 1935 there were over 3,000 lynchings in 13 Democratic States, as follows:

Georgia	458
Mississippi	455
Texas	373
Alabama	340
Louisiana	249
Florida	242
Arkansas	242
Tennessee	209
Kentucky	174
South Carolina	140
Oklahoma	107
Missouri	92
North Carolina	90

And from 1882 to the present there have been 582 lynchings in the State of Mississippi alone. It is stated that more than 100 of those lynched were women. And, according to statistics submitted, less than one out of every six lynched was charged with rape or attempted rape. Hundreds were charged with only trivial offenses and many cases innocent of any offense at all. Justice is but a mockery when it is realized that although there were more than 3,000 lynched between 1889 and 1935, only in about 12 cases were there any apprehension and conviction of the perpetrators, and they were given only slight sentences.

In view of this unpleasant record of atrocious treatment of helpless colored citizens and the failure of justice in such cases to be either adequate or effective in granting them protection or providing compensation to their families, it is not strange that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, in making its report on the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill, stated:

A continuation of the practice of lynching, coupled with a complete failure of the government of those States involved to apprehend and punish the participators of these crimes, supports the need for Federal legislation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE APPEAL TO PRESIDENT

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in strong, clear, and forceful language, on May 7, 1936, made its appeal to President Roosevelt in the following message:

At Colbert, Ga., on April 28, and at Lepanto, Ark., April 29, occurred the seventy-first and seventy-second authenticated lynchings since you took office on March 4, 1933. These killings by mobs have occurred at an average of one every 15½ days since you have been the Chief Executive of this Nation. Since January 1934 the Government has had it within its power to pass a Federal antilynching law, but thus far the Costigan-Wagner bill has been sidetracked while unchecked mobs stage grisly parades every fortnight.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, together with more than 40,000,000 persons who have endorsed this legislation, urgently request your administration to bring this legislation to the floor of both Houses so that it may be considered upon its merits.

Notwithstanding the fact that the records show that about every 15½ days since President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party have been in complete control of our Government, there has been a lynching, and that in more than 95 percent of these cases the lynchings have occurred in Democratic-controlled States, yet no action has been taken either by the President or Democratic leaders in Congress to bring before Congress any one of the numerous antilynching bills that have been introduced to provide protection and relief to our colored citizens in States where justice fails.

PRESIDENT TAKES NO ACTION TO FORCE PASSAGE OF ANTILYNCHING LAW

Since March 4, 1933, the President has held such complete domination of the Democratic Congress that he could obtain passage of any and all legislation in which he was interested. He had merely to make known his wishes to Democratic leaders and they in turn would start the legislative wheels and grind out the desired legislation. So complete was the Presidential control of Congress that from time to time the President felt free to issue lists of what he termed "must" legislation. These lists were just what the name indicates—legislation that the President said "must" be passed. The Democratic Congress has never failed to respond. Every such demand has been complied with.

I have mentioned these conditions and made reference to legislative "must" lists prepared by the President in order to make plain that if antilynching legislation had been placed upon such "must" lists it likewise would have been passed. The failure of the President and Democratic leaders in Congress to place it upon any such "must" list indicates a complete lack of interest in or desire to have any antilynching legislation passed by Congress, and the statements made concerning it by Democratic leaders leave no doubt of an actual opposition upon their part to the passage of any such legislation. Under Democratic leadership this just and fair legislation seeking to right a great wrong to our colored citizens was placed upon a "must not" list instead of a "must" list, where it should have been.

The President had no difficulty in having a subservient Democratic Congress pass "must" legislation to control the growing of potatoes, peanuts, and rice, and to plow up wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco, and to kill pigs. All of this was done, notwithstanding the violation of constitutional principles. Yet when antilynching legislation was sought to control mobs, protect the rights of colored citizens, and stop unlawful killings, the same Democratic leadership claimed the existence of constitutional provisions against such legislation. Their action indicates they are more interested in peanuts, potatoes, tobacco, cotton, rice, wheat, corn, and pigs than they are in human beings who suffer from the ravages of mob violence.

And, notwithstanding this record of unfaithfulness to our colored citizens, the Democratic Party by numerous methods of propaganda, publicity, and through the oratory of its speakers is seeking to impress them with its solicitude for their welfare. To make its appeal more effective it is making every endeavor to withhold from sight the true facts of Democratic opposition to antilynching legislation.

REPUBLICANS FIGHT FOR PASSAGE OF ANTILYNCHING BILL

In the face of this Democratic opposition the Republican Party in Congress has sought by every conceivable means to procure favorable consideration of the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill or any other measure that would accomplish the same purpose. Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee have tirelessly striven to get the measure reported to the floor of the House for action, but the overwhelming Democratic majority of the committee has prevented. With other Republican Members of the House I have signed the petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill so that the membership of the House might act upon the same, but without success. The truth is that the Democratic Party is opposed to the adoption of any such legislation and will not let it come before the House for consideration.

In conclusion, I wish to give assurance that the discouragements of the past will not preclude my continuing interest in the enactment of adequate and effective antilynching legislation, and I shall continue my endeavors until full justice has been done and protection provided for our colored citizenship in their constitutional right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

DEADLOCKING A PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address I will deliver June 29, 1936, as follows:

Mr. Farley declares President Roosevelt will be returned to office by the same overwhelming vote as in 1932. Mr. Hamilton, chair-

man of the Republican committee, declares Mr. Landon will carry 42 of the 48 States. According to Mr. LEMKE, the candidate of the newly born Union Party, he will have so many votes that neither of the old parties will have a majority, there will be a deadlock in the electoral college, and the election of the President will be thrown into the House of Representatives.

As we cannot believe all these predictions, we are left to our own judgment.

The electoral-college system provides a crude method of counting votes, where only two candidates are in the field. Even then it is capable of tricky results.

With two strong parties in the field, a third party of sizeable strength cannot appear without creating a doubt as to whether or not the election will be by the votes of the people, or result in a deadlock to be settled by election of the President in the House of Representatives.

So far, the American field of politics has never developed a congenial climate for the endurance of third parties. They have flourished for their brief hour and declined as rapidly as they ascended.

In 1800, 1824, and 1876 the Presidential electors were, under the Constitution, unable to decide the election. In the first two instances the election was in the House of Representatives; in the latter instance a specially appointed electoral commission determined the result.

The provisions for the election of the President are among the most important sections of the Constitution. They are generally known, but little understood.

Why an electoral college? How does it provide for breaking deadlocks?

With difficulty the constitutional fathers decided upon the method of selecting the President. At that time there were no political parties as we now know them. The electoral college was designed for a nonpartisan government. It had two main purposes. One was to place the selection of the President in a small group of wise, experienced men, each of whom was to use his own discretion in voting for the best man possible for President.

When it was suggested the people should elect the President one of the delegates in the Constitutional Convention declared the people were no better qualified for that serious duty than a committee of blind men would be to select colors. That did not fully represent, however, the viewpoint of the constitutional fathers.

The other important reason for selecting the President through Presidential electors instead of by direct vote was to preserve to each State its relative strength in exercising the powers of the Federal Government. Each Colony was jealous of surrendering its individual powers to be swallowed up in the greater organization of the Federal Government. To assure each State a permanent part in the Federal Government according to its importance it was provided that each State should be represented in the lower House of Congress by Representatives in proportion to its population. To placate the distrust of the small States it was provided that in the upper House of Congress each State should have equal representation with every other State, each State to have two Senators.

This same distribution of power to the States was provided in selecting Presidential electors.

Opposition was made to electing the President by direct vote, because such a system of election would furnish no guaranty to the States of the preservation of their relative strength. The qualification of voters was left to each State. It was recognized that the proportionate number of people who would vote would greatly vary in the different States. In elections in recent years the number of people per hundred who vote in different States has varied from 10 or 15 up to 43.

Thus, the relative strength of the States in proportion to population could not be preserved by a Nation-wide vote regardless of State lines. The vote of the individual voter was not a common unit to measure the rights of the States in a national election. The electoral votes, granted uniformly to the States and mainly in proportion to population, furnished the common voting unit the States accepted as a means of preserving their just proportion of power in the Federal Government.

After the Federal Government started to function under the leadership of Hamilton on one side and Jefferson on the other, political parties rapidly developed. Those parties had defined purposes and knew what kind of a President they wanted. The people no longer wanted Presidential electors to use an independent judgment in selecting a President. The people wanted to use their own judgment. So beginning with the third Presidential election, and completing the change in the fourth Presidential election of 1800, delegates were selected to vote for party candidates, and pledged to that purpose in advance.

The discretionary power of the electors was taken away. Thus, one of the two original purposes of the electoral-college system ceased to exist.

Another important transformation of the system began and was completely consummated about 1832, except for unimportant exceptions. Many electors were originally selected by districts. This method frequently resulted in a division of the State electoral votes among different party candidates.

For years there was a struggle for and against minority representation in the State vote for President. Suppression of minority representation finally prevailed. Party interest was placed above public interest. Votes cast for minority party candidates are not only not counted for the minority, so far as electoral votes are concerned, but are actually counted for their opponents. The State unit vote still stands as a monument to the suppression of minority representation in the election of Presidents.

Presidential electors are selected on a plurality vote; that is, the set of candidates receiving the highest vote in the State is elected regardless of whether or not that vote be a majority.

Novel results frequently happen from this rule. In 1912 Mr. Wilson, with only 42 percent of the popular vote, received 82 percent of the electoral votes.

Suppose two candidates are running for President. The electors representing one candidate receive a majority of 5,000 in the State of New York, with its 4,500,000 voters, and the electors representing the opposing candidate receive a 5,000 majority in the State of Nevada, with its 3 electoral votes. Thus the total vote for the two candidates would be exactly equal in those two States, but in the electoral college the man who carried New York would have 47 electoral votes and the other candidate who carried Nevada would have 3. Although over 2,000,000 voters in New York voted for the minority candidate, he would receive no electoral votes whatever from New York.

In each of the last two Presidential elections over 38 percent of all the popular votes for President, representing probably 15,000,000 people, had no representation whatever in the electoral college.

Though no majority is required to elect an elector, the Constitution requires a majority of the electors to elect the President. If no candidate receives a majority, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives.

If Mr. LEMKE receives a sufficient number of electoral votes to prevent either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Landon from receiving a majority of all the electoral votes, the election will be decided in the House of Representatives.

The House is thus selected as a means of breaking a deadlock in the electoral college. The method of selection in the House is crude and archaic. Each State has but one vote. A majority is necessary to elect. New York, with 13,000,000 people, has no more votes than a State with 400,000. The majority of the Representatives from each State determine how the vote of that State shall be cast. If there is a tie vote, the State has no vote. Thus it might easily happen that the party which carried the country by a very substantial plurality would have only a minority of the votes in the House of Representatives and be unable to elect its candidate.

Under the "lame duck" amendment, the newly elected Congress would select the President. Where there are three candidates for President, all of whom have carried some States, it may well follow that the same division that made it impossible for any one party to get a majority in the electoral college will make such majority impossible in the House.

Then, in all probability, at least three parties will be represented in the membership of the House and no party may have a clear majority. Members from one party must vote for the candidate of another party if a President is to be selected. The practical results that follow from such a situation have been established by former elections in the House. Patriotic fidelity may prevail. The contest may resolve itself into a political auction, with each party bidding for sufficient votes from one of the other two parties to secure the election of its President. That means wire pulling, underground trafficking, and scandal, with the resulting reflection upon the title of the succeeding President, who becomes a beneficiary of the questionable method by which his selection was secured.

The whole electoral-college system, with its method of settling deadlocks is crude, antiquated, and unworthy of an intelligent, progressive people.

When the discretionary power to select the President was taken away from the Presidential elector there was no longer any reason for his existence. His position should have been abolished. The other great purpose of the electoral-college system, to preserve the relative strength of the State, could be preserved by retaining electoral votes without Presidential electors. Those votes should be divided between the candidates in direct proportion to their popular vote in the State. Thus we would still preserve the electoral vote as the common voting unit for all the States. Popular will would be justly reflected in electing a President.

The plurality vote should determine the election. A method that requires the settlement of a deadlock, through political trading and trafficking and scandal, in order to secure a majority vote, is far less desirable than a clean-cut plurality selection of the President. Thus we could abolish elections in the House of Representatives. We could assure the election of a President by a method that is just and certain in its results.

For 8 years I have been advocating this reform in our electoral system. Twice a committee of the House has reported unanimously in favor of this method.

At times in the past, when these deadlocks have occurred, the country was aflame with partisan feeling to such an extent that reform of our electoral system was impossible. Then when the bitterness had ceased there was a lack of general interest necessary to accomplish such reform. Ordinarily we get by under the present system. We see no immediate alarm. We have proceeded much like the man who could not build his roof when it was raining, and who did not need it when it was not raining. In the next few years, while our country is free from these bitter controversies of the past, we should consider, debate, and supplant our archaic system of electing a President by one that is just, honest, and certain in its operation.

THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY

Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address to be delivered by me before the Democratic national con-

vention, in Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1936, on the state of the country:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, it is my conception that the party which we represent here today was not founded for a single mission, which accomplished left it drifting with no fixed star or principle to guide it. It was born and has lived to uphold great fundamental truths of government that need always to be lifted and enforced.

This administration came into power with the distinct understanding that the forgotten man should be remembered, and that the Government should function not only for the rich and powerful but for the hungry and helpless. It was dedicated to the task of helping the underprivileged, in which group millions of American citizens find themselves today.

No thinking American was surprised a few years ago when a former Republican Vice President went to a Republican President and from the coffers of our Treasury received a so-called loan of \$90,000,000 for what was said to have been a defunct bank. This is the way the Republican Party does things. That party always lends a listening, attentive, and sympathetic ear to the cries and requests of the rich and the privileged. Not so with the Democratic Party. It is the party of the common people and stands for a square deal for all the people.

One of the most startling events in the recent political life of this Nation was a humble happening in the Delta of the Mississippi shortly after this administration came into power. Sylvester Harris, a Negro farmer living near Columbus, Miss., in some way heard that this was a humanitarian administration which had as a part of its program the lending of money to distressed home owners. This poor Negro, unlettered, dressed in overalls, sold a cow from his farm, and with the price of the cow called President Franklin Roosevelt at the White House, and said to him: "I am about to lose my farm through the foreclosure of a mortgage. I have no money with which to pay the mortgage. I understand that this Government through you will help people in my condition. Will you not help me?" Within less than 30 days money with which to pay this mortgage had been provided through the activities of this party and this man was once more a happy farmer, a happy and contented husband and father—a satisfied and progressive American citizen, realizing in his heart that under the Democratic Party this is a Government that reaches down and helps the forgotten man, the underprivileged citizens, be they white or black.

This is but one of millions of incidents where the Government, through the Democratic Party, has reached out a helping hand and saved deserving but helpless families. When has this Government been so close to the common people as it is at this very hour? You will be interested to know that while Harris has kept faith with the Government and met his payments, Mr. Dawes has defaulted and suit has been filed against him by the Government.

There is no doubt in my mind but that under this administration my group has been given the largest opportunity to share in the benefits and protection of the Government that has come to it for four decades. The Democratic Party as constituted today has said to the Negro, through the conduct of its program and through the action of our great President, "That any American, whether white, black, yellow, or brown, who is good enough to fight and die for his country should be given the largest and fullest opportunity to work and live for his country, and no privilege or opportunity vouchsafed to American citizens by the Constitution should be denied him."

There was a time when the late Frederick Douglas said: "That insofar as the Negro was concerned the Republican Party was the ship and all else the sea." That might have been true in his day, but certainly it is not true today. The Republican Party may be the ship, but I say to you the ship is on fire and, like the *Morro Castle*, is burning to the water's edge. The safety of my people consists in taking a life belt and plunging into the sea. By so doing, there is hope through the rescue agencies of the Democratic Party.

The so-called generous attitude of the Republican Party toward the Negro ended 30 years ago. The Grand Old Party long since deviated from its ancient doctrine of human rights in quest of material prosperity. It grew cold and indifferent toward its black ward and beneficiary and insisted upon weaning him. In the meantime the Democratic Party has been gradually growing not only less hostile but more friendly and considerate toward my group.

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens, these 12,000,000 of struggling Negroes in this country have not forgotten the economic conditions in which the Democratic Party found them in 1933 after having witnessed the Hoover prosperity in which we had neither chicken nor pot. For 3 long tragic years we heard the voice of a Republican President reflecting the sentiment of his party, telling us that prosperity was just around the corner. We discovered to our everlasting disappointment that prosperity was around the corner, but was going the other way. We know who saved the day. We know how our great President threw himself and the Government between the American people and actual starvation. At his inauguration he said that he would see that no American citizen starved; that promise has been kept, and instead of being a nation of starving, disgruntled, and dissatisfied people, ready to get at each other's throats, we are fast becoming a nation of contented and employed people, working for the advancement of our country. You ask me, now that the crisis is virtually past, what will be the attitude of my people in the coming election? I answer in

these words: "The Negro of America is a grateful people. We never have and we never will bite the hand that helps us."

Out of the turmoil of deliberate misrepresentation and vicious, cruel, and unwarranted attacks, will more than 30,000,000 grateful Americans march on the 3d day of November to say to the greatest President who has lived, that "We are with you, and by the grace of God, you shall serve us another term." Among these millions of grateful voters, you will see more than 3,000,000 of colored American voters marching breast to breast with you to the great victory that awaits the faithful and the true.

We shall stand with you in this matter as Crispus Attucks stood with the little group on State Street in Boston in pre-Revolutionary days. We shall stand as that valiant group of Negro soldiers stood with General Jackson in the Battle of New Orleans. We shall stand as the Negro soldiers stood with Theodore Roosevelt in his famous charge on San Juan Hill. We shall stand as the Negro soldiers stood side by side with you in the World War and faced the German cannon in Argonne Forest. History shows that we have always stood by our friends. We will not fail them now.

The name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is indelibly stamped upon the mind and heart of every Negro in this country. We look upon him as our greatest friend and benefactor. Our final word: "Mr. President, we are with you all the way."

WASTED WATERS

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire at this time to very briefly discuss H. R. 12678, a bill to provide for the control of flood waters in the Wisconsin Valley and for the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands, to create a Wisconsin Valley Authority. This bill also provides for the sale of surplus power on the aforementioned projects.

Keeping in mind the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in relation to the Tennessee Valley Authority in drafting this bill, it has been my purpose by the introduction of this legislation to make a beginning in the direction of utilization of the vast water-power resources of Wisconsin so as to bring to the people of my State and my city the benefits and advantages of cheap electrical rates. These great benefits are now being enjoyed, and will be enjoyed in the future, by the populace of other sections of the country where the development of natural resources has begun so auspiciously under the Democratic administration.

The power question and the development of natural resources for power purposes is unquestionably one of the greatest issues with which the American people have to deal during the next 25 or 50 years. It is a question that touches every business, every home, and every walk of life. From the beginning of the discovery of the principle of electricity, selfish and greedy groups of men have attempted to sequester and control the great natural resources of water used to develop hydroelectric power. In many States these great natural resources have been lost to the people for perhaps all time to come. In Wisconsin we have been fortunate in that we have not frittered away our inheritance as lavishly as have the people of other States, yet we constantly face the danger of losing all control of the vast water power available for the public benefit.

It has been ascertained that there is enough hydroelectric power now being wasted in the navigable streams of the Nation that, if properly harnessed, could be used to turn all the wheels of industry, light all the homes and halls, factories and mills, wash all the clothes, heat all the water used in America. In Wisconsin one of our greatest sources of wealth, with the exception of the soil, which gives sustenance to our fine herds of dairy cattle, and the factories, which produce a myriad selection of products for sale to all the world, is a vast supply of flowing water which can be turned to the generation of power.

Those who are familiar with the tremendous development at Muscle Shoals can realize, without the need of any descriptive powers of mine, the inherent power possibilities of the great Wisconsin Valley. The amount of hydroelectric power that can be produced at Muscle Shoals now is equal to the combined strength of all the slaves freed by the Civil War. It is safe to say that untold amounts of power can be generated along the lengthy reaches of the fast-flowing Wisconsin.

While some still hold to the theory that our streams should be private property, used only by private interests for private gain, I have maintained always that natural resources, made profitable only by the nearness of consumers to purchase the

output, make these resources primarily public property. These great resources constitute a national wealth which should and must be developed solely for the benefit of our citizens.

As instances of what the development of Wisconsin's vast water power would mean to the people and to the industry of our State, I quote here some comparisons between what is now being paid by people in various cities of America for power consumption and what is possible through the development of natural resources as exemplified by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When the Muscle Shoals bill was passed, the first 100 kilowatt-hours in Columbia, S. C., had been costing consumers \$8. Under the Tennessee Valley Authority contract the same number of hours will now cost \$2.50. The average annual consumption of electric power for domestic use in the Dominion of Canada, where power is supplied by publicly owned plants, is 4,321 kilowatt-hours, in comparison to only 603 kilowatt-hours in the United States. If we use 4,000 kilowatt-hours per month of electrical energy for domestic use in Quebec or Ontario as a basis for our comparisons, we would find this energy cost approximately \$30 to the citizens of Canada. These 4,000 kilowatt-hours per month in the United States, costing so little in Canada but so much here, cost the consumers of Bisbee, Ariz., \$164.40. In Fort Smith, Ark., \$290; in Denver, Colo., \$260; in Wilmington, Del., \$249.63; in Miami, Fla., \$281.90; in Boise, Idaho, \$162.30; in Quincy, Ill., \$240.85; in Winona, Minn., \$124.20; in Scottsbluff, Nebr., \$244.38. These figures were compiled by the National Electric Light Association in 1931.

To give the citizen of the rural districts an opportunity of comparing what his costs to operate his farm would be under the development of public power in Wisconsin, I include herewith a table of estimated monthly cost to farmers for certain items of electrical service in the Tennessee Valley area. Most people who live in country districts know the drudgery of country life. Rural electrification promises to be the greatest blessing that the women of the country have ever known. Not only will it give them lights and bring to them the marvels of the radio, but it supplies power for the iron and the churn, the washing machine, cream separator, the vacuum cleaner, and all the other conveniences that too few farm women in our State have known. The following schedule briefly shows what the use of the various equipment adds to the farmer's light and power bill under the yardstick for power costs established by the Tennessee Valley Authority:

Estimated monthly cost to farmers of following items of electrical service (Tennessee Valley Authority)

Item no.	Monthly bill	Service and appliance used
1	\$0.75	Lights.
2	1.00	Lights and radio.
3	1.50	Lights, radio, and water pump.
4	2.00	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, and percolator.
5	2.50	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, and washing machine.
6	3.00	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, washing machine, toaster, waffle iron, vacuum cleaner, food mixer, and fans.
7	3.50	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, washing machine, toaster, waffle iron, vacuum cleaner, food mixer, fans, and refrigerator.
8	5.00	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, washing machine, toaster, waffle iron, vacuum cleaner, food mixer, fans, refrigerator, and electric range.
9	6.50	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, washing machine, toaster, waffle iron, vacuum cleaner, food mixer, fans, refrigerator, electric range, and electric water heater.
10	8.00	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, washing machine, toaster, waffle iron, vacuum cleaner, food mixer, fans, refrigerator, electric range, electric water heater and operation of small farm motor for sawing wood, running feed mill, ensilage cutter, and miscellaneous small power requirements.
11	10.00	Lights, radio, water pump, electric iron, percolator, washing machine, toaster, waffle iron, vacuum cleaner, food mixer, fans, refrigerator, electric range, electric water heater, operation of small farm motor for sawing wood, running feed mill, ensilage cutter, and miscellaneous small power requirements, and light and power for 30-cow dairy.

For those in the city, and particularly in the great metropolitan areas which could easily and most economically be served by the surplus power that could be generated from the wasted waters of Wisconsin, I submit a table showing the domestic rates of the net monthly bills for typical residential

consumers. In the city of Milwaukee alone the savings possible in the use of 40 kilowatt-hours of energy, as compared with Toronto, show a saving of more than 100 percent for lighting and simple appliances and on 100 hours for refrigeration a saving of over 200 percent. These tables indicate the tremendous possibilities for comfort, convenience, and happiness made available by lower electric rates through the development of public power.

eration a saving of over 200 percent. These tables indicate the tremendous possibilities for comfort, convenience, and happiness made available by lower electric rates through the development of public power.

TABLE 2.—Domestic rates—Net monthly bills for typical residential customer

City and State	Popnlation	Company	(1)			(2)		(3)	(4)	(5)		Average monthly domestic consumption
			Lighting and small appliances			No. 1 plus refrigeration		No. 2 plus cooking	No. 3 plus water heating	No. 4 plus extra use		
			15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	750 kilowatt-hours	1,000 kilowatt-hours	
Atlanta, Ga.	270,000	Georgia Power Co.	\$1.00	\$1.45	\$2.12	\$3.95	\$4.95	\$6.57	\$8.57	\$11.36	\$13.92	73
Boston, Mass.	781,000	Edison Electric Illuminating Co.	1.05	1.65	2.40	5.20	6.70	9.70	12.70	18.70	23.70	52
Brooklyn, N. Y.	2,590,000	Brooklyn Edison Co.	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	38.05	50.55	38
Buffalo, N. Y.	573,000	Buffalo General Electric Co.	.75	1.13	1.70	3.06	3.81	5.31	9.06	12.81	16.56	66
Birmingham, Ala.	259,000	Birmingham Electric Co.	.98	1.55	2.30	4.05	5.30	7.80	12.55	16.30	20.05	40
Baltimore, Md.	804,000	Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co.	.75	1.25	2.00	4.18	5.86	8.98	12.22	15.22	18.22	60
Chicago, Ill.	3,376,000	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1.03	1.51	2.04	3.75	5.17	8.02	15.15	22.28	29.40	61
Cincinnati, Ohio	451,000	Union Gas & Electric Co.	.75	1.25	1.70	3.00	4.00	6.00	10.63	15.06	19.13	55
Detroit, Mich.	1,568,000	Detroit Edison Co.	1.03	1.39	1.93	3.53	4.65	6.90	9.96	13.90	16.72	58
Denver, Colo.	287,000	Public Service Co. of Colorado	.90	1.50	2.40	4.80	6.30	9.30	16.80	24.30	31.80	40
Dallas, Tex.	260,000	Dallas Power & Light Co.	.83	1.28	2.20	4.60	6.45	8.40	13.40	18.40	23.40	54
Indianapolis, Ind.	364,000	Indianapolis Power & Light Co.	.86	1.44	2.30	4.80	6.72	8.53	11.53	16.65	21.03	44
Jackson, Miss.	48,242	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	1.30	1.90	2.80	5.40	6.40	8.40	12.40	16.15	19.90	47
Milwaukee, Wis.	573,000	Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co.	.93	1.55	2.04	3.75	5.18	7.08	8.60	12.78	16.34	47
New Orleans, La.	453,000	New Orleans Public Service Co.	1.38	2.13	3.25	6.00	7.25	10.75	14.50	18.25	22.00	40
Portland, Oreg.	301,000	Portland General Electric Co.	1.00	1.38	1.95	3.39	4.29	6.09	8.09	15.14	18.27	87
St. Louis, Mo.	821,000	Laclede Power & Light Co.	.69	1.07	1.43	2.85	4.04	5.70	9.26	12.82	16.39	56
San Francisco, Calif.	634,000	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	1.00	1.63	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	12.45	14.95	53
Salt Lake City, Utah.	140,000	Utah Power & Light Co.	1.18	1.88	2.93	4.82	7.07	7.70	10.45	15.58	19.95	73
Philadelphia, Pa.	1,950,000	Philadelphia Electric Co.	1.03	1.58	2.40	4.45	5.95	8.70	11.70	16.83	20.70	48
Washington, D. C.	486,000	Potomac Electric Power Co.	.75	.98	1.56	3.60	3.95	5.67	10.10	13.85	17.60	68
Mean average			.98	1.49	2.20	4.23	5.62	7.93	12.06	16.99	21.46	55
Median average			1.00	1.50	2.12	4.18	5.86	7.85	11.53	15.68	19.90	54
Toronto, Ont.	626,674	Ontario Hydro Commission	.75	.75	.90	1.44	1.89	2.79	5.04	7.29	9.54	138
Port Arthur, Ont.	19,749	do	.68	.68	.84	1.32	1.73	2.80	4.83	6.85	8.88	186
St. Catharines, Ont.	26,192	do	.75	.75	.93	1.47	1.92	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	142
Ottawa, Ont.	130,672	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.05	2.88	3.92	5.05	6.17	311
Brantford, Ont.	30,724	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	142
Guelph, Ont.	20,754	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	99
Hamilton, Ont.	154,701	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	140
Kingston, Ont.	23,260	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.65	2.10	3.29	5.54	7.79	10.04	92
London, Ont.	73,173	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	196
Niagara Falls, Ont.	18,507	do	.75	.75	.92	1.51	1.97	3.04	5.07	7.09	9.12	205
St. Thomas, Ont.	16,275	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	155
Woodstock, Ont.	10,956	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	137
Port Williams, Ont.	25,188	do	.75	.86	1.20	1.87	2.32	3.52	5.77	8.02	10.27	416
Owen Sound, Ont.	12,803	do	.75	.86	1.20	2.01	2.46	3.65	5.90	8.15	10.40	83
Welland, Ont.	10,668	do	.75	.79	1.09	1.88	2.38	3.66	6.14	8.61	11.09	104
Sarnia, Ont.	17,801	do	.75	.79	1.26	2.29	2.78	3.77	6.25	8.72	11.20	97
Chatham, Ont.	16,223	do	.75	.86	1.20	1.97	2.54	3.82	6.30	8.77	11.25	88
Windsor, Ont.	65,565	do	.75	.81	1.30	2.38	2.92	4.00	6.70	9.40	12.10	165
Kitchener, Ont.	31,443	do	.75	.75	1.02	1.81	2.35	3.73	7.14	9.13	11.83	141
East Windsor, Ont.	14,333	do	.75	.81	1.30	2.38	2.92	4.00	6.70	9.40	12.10	108
Peterborough, Ont.	22,809	do	.75	.75	1.20	1.99	2.65	3.97	6.79	9.59	12.41	107
Mean average			.75	.77	1.07	1.82	2.29	3.45	5.79	8.05	10.35	155
Median average			.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.19	3.38	5.63	7.88	10.13	141
Tacoma, Wash.	106,837	City of Tacoma, department of public utilities, light division.	.68	1.13	1.80	2.40	2.90	3.90	6.40	8.90	10.60	117
Tupelo, Miss.		Tennessee Valley Authority rates.	.75	.75	1.20	2.50	3.50	5.00	6.90	7.90	8.90	103
Little Rock, Ark.	81,679	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	1.50	2.10	2.90	5.10	6.60	9.60	14.60	19.60	24.60	49

Business and the manufacturers are as interested and as much in need of efficient public power development as any other group; and to indicate the possibilities of savings which a planned and careful development of the water-power resources of our State would make possible, I include herewith

a table recently compiled on commercial rates, showing net bill costs and monthly commercial consumption for various cities both in the United States and Canada. The Canadian figures indicate the lower cost of public power development.

TABLE 3.—Table of monthly commercial rates—Net bills for billing demands and monthly commercial consumptions

City and State	0.75 kilowatt			3 kilowatts		6 kilowatts	12 kilowatts
	25 kilowatt-hours per month	50 kilowatt-hours per month	75 kilowatt-hours per month	150 kilowatt-hours per month	375 kilowatt-hours per month	750 kilowatt-hours per month	1,500 kilowatt-hours per month
Atlanta, Ga.	\$1.63	\$3.15	\$4.65	\$9.14	\$20.88	\$39.61	\$72.08
Boston, Mass.	1.88	3.75	5.63	11.25	28.13	53.75	102.50
Brooklyn, N. Y.	1.90	3.40	4.65	11.40	22.65	44.40	87.90
Buffalo, N. Y.	1.25	2.45	3.45	7.50	16.80	33.60	41.00
Birmingham, Ala.	1.88	3.25	4.75	12.00	18.75	37.50	70.00
Baltimore, Md.	1.25	2.50	3.34	7.01	14.57	29.14	51.55
Chicago, Ill.	2.29	2.93	3.56	10.43	16.16	32.33	64.65
Cincinnati, Ohio	1.25	2.50	3.45	7.50	14.72	29.43	58.86
Detroit, Mich.	2.12	3.02	3.92	10.26	18.36	36.72	73.44
Denver, Colo.	2.25	3.50	4.75	10.50	21.75	43.50	78.05
Dallas, Tex.	1.44	2.88	4.32	8.64	21.60	35.34	63.48
Indianapolis, Ind.	1.50	3.00	4.18	7.70	16.79	31.21	55.79
Jackson, Miss.	3.25	5.00	6.75	15.50	30.50	59.00	116.00
Milwaukee, Wis.	2.03	3.32	4.60	8.45	19.99	39.88	73.04
New Orleans, La.	2.13	4.00	5.50	10.00	22.75	41.50	69.00

TABLE 3.—Table of monthly commercial rates—Net bills for billing demands and monthly commercial consumptions—Continued

City and State	0.75 kilowatt			3 kilowatts		6 kilowatts	12 kilowatts
	25 kilowatt-hours per month	50 kilowatt-hours per month	75 kilowatt-hours per month	150 kilowatt-hours per month	375 kilowatt-hours per month	750 kilowatt-hours per month	1,500 kilowatt-hours per month
Portland, Oreg.	\$1.31	\$2.61	\$3.92	\$7.84	\$17.34	\$32.30	\$60.50
St. Louis, Mo.	2.01	2.73	3.44	9.50	15.91	32.16	62.86
San Francisco, Calif.	1.53	2.65	3.78	7.15	15.88	29.75	53.50
Salt Lake City, Utah	1.88	3.63	5.38	10.63	25.81	48.99	84.26
Philadelphia, Pa.	1.83	3.20	4.58	9.60	19.23	37.98	74.01
Washington, D. C.	.95	1.90	2.85	5.50	12.53	23.40	45.15
Mean average	1.79	3.11	4.35	9.40	19.58	37.69	69.42
Median average	1.88	3.02	4.32	9.50	18.75	36.72	69.00
Toronto	.90	1.80	2.30	5.40	10.53	21.06	42.12
Port Arthur	.81	1.20	1.62	3.65	6.38	12.76	25.52
St. Catherine	.76	1.15	1.55	3.78	6.38	12.76	25.52
Ottawa	1.07	1.57	2.06	5.24	8.55	17.09	34.18
Brantford	.76	1.15	1.55	3.78	6.38	12.76	25.52
Guelph	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.43	14.85	29.35
Hamilton	.76	1.15	1.55	3.78	6.38	12.76	25.52
Kingston	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.25	14.51	29.03
London	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.09	14.18	28.35
Niagara Falls	.85	1.28	1.70	3.83	6.61	13.19	26.39
St. Thomas	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.09	14.18	28.35
Woodstock	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.09	14.18	28.35
Fort Williams	1.02	1.58	2.14	4.73	8.78	17.55	35.10
Owen Sound	1.02	1.58	2.14	4.73	8.78	17.55	35.10
Welland	.95	1.44	1.94	4.32	7.70	15.39	30.78
Sarnia	.99	1.53	2.07	4.59	8.24	16.47	32.94
Chatham	1.02	1.58	2.14	4.73	8.64	17.28	34.56
Windsor	1.02	1.58	2.14	4.73	8.64	17.28	34.56
Kitchener	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.25	14.51	29.03
East Windsor	1.02	1.58	2.14	4.73	8.64	17.28	34.56
Peterborough	1.02	1.58	2.14	4.73	8.78	17.55	35.10
Mean average	.92	1.42	1.90	4.34	7.74	15.48	30.90
Median average	.90	1.35	1.80	4.05	7.43	14.85	29.03
Tacoma, Wash.	.88	1.75	2.63	5.25	11.25	22.50	42.00
Tupelo, Miss., T. V. A. rates	.82½	1.65	2.48	4.95	11.00	19.25	30.25
Little Rock, Ark.	2.25	3.75	5.25	12.25	25.00	46.75	80.25

Cheap electricity is the greatest boon that modern science can bring to the women and the families of America. It transforms the mother and the wife from a land and a life of drudgery to a land and life of freedom and development. It makes possible the enjoyment of those too few leisure hours of life to which the women of rural and urban America are so richly entitled.

Cheap electricity makes the difference between a State of few manufacturers and few opportunities of employment and a State humming with the wheels of industry and offering employment and opportunity to present and future generations. In the West and in the South, where power projects are under construction, new factories, new industries, new opportunities for employment are daily, weekly, and monthly on the increase. Cheap electricity not only benefits every farmer and industrial worker but adds billions to our national wealth from resources now running waste to the sea. Cheap electricity will make America the richest, the most contented, the most powerful, and the most prosperous nation in the world.

In drafting H. R. 12678, with the aid and assistance of those leaders in the House and the Senate who have done much to embark America on the beneficial development of our natural resources, I have kept in mind the principle that these natural resources can be developed and that the wasted waters of our rivers can be harnessed without destroying a single penny of the capital of private investors or working any hardships upon any of our citizens in any walk or occupation of life. While H. R. 12678 provides for the thorough and planned development of the Wisconsin Valley, the harnessing of surplus waters and control of flood waters, it also provides that power incidentally generated shall be sold to those distributing companies, whether private or municipally owned, that will and can agree to provisions which limit the resale of such power to the consumer at prices providing for not more than is necessary to return a fair and equitable profit upon invested capital.

The introduction of this measure is the only possible manner by which a thorough study and survey of the power possibilities of the Wisconsin River can be inaugurated by the War Department for report to the Congress. I am advised that this survey has begun and that reports of its

progress and findings will be made to the Congress. While the survey, beginning, and development of a project with such vast possibilities of prosperity and advantages for our people is not a matter of days or weeks but of months and perhaps years, I feel that by a proper beginning we have taken the first step toward progress in Wisconsin. Perhaps the task will be long and arduous. Unquestionably the opposition will be the same that has come from special privilege and special interests every time the people themselves have desired to improve their conditions through their own efforts.

While once many of us frowned upon public ownership of power resources, the vast majority have been convinced that we never can get power to the farm and city residents of this country at rates they should pay through private enterprise, but that it must come through public enterprise, or at least the public must own the power-production facilities. Propaganda, floods of money, misrepresentation, and opposition face the friends of any project designed to develop Wisconsin water power for this generation and the generations to come. Truth, fact, and right, however, have always survived such attacks and prosper despite criticism and calumny. In closing I want to impress one vital fact upon you: A great wealth of power is at the command of the people of our State in the Wisconsin Valley. It should and must be used for the benefit of the people. If used properly and in the public interest, every home, every factory in the State and the surrounding States can be electrified, and our people can enjoy the advantages of appliances and facilities that scientific developments of this great modern age have made possible.

Let us electrify Wisconsin and those surrounding areas through the development of our great power resources. When we have done that, we will have added one more glorious chapter to the history of a great country and a great State. We will have provided for the common good and promoted the general welfare. We will have laid the foundation for the building of a new civilization, prevented the destruction and economic losses of floods and droughts, and we will have brought to a great State a magnificent development that the ages cannot impair and time only add to in value.

TABLE NO. 1.—Typical monthly bills—Residential service

[Domestic and residential light and power rates in effect on Jan. 1, 1935, in cities of 50,000 population and over. These tables are taken from the preliminary report of the electric-rates survey made by the Federal Power Commission. In the column designed "Control" it is specified opposite the name of each company whether it is (I) independent, (S) subsidiary of a holding company, (M) municipally owned and operated]

CITIES OF 100,000 POPULATION AND OVER IN UNITED STATES

Name of community	Population, 1930 census ¹	Service supplied by—		Lighting and small appliances					Lighting, etc., and cooking			Lighting, etc., cooking and water heating				Average cost (cents per kilowatt-hours)					
		Control	Name of company	Date	Minimum bill		15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
					Amount	Kilowatt-hours, inclusive															
Akron, Ohio	255	S	Ohio Edison Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	\$0.50	10	\$0.75	\$1.20	\$1.80	\$3.83	\$5.08	\$7.08	\$10.08	4.80	3.83	2.83	2.02				
Albany, N. Y.	127	S	New York Power & Light Corporation.	do	.75	9	1.20	2.00	2.55	4.35	5.85	8.35	11.85	8.00	4.35	3.34	2.37				
Atlanta, Ga.	270	S	Georgia Power Co.	do	1.00	15	1.00	1.62	2.37	4.57	6.07	8.32	10.32	6.48	4.57	3.33	2.06				
Do	270	S	do	do	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.12	3.95	4.95	6.57	8.57	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.71				
Baltimore, Md.	804	I	Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore.	do	.60	12	.75	1.25	2.00	4.18	5.86	8.98	12.22	5.00	4.18	3.59	2.44				
Birmingham	259	S	Birmingham Electric Co.	do	.70	10	.98	1.55	2.30	4.05	5.30	7.80	12.55	6.20	4.05	3.12	2.51				
Boston, Mass.	781	I	Edison Electric Illuminating Co. of Boston.	July 1, 1934	.75	10	1.13	1.75	2.50	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.80	7.00	5.30	3.92	2.56				
Do	781	I	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.75	10	1.05	1.65	2.40	5.20	6.70	9.70	12.70	6.60	5.20	3.88	2.54				
Do	781	S	Boston Consolidated Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	.75	10	1.13	1.75	2.50	5.50	7.00	10.00	17.50	7.00	5.50	4.00	3.50				
Do	781	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.75	10	1.05	1.65	2.40	5.40	6.90	9.90	17.40	6.60	5.40	3.96	3.48				
Bridgeport	146	I	United Illuminating Co.	do	1.00	19	1.00	1.31	2.10	5.25	7.88	10.90	15.40	5.24	5.25	4.36	3.08				
Buffalo, N. Y.	573	S	Buffalo General Electric Co.	do	.75	15	.75	1.13	1.70	3.06	3.81	5.31	9.06	4.52	3.06	2.12	1.81				
Cambridge	113	S	Cambridge Electric Light Co.	do	.00		.75	1.25	1.90	3.40	4.65	7.15	13.40	5.00	3.40	2.86	2.68				
Camden, N. J.	118	S	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46				
Do	118	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46				
Canton, Ohio	104	S	The Ohio Power Co.	do	.50	7	1.05	1.75	2.50	4.60	6.10	9.10	11.80	7.00	4.60	3.60	2.36				
Chattanooga, Tenn.	119	S	Tennessee Electric Power Co.	do	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.38	4.58	6.08	8.33	11.83	6.52	4.58	3.33	2.37				
Do	119	S	do	do	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.13	3.95	4.95	6.58	9.70	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.94				
Chicago, Ill.	3,376	I	Commonwealth Edison Co.	do	.50	7	1.03	1.51	2.04	3.75	5.17	8.02	15.15	6.04	3.75	3.21	3.03				
Cincinnati, Ohio	451	S	Union Gas & Electric Co.	do	.60	12	.75	1.25	1.70	3.00	4.00	6.00	10.63	5.00	3.00	2.40	2.13				
Cleveland, Ohio	900	M	City of Cleveland, Department of Public Utilities.	do	.60	15	.60	.88	1.31	3.05	4.50	7.40	14.65	3.52	3.05	2.96	2.93				
Do	900	S	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	do	.60	15	.60	1.00	1.60	4.00	6.00	9.88	16.88	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.38				
Columbus, Ohio	290	S	Columbus Railway, Power & Light Co.	July 1, 1934	.50	8	.90	1.50	2.40	5.50	7.75	8.95	13.95	6.00	5.50	3.58	2.79				
Do	290	M	Columbus Division of Electricity.	Jan. 1, 1935	.50	9	.75	1.25	1.95	4.50	6.00	8.50	13.50	5.00	4.50	3.40	2.70				
Do	290	M	Columbus Division of Electricity.	July 1, 1934	.50	0-12	.75	1.25	2.00	4.75	6.75	8.30	13.30	5.00	4.75	3.32	2.66				
Do	290	M	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.50	0-12	.60	1.00	1.58	3.80	5.54	8.30	13.30	4.00	3.80	3.32	2.66				
Dallas, Tex.	260	S	Dallas Power & Light Co.	July 1, 1934	.50	8	.86	1.44	2.30	4.70	6.50	8.50	13.50	5.76	4.70	3.40	2.70				
Do	260	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.50	9	.83	1.38	2.20	4.60	6.40	8.40	13.40	5.52	4.60	3.36	2.68				
Dayton, Ohio	200	S	Dayton Power & Light Co.	do	.55	9	.90	1.50	2.30	4.90	6.40	9.40	12.78	6.00	4.90	3.72	2.56				
Denver, Colo.	287	S	Public Service Co. of Colorado.	do	.90	15	.90	1.50	2.40	4.80	6.30	9.30	16.80	6.00	4.80	3.76	3.36				
Des Moines, Iowa	142	S	Des Moines Electric Light Co.	do	.75	15	.75	1.25	1.97	4.10	5.70	7.45	9.70	5.00	4.10	2.98	1.94				
Detroit, Mich.	1,568	I	The Detroit Edison Co.	do	.45	5	1.03	1.39	1.93	3.53	4.65	6.90	9.96	5.56	3.53	2.76	1.99				
Duluth, Minn.	101	S	Minnesota Power & Light Co.	July 1, 1934	.25	4	.90	1.50	2.40	4.01	5.01	7.01	13.04	6.00	4.01	2.80	2.61				
Do	101	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.25	4	.90	1.50	2.40	4.01	5.01	7.01	9.51	6.00	4.01	2.80	1.90				
Elizabeth, N. J.	114	S	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46				
Do	114	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46				
El Paso, Tex.	102	S	El Paso Electric Co.	do	.75	9	1.20	2.00	2.70	4.90	5.90	7.90	10.40	8.00	4.90	3.16	2.08				
Erie, Pa.	115	S	Erie County Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	.71	8	1.22	2.02	3.23	5.94	7.84	11.64	21.14	8.08	5.94	4.66	4.23				
Do	115	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.70	9	1.13	1.75	2.50	5.50	7.40	11.20	20.70	7.00	5.50	4.48	4.14				
Do	115	S	Erie Lighting Co.	July 1, 1934	.71	8	1.21	2.02	3.23	5.94	7.84	11.64	21.14	8.08	5.94	4.66	4.23				
Do	115	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.70	9	1.13	1.75	2.50	5.50	7.40	11.20	20.70	7.00	5.50	4.48	4.14				
Evansville, Ind.	102	S	Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	16	1.00	1.52	2.18	3.81	5.03	7.46	10.61	6.08	3.81	2.98	2.12				
Do	102	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	16	1.00	1.50	2.25	4.35	5.35	7.10	10.25	6.00	4.35	2.84	2.05				
Fall River, Mass.	115	S	Fall River Electric Light Co.	do	.50	6	1.20	2.00	2.75	5.80	7.65	10.25	17.75	8.00	5.50	4.10	3.55				
Flint, Mich.	166	S	Consumers Power Co.	do	.50	5	1.26	1.83	2.28	3.56	4.56	6.56	9.31	7.32	3.56	2.62	1.86				
Fort Wayne, Ind.	114	M	Municipal Electric Light & Power Works.	do	.50	10	.75	1.25	2.00	4.60	6.60	9.10	16.60	5.00	4.60	3.64	3.32				
Do	114	S	Indiana Service Corporation.	do	.50	10	.75	1.25	2.00	4.60	6.60	9.10	14.00	5.00	4.60	3.64	2.80				
Fort Worth, Tex.	163	S	Texas Electric Service Co.	July 1, 1934	.50	8	.90	1.50	2.40	4.25	6.20	8.60	13.60	6.00	4.25	3.44	2.72				
Do	163	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	.50	9	.83	1.38	2.20	4.13	6.00	8.40	13.40	5.52	4.13	3.36	2.68				
Gary, Ind.	100	S	Gary Heat, Light & Water Co.	do	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.45	4.00	5.25	7.75	14.00	6.52	4.00	3.10	2.80				
Grand Rapids, Mich.	168	S	Consumers Power Co.	do	.50	5	1.26	1.83	2.28	3.56	4.56	6.56	9.31	7.32	3.56	2.62	1.86				
Hartford, Conn.	164	I	Hartford Electric Light Co.	July 1, 1934	.50		1.25	1.75	2.20	4.00	5.50	8.25	10.75	7.00	4.00	3.20	2.15				
Do	164	I	do	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.25	1.75	2.20	4.00	5.50	8.25	10.62	7.00	4.00	3.25	2.12				
Houston, Tex.	292	S	Houston Lighting & Power Co.	do	.50	8	.90	1.30	1.90	4.30	5.78	8.28	14.53	5.20	4.30	3.31	2.91				
Indianapolis, Ind.	364	S	Indianapolis Power & Light Co.	do	.65	10	.86	1.44	2.30	4.80	6.72	8.53	11.53	5.76	4.80	3.41	2.31				
Jacksonville, Fla.	129	M	Jacksonville municipal light plant.	do	.50	7	1.05	1.75	2.80	7.00	10.50	7.95	12.95	7.00	7.00	3.18	2.59				
Jersey City, N. J.	316	S	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46				
Do	316	S	do	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46				

TABLE NO. 1.—Typical monthly bills—Residential service—Continued
CITIES OF 100,000 POPULATION AND OVER IN UNITED STATES—continued

Name of community	Population, 1930 census	Service supplied by—			Lighting and small appliances				Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration				Lighting, etc., and cooking	Lighting, etc., cooking and water heating	Average cost (cents per kilowatt-hours)			
		Control	Name of company	Date	Minimum bill				100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours			25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
					Amount	Kilowatt-hours, inclusive	15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours										
Knoxville, Tenn.	105	S.	Tennessee Public Service Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	\$1.00	15	\$1.00	\$1.63	\$2.38	\$4.58	\$6.08	\$8.33	\$12.08	6.52	4.58	3.33	2.42	
Do.	105	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.13	3.95	4.95	6.58	9.70	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.94	
Long Beach, Calif.	142	I.	Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.	do.	1.00	20	1.00	1.25	2.00	4.75	7.00	7.00	9.25	5.00	4.75	2.80	1.85	
Los Angeles, Calif.	1,238	M.	Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light.	do.	.60	13	.72	1.20	1.81	3.31	4.56	6.31	8.81	4.80	3.31	2.52	1.76	
Do.	1,238	S.	Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation.	do.	.60	12	.72	1.20	1.81	3.31	4.56	6.31	8.81	4.80	3.31	2.52	1.76	
Do.	1,238	I.	Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.	do.	.60	13	.68	1.13	1.80	3.31	4.56	6.31	9.25	4.52	3.31	2.52	1.85	
Louisville, Ky.	307	S.	Louisville Gas & Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	.60	12	.75	1.25	2.00	3.80	5.30	8.30	12.05	5.00	3.80	3.32	2.41	
Do.	307	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.60	12	.75	1.25	2.00	3.80	5.30	8.30	10.80	5.00	3.80	3.32	2.16	
Lowell, Mass.	100	S.	Lowell Electric Light Corporation.	do.	.75	4	1.35	2.22	3.10	5.60	7.35	10.85	19.60	8.88	5.60	4.34	3.92	
Lynn, Mass.	102	I.	Lynn Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.75	11	.98	1.63	2.38	5.38	6.88	9.88	17.38	6.52	5.38	3.95	3.48	
Memphis, Tenn.	253	S.	Memphis Power & Light Co.	do.	.90	16	.90	1.38	2.20	4.25	5.75	8.75	16.25	5.52	4.25	3.50	3.25	
Miami, Fla.	110	S.	Florida Power & Light Co.	do.	1.00	8	1.71	2.76	4.18	6.16	8.40	10.40	15.40	11.04	6.16	4.16	3.08	
Milwaukee, Wis.	578	S.	Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co.	do.	.50	8	.93	1.55	2.04	3.75	5.18	7.08	8.60	6.20	3.75	2.83	1.72	
Minneapolis, Minn.	464	S.	Northern States Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	13	1.14	1.85	2.33	4.04	5.44	7.34	9.84	7.40	4.04	2.94	1.97	
Do.	464	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.19	1.66	2.18	3.80	4.89	6.79	9.29	6.64	3.80	2.72	1.86	
Nashville, Tenn.	153	S.	Tennessee Electric Power Co.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.38	4.58	6.08	8.33	11.83	6.52	4.58	3.33	2.37	
Do.	153	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	.00	1.45	2.13	3.95	4.95	6.58	9.70	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.94	
Newark, N. J.	442	S.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46	
Do.	442	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46	
New Bedford, Mass.	112	S.	New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co.	do.	.75	9	1.14	1.62	2.32	4.35	5.54	7.91	13.85	6.48	4.35	3.16	2.77	
New Haven, Conn.	162	I.	United Illuminating Co.	do.	1.00	19	1.00	1.31	2.10	5.25	7.88	10.90	15.40	5.24	5.25	4.36	3.08	
New Orleans, La.	458	S.	New Orleans Public Service Co., Inc.	do.	.25		1.38	2.13	3.25	6.00	9.25	10.75	14.50	8.52	6.00	4.30	2.90	
New York	6,930																	
(a) Bronx	1,265	S.	Bronx Gas & Electric Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
Do.	1,265	S.	New York Edison Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
Do.	1,265	S.	Westchester Lighting Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
(b) Brooklyn	2,500	S.	Brooklyn Edison Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
(c) Manhattan	1,867	S.	Brush Electric Illuminating Co. of New York.	do.	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
Do.	1,867	S.	New York Edison Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
Do.	1,867	S.	United Electric Light & Power Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
(d) Queens	1,079	S.	New York & Queens Electric Light & Power Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.30	1.80	2.55	5.55	8.05	13.05	25.55	7.20	5.55	5.22	5.11	
Do.	1,079	S.	Queens Borough Gas & Electric Co.	do.	1.00		1.28	2.13	3.20	6.25	8.75	12.75	20.25	8.52	6.25	5.10	4.05	
(e) Richmond	158	S.	Staten Island Edison Corporation.	do.	.95	10	1.35	2.15	3.11	5.51	6.91	8.91	13.91	8.60	5.51	3.56	2.78	
Norfolk, Va.	129	S.	Virginia Electric & Power Co.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.60	5.30	6.60	8.25	10.75	6.52	5.30	3.30	2.15	
Oakland, Calif.	284	S.	Great Western Power Co.	do.	.40		1.08	1.53	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	6.12	4.20	3.14	1.99	
Do.	284	I.	Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.	do.	.40		1.08	1.53	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	6.12	4.20	3.14	1.99	
Oklahoma City, Okla.	185	S.	Oklahoma Gas & Elec. Co.	do.	1.00	14	1.05	1.75	2.80	4.60	6.10	9.10	16.60	7.00	4.60	3.64	3.32	
Omaha, Nebr.	214	S.	Nebraska Power Co.	do.	.50	9	.83	1.38	2.20	4.25	5.75	8.15	11.90	5.52	4.25	3.26	2.38	
Paterson, N. J.	138	S.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46	
Do.	138	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46	
Peoria, Ill.	104	S.	Central Illinois Light Co.	do.	.75	10	1.00	1.50	2.01	3.81	4.81	6.81	10.31	6.00	3.81	2.72	2.06	
Philadelphia, Pa.	1,950	S.	Philadelphia Electric Co.	do.	.75	10	1.03	1.58	2.40	4.45	5.95	8.70	11.70	6.32	4.45	3.48	2.34	
Pittsburgh, Pa.	669	S.	Duquesne Light Co.	do.	.50	7	1.05	1.55	2.20	4.10	5.60	8.60	16.10	6.20	4.10	3.44	3.22	
Portland, Oreg.	301	S.	Northwestern Electric Co.	do.	1.00	18	1.00	1.38	2.05	3.72	4.62	6.42	10.92	5.52	3.72	2.57	1.18	
Do.	301	S.	Portland General Electric Co.	do.	1.00	18	1.00	1.38	1.95	3.39	4.29	6.09	8.09	5.52	3.39	2.44	1.62	
Providence, R. I.	252	S.	The Narragansett Electric Co.	do.	.50	3	1.28	1.93	2.91	5.81	7.31	9.84	14.84	7.72	5.81	3.94	2.97	
Reading, Pa.	111	S.	The Metropolitan Edison Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.25	3.40	5.50	7.00	9.50	14.50	9.00	5.50	3.80	2.90	
Do.	111	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.32	2.12	3.20	5.42	6.92	9.42	14.42	8.48	5.42	3.77	2.88	
Richmond, Va.	182	S.	Virginia Electric & Power Co.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.60	5.30	6.60	8.25	10.75	6.52	5.30	3.30	2.15	
Rochester, N. Y.	328	S.	Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation.	do.	1.00	12	1.15	1.65	2.40	5.00	7.00	10.00	12.25	6.60	5.00	4.00	2.45	
St. Louis, Mo.	821	S.	Laclede Power & Light Co.	do.	.50	11	.65	1.07	1.43	2.85	4.04	5.70	9.26	4.28	2.85	2.28	1.85	
Do.	821	S.	Union Electric Light & Power Co.	do.	.50	10	.71	1.19	1.71	3.13	4.32	6.22	9.78	4.76	3.13	2.49	1.96	
St. Paul, Minn.	271	S.	Northern States Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.28	1.96	2.39	4.10	5.53	3.83	11.94	7.84	4.10	3.35	2.39	
Do.	271	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.25	1.75	2.30	4.00	5.15	7.15	10.71	7.00	4.00	2.86	2.14	
Salt Lake City, Utah.	140	S.	Utah Power & Light Co.	do.	.90	11	1.18	1.88	2.93	4.82	7.07	7.70	10.45	7.52	4.82	3.08	2.09	
San Antonio, Tex.	231	S.	San Antonio Public Service Co.	do.	.50	7	.98	1.63	2.60	4.88	6.38	8.38	13.38	6.52	4.88	3.35	2.68	
San Diego, Calif.	147	S.	San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.90	12	1.07	1.65	2.51	4.59	6.09	7.88	12.88	6.60	4.59	3.15	2.58	
San Francisco, Calif.	634	S.	Great Western Power Co. of California.	do.	.40		1.08	1.53	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	6.12	4.20	3.14	1.99	
Do.	634	I.	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.40		1.08	1.53	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	6.12	4.20	3.14	1.99	

TABLE No. 1.—Typical monthly bills—Residential service—Continued
CITIES OF 100,000 POPULATION AND OVER IN UNITED STATES—continued

Name of community	Population, 1930 census	Service supplied by—		Lighting and small appliances						Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration	Lighting, etc., and cooking	Lighting etc., cooking and water heating	Average cost (cents per kilowatt-hours)							
		Control	Name of company	Date	Minimum bill		15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours				100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
					Amount	Kilowatt-hours, inclusive														
Scranton, Pa.	143	S	The Scranton Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	\$1.00	14	\$1.05	\$1.75	\$2.80	\$5.00	\$6.50	\$9.50	\$14.50	7.00	5.00	3.80	2.90			
Do.	143	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.45	4.85	6.35	9.35	12.05	6.52	4.85	3.74	2.41			
Seattle, Wash.	365	M	City of Seattle, department of lighting.	do.	.75	14	.85	1.40	2.20	3.40	4.40	6.30	8.15	5.60	3.40	2.52	1.63			
Do.	365	S	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	do.	.75	13	.83	1.38	2.20	3.40	4.40	6.28	8.15	5.52	3.40	2.51	1.63			
Somerville, Mass.	103	L	Edison Electric Illuminating Co. of Boston.	July 1, 1934	.75	10	1.13	1.75	2.50	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.80	7.00	5.30	3.92	2.56			
Do.	103	L	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.75	10	1.05	1.65	2.40	5.20	6.70	9.70	12.70	6.60	5.20	3.83	2.54			
South Bend, Ind.	104	S	Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.55	4.65	6.15	9.15	12.90	6.52	4.65	3.63	2.58			
Do.	104	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.40	4.30	5.55	8.05	11.70	6.52	4.30	3.22	2.34			
Spokane, Wash.	115	S	Washington Water Power Co.	do.	.70	12	.83	1.38	2.00	3.80	5.30	8.30	10.30	5.52	3.80	3.32	2.06			
Springfield, Ill.	149	S	United Electric Light Co.	July 1, 1934	.67	12	.83	1.38	2.20	4.60	6.38	9.38	16.88	5.52	4.60	3.75	3.38			
Do.	149	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.67	12	.83	1.38	2.20	4.60	6.35	9.10	15.35	5.52	4.60	3.64	3.07			
Syracuse, N. Y.	209	S	Syracuse Lighting Co., Inc.	do.	.90	12	1.05	1.55	2.10	3.90	5.40	7.90	12.90	6.20	3.90	3.16	2.58			
Tacoma, Wash.	106	M	City of Tacoma, department of public utilities.	do.	.50	11	.68	1.13	1.80	2.40	2.90	3.90	6.40	4.52	2.40	1.56	1.28			
Tampa, Fla.	101	L	Tampa Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	10	1.50	2.50	4.00	7.00	8.50	11.00	16.00	10.00	7.00	4.40	3.20			
Do.	101	L	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.50	2.50	3.40	6.25	7.75	10.00	15.00	10.00	6.25	4.00	3.00			
Toledo, Ohio	290	S	The Toledo Edison Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.25	1.75	2.50	4.90	6.40	9.40	16.90	7.00	4.90	3.76	3.38			
Trenton, N. J.	123	S	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46			
Do.	123	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46			
Tulsa, Okla.	141	S	Public Service Co. of Oklahoma.	do.	1.00	14	1.05	1.75	2.65	4.75	6.25	8.90	11.40	7.00	4.75	3.56	2.28			
Utica, N. Y.	101	S	Utica Gas & Electric Co.	do.	1.00	13	1.13	1.88	2.75	5.75	7.25	10.25	17.75	7.52	5.75	4.10	3.55			
Washington, D. C.	486	S	Potomac Electric Power Co.	do.	.75	19	.75	.98	1.55	3.60	3.95	5.67	10.10	3.92	3.60	2.27	2.02			
Wichita, Kans.	111	S	Kansas Gas & Electric Co.	do.	1.00	13	1.08	1.48	2.08	4.23	5.98	7.98	14.35	5.92	4.23	3.19	2.87			
Wilmington, Del.	106	S	Delaware Power & Light Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	13	1.13	1.88	2.78	5.48	6.98	9.98	17.48	7.52	5.48	3.99	3.50			
Do.	106	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	13	1.13	1.88	2.78	5.48	6.98	9.98	12.98	7.52	5.48	3.99	2.60			
Worcester, Mass.	195	S	Worcester Electric Light Co.	do.	.75	15	.75	1.25	2.00	4.85	7.00	8.50	13.50	5.00	4.85	3.40	2.70			
Yonkers, N. Y.	134	S	Yonkers Electric Light & Power Co.	do.	1.00	12	1.20	1.95	2.95	6.85	10.10	15.85	28.35	7.80	6.85	6.34	5.67			
Youngstown.	170	S	Ohio Edison Co.	July 1, 1934	.50	9	.83	1.38	2.20	4.80	6.03	8.00	11.00	5.52	4.80	3.20	2.20			
Do.	170	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.50	10	.75	1.20	1.80	3.83	5.05	7.08	10.08	4.80	3.83	2.83	2.02			

CITIES OF 50,000 TO 100,000 POPULATION IN UNITED STATES

Allentown, Pa.	92,563	S	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	\$1.00	10	\$1.38	\$2.13	\$3.20	\$5.70	\$7.08	\$9.08	\$13.20	8.52	5.70	3.63	2.64
Altoona, Pa.	82,054	S	Penn. Central Light & Power Co.	do.	1.00	11	1.35	2.00	2.84	5.84	8.34	7.89	12.64	8.36	5.84	3.16	2.53
Asheville, N. C.	50,193	S	Carolina Power & Light Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	10	1.50	2.25	3.00	6.00	8.50	9.65	12.65	9.00	6.00	3.85	2.53
Do.	50,193	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.50	1.88	2.40	4.25	5.25	7.25	11.00	7.52	4.25	2.90	2.20
Atlantic City	66,198	S	Atlantic City Electric Co.	do.	1.00	11	1.35	2.25	3.60	5.50	7.00	10.00	15.00	9.00	5.50	4.00	3.00
Augusta, Ga.	60,342	S	Georgia Power Co.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.62	2.37	4.57	6.07	8.32	10.32	6.48	4.57	3.33	2.06
Do.	60,342	S	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.12	3.95	4.95	6.57	8.57	5.80	3.95	2.03	1.71
Austin, Tex.	53,120	M	Municipal Water, Light & Power Department.	do.	.50	6	1.21	2.03	3.24	5.36	7.61	7.88	14.63	8.12	5.36	3.15	2.93
Bayonne, N. J.	88,979	S	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46
Do.	88,979	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46
Beaumont, Tex.	57,732	S	Gulf States Utilities Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	10	1.43	2.38	3.43	5.45	6.95	8.25	10.75	9.52	5.45	3.30	2.15
Do.	57,732	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.28	2.13	3.18	5.45	6.95	8.25	10.75	8.52	5.45	3.30	2.15
Berkeley, Calif.	82,109	S	Great Western Power Co. of California.	do.	.40	---	1.08	1.63	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	6.12	4.20	3.14	1.99
Do.	82,109	L	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.40	---	1.08	1.53	2.10	4.20	5.95	7.85	9.95	6.12	4.20	3.14	1.99
Bethlehem, Pa.	57,892	S	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.38	2.13	3.20	5.70	7.08	9.08	13.20	8.52	5.70	3.63	2.64
Binghamton, N. Y.	76,662	S	New York State Electric & Gas Corporation.	do.	1.00	---	1.53	1.88	2.40	4.50	5.50	7.50	12.50	7.52	4.50	3.00	2.50
Brockton, Mass.	63,797	S	Edison Electric Illuminating Co. of Brockton.	do.	.75	9	1.20	1.90	2.50	4.65	6.40	8.90	12.46	7.60	4.65	3.56	2.49
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.	56,097	L	Iowa Electric Light & Power Co.	do.	1.00	16	1.00	1.60	2.30	4.78	6.03	8.53	11.78	6.00	4.78	3.41	2.36
Charleston, S. C.	62,265	S	South Carolina Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.28	2.12	3.15	5.85	7.34	10.09	13.33	8.48	5.55	4.04	2.67
Do.	62,265	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	12	1.17	1.93	2.90	5.60	7.09	9.84	13.08	7.72	5.60	3.94	2.62
Do.	62,265	S	do.	do.	1.00	12	1.18	1.71	2.54	4.62	5.62	7.24	10.37	6.84	4.62	2.90	2.07
Charleston, W. Va.	60,408	S	Appalachian Electric Power Co.	do.	1.00	8	1.40	2.00	2.60	4.75	6.25	9.25	12.25	8.00	4.75	3.70	2.45
Charlotte, N. C.	82,675	S	Southern Public Utilities Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	13	1.14	1.84	2.50	4.95	6.63	9.34	16.84	7.36	4.75	3.74	3.37
Do.	82,675	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.80	10	1.13	1.78	2.40	4.20	5.60	8.10	11.60	7.12	4.20	3.24	2.32
Chester, Pa.	58,164	S	Philadelphia Electric Co.	do.	.75	9	1.13	1.68	2.50	4.55	6.05	8.80	11.80	6.72	4.65	3.52	2.36
Cicero, Ill.	66,602	L	Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois.	do.	.50	7	1.02	1.70	2.63	4.68	5.68	7.68	10.68	6.80	4.68	3.07	2.14
Cleveland Heights, Ohio.	50,945	S	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	do.	.60	15	.60	1.00	1.60	4.00	6.00	9.88	16.88	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.38
Columbia, S. C.	51,581	S	Broad River Power Co.	July 1, 1934	.80	11	1.08	1.80	2.88	5.60	7.10	9.60	14.60	7.20	5.60	3.84	2.92
Do.	51,581	S	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.75	11	1.05	1.65	2.40	4.65	5.90	7.90	11.65	6.60	4.65	3.16	2.33
Covington, Ky.	65,252	S	Union Light, Heat & Power Co.	do.	.60	12	.75	1.25	1.70	3.00	4.00	6.00	11.00	5.00	3.00	2.40	2.20
Davenport, Iowa	60,751	S	Peoples Light Co.	do.	.50	6	1.08	1.78	2.39	4.01	5.36	---	---	7.12	4.01	---	---
Dearborn, Mich.	50,338	L	Detroit Edison Co.	do.	.45	5	1.03	1.39	1.93	3.53	4.65	6.90	9.96	5.56	3.53	2.76	1.99
Decatur, Ill.	57,510	S	Illinois Power & Light Corporation.	do.	.75	12	.90	1.50	2.25	4.25	5.75	8.00	10.75	6.00	4.25	3.20	2.15

TABLE NO. 1.—Typical monthly bills—Residential service—Continued
CITIES OF 50,000 TO 100,000 POPULATION IN UNITED STATES—continued

Name of community	Population, 1930 census	Service supplied by—			Lighting and small appliances					Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration		Lighting, etc., and cooking	Lighting, etc., cooking and water heating	Average cost (cents per kilowatt-hours)					
		Control	Name of company	Date	Minimum bill		15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours			250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
					Amount	Kilowatt-hours, inclusive													
Durham, N. C.	52,037	S.	Durham Public Service Co.	July 1, 1934	\$1.00	12	\$1.20	\$1.90	\$2.80	\$5.40	\$8.90	\$9.65	\$15.90	7.60	5.40	3.86	3.18		
Do.	52,037	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	12	1.20	1.88	2.70	5.00	6.75	9.25	15.50	7.52	5.00	3.70	3.10		
East Chicago, Ind.	54,784	S.	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.	do.	1.00	11	1.35	1.90	2.55	4.55	6.05	9.05	7.60	4.55	3.62				
East Orange, N. J.	68,020	S.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46		
Do.	68,020	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46		
East St. Louis, Mo.	74,347	S.	East St. Louis Light & Power Co.	do.	.50	10	.71	1.19	1.71	3.13	4.32	6.22	9.78	4.76	3.13	2.49	1.96		
Evanston, Ill.	63,338	L.	Public Service Co. of Northern Illinois.	do.	.50	7	1.02	1.70	2.63	4.68	5.68	7.68	10.68	6.80	4.68	3.07	2.14		
Fresno, Calif.	52,513	S.	San Joaquin Light & Power Corporation.	do.	.50		1.18	1.63	2.20	4.30	6.05	7.95	10.05	6.52	4.30	3.18	2.01		
Galveston, Tex.	52,938	S.	Houston Light & Power Co.	do.	.50	8	.90	1.30	1.90	4.30	5.78	8.28	14.53	5.20	4.30	3.31	2.91		
Glendale, Calif.	62,736	M.	City of Glendale public-service department.	July 1, 1934	.60	12	.72	1.20	1.81	3.31	4.56	6.68	11.68	4.80	3.31	2.67	2.24		
Do.	62,736	M.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.60	13	.68	1.13	1.80	3.30	4.25	5.75	8.25	4.52	3.30	2.30	1.65		
Greensboro.	53,569	S.	Southern Public Utilities Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	13	1.14	1.84	2.50	4.75	6.63	9.34	16.84	7.36	4.75	3.74	3.37		
Do.	53,569	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.80	10	1.13	1.78	2.40	4.20	5.60	8.10	11.60	7.12	4.20	3.24	2.32		
Hamilton, Ohio	52,176	S.	Hamilton Service Co.	do.	.75	16	.75	1.13	1.80	3.75	5.00	7.50	13.75	4.52	3.75	3.00	2.75		
Do.	52,176	M.	Hamilton municipal electric plant.	do.	.50	11	.68	1.13	1.80	3.75	5.00	7.25	12.25	4.52	3.75	2.90	2.45		
Hammond, Ind.	64,560	S.	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.	do.	1.00	11	1.35	1.90	2.55	4.55	6.05	9.05	7.60	4.55	3.62				
Hamtramck, Mich.	56,268	L.	Detroit Edison Co.	do.	.45	5	1.03	1.39	1.93	3.53	4.65	6.90	9.96	5.56	3.53	2.76	1.99		
Harrisburg, Pa.	80,339	S.	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.21	1.64	2.28	4.83	6.95	9.08	13.20	6.56	4.83	3.63	2.64		
Highland Park, Mich.	52,959	L.	Detroit Edison Co.	do.	.45	5	1.03	1.39	1.93	3.53	4.65	6.90	9.96	5.56	3.53	2.76	1.99		
Hoboken, N. J.	59,261	S.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46		
Do.	59,261	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46		
Holyoke, Mass.	56,537	M.	Municipal gas and electric department.	do.	.50	12	.60	1.00	1.60	4.00	5.75	9.25	18.00	4.00	4.00	3.70	3.60		
Huntington, W. Va.	75,572	S.	Appalachian Electric Power Co.	do.	1.00	8	1.40	2.00	2.60	4.75	6.25	9.25	12.25	8.00	4.75	3.70	2.45		
Irvington, N. J.	56,733	S.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.46		
Do.	56,733	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46		
Jackson, Mich.	55,187	S.	Consumers Power Co.	do.	.50	5	1.26	1.83	2.28	3.56	4.56	6.56	9.31	7.32	3.56	2.62	1.86		
Johnstown, Pa.	66,993	S.	Pennsylvania Electric Co.	do.	1.00	11	1.35	2.25	2.70	4.50	6.00	8.00	13.50	9.00	4.50	3.20	2.70		
Kalamazoo, Mich.	54,786	S.	Consumers Power Co.	do.	.50	5	1.26	1.83	2.28	3.56	4.56	6.56	9.31	7.32	3.56	2.62	1.86		
Do.	54,786	M.	Kalamazoo division, lighting department public utilities.	do.	.50	8	.90	1.50	1.95	3.44	4.44	6.44	11.44	6.00	3.44	2.58	2.29		
Kenosha, Wis.	50,262	S.	Wisconsin Gas & Electric Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	.50	7	1.07	1.79	2.30	4.01	5.43	7.33	8.86	7.16	4.01	2.93	1.77		
Lakewood, Ohio	70,509	M.	City of Cleveland, Department Public Utilities, Division Light and Power.	do.	.60	15	.60	.88	1.31	3.05	4.50	7.40	14.65	3.52	3.05	2.96	2.93		
Do.	70,509	S.	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	do.	.60	15	.60	1.00	1.60	4.00	6.00	9.88	16.88	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.38		
Lancaster, Pa.	59,949	S.	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.38	2.13	3.20	5.70	7.08	9.08	13.20	8.52	5.70	3.63	2.64		
Lansing, Mich.	78,397	M.	Board of Water & Electric Light Commissioners.	do.	.40	8	.75	1.25	1.85	3.25	4.25	6.00	9.75	5.00	3.25	2.40	1.95		
Lawrence, Mass.	85,068	S.	Lawrence Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.75	8	1.35	2.05	2.80	5.30	7.30	11.30	17.55	8.20	5.30	4.52	3.51		
Lincoln, Nebr.	75,933	M.	City Hall Municipal Water & Light Department.	July 1, 1934	.40		1.05	1.43	2.00	3.99	5.66	8.98	17.29	5.72	3.99	3.59	3.46		
Do.	75,933	M.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.40		1.05	1.43	2.00	3.99	5.66	8.98	17.29	5.72	3.99	3.59	3.46		
Do.	75,933	M.	do.	do.	.40		1.05	1.43	2.00	3.71	5.13	7.74	13.68	5.72	3.71	3.10	2.74		
Do.	75,933	S.	Iowa-Nebraska Light & Power Co.	July 1, 1934	.40		1.05	1.43	2.00	3.99	5.65	8.98	17.29	5.72	3.99	3.59	3.46		
Do.	75,933	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.40		1.10	1.50	2.10	3.90	5.40	8.15	14.40	6.00	3.90	3.26	2.88		
Little Rock, Ark.	81,679	S.	Arkansas Power & Light Co.	do.	.60		1.50	2.10	2.90	5.10	6.60	9.60	14.60	8.40	5.10	3.84	2.92		
Macon, Ga.	53,829	S.	Georgia Power Co.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.62	2.37	4.57	6.07	8.32	10.32	6.48	4.57	3.33	2.06		
Do.	53,829	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.12	3.95	4.95	6.57	8.57	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.71		
Madison, Wis.	67,899	S.	Madison Gas & Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	.75	13	.82	1.22	1.68	2.88	3.88	5.88	10.88	4.88	2.88	2.25	2.18		
Do.	67,899	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.60	0	.94	1.17	1.50	2.73	3.73	5.60	9.98	4.68	2.73	2.24	2.00		
Malden, Mass.	58,036	S.	Malden Electric Co.	do.	.50	6	1.12	1.77	2.60	4.70	6.45	9.95	18.70	7.08	4.70	3.98	3.74		
Manchester, N. H.	76,834	S.	Public Service Co. of New Hampshire.	do.	1.00	10	1.50	2.34	3.24	5.36	6.36	9.36	13.36	9.36	5.36	3.34	2.67		
McKeesport, Pa.	54,632	S.	Duquesne Light Co.	do.	.50	7	1.05	1.55	2.20	4.10	5.60	8.60	16.10	6.20	4.10	3.44	3.22		
Medford, Mass.	59,714	S.	Malden Electric Co.	do.	.50	6	1.12	1.77	2.60	4.70	6.45	9.95	18.70	7.08	4.70	3.98	3.74		
Mobile, Ala.	68,202	S.	Alabama Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	15	1.00	1.55	2.30	4.05	5.30	8.00	12.25	6.20	4.05	3.12	2.45		
Do.	68,202	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.13	3.70	4.70	6.36	9.49	5.80	3.70	2.54	1.90		
Do.	68,202	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	15	1.00	1.55	2.30	4.05	5.30	7.60	11.35	6.20	4.05	3.04	2.27		
Do.	68,202	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.13	3.95	4.95	6.58	9.70	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.94		
Montgomery, Ala.	66,079	S.	do.	July 1, 1934	1.00	15	1.00	1.55	2.30	4.05	5.30	7.80	12.25	6.20	4.05	3.12	2.45		
Do.	66,079	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.13	3.70	4.70	6.36	9.49	5.80	3.70	2.54	1.90		
Do.	66,079	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	15	1.00	1.55	2.30	4.05	5.30	7.60	11.35	6.20	4.05	3.04	2.27		
Do.	66,079	S.	do.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.45	2.13	3.95	4.95	6.58	9.70	5.80	3.95	2.63	1.94		
Mount Vernon, N. Y.	61,499	S.	Westchester Lighting Co.	do.	1.00	8	1.56	2.36	3.41	7.31	10.56	16.31	28.81	9.44	7.31	6.52	5.76		
New Britain, Conn.	68,128	S.	Connecticut Light & Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	10	1.50	2.10	2.70	5.10	7.10	10.10	13.80	8.40	5.10	4.04	2.76		
Do.	68,128	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.50	2.10	2.70	5.10	7.10	9.35	13.30	8.40	5.10	3.74	2.66		
New Rochelle, N. Y.	54,000	S.	Westchester Lighting Co.	do.	1.00	8	1.56	2.36	3.41	7.31	10.56	16.31	28.81	9.44	7.31	6.52	5.76		
Newton, Mass.	65,276	L.	Edison Electric Illuminating Co. of Boston.	July 1, 1934	.75	10	1.13	1.75	2.50	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.80	7.00	5.30	3.92	2.56		
Do.	65,276	L.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.75	10	1.05	1.65	2.40	5.20	6.70	9.70	12.70	6.60	5.20	3.88	2.54		

TABLE NO. 1.—Typical monthly bills—Residential service—Continued
CITIES OF 50,000 TO 100,000 POPULATION IN UNITED STATES—continued

Name of community	Population, 1930 census	Control	Service supplied by—		Lighting and small appliances				Lighting, small appliances, and refrigeration	Lighting, etc., and cooking	Lighting, etc., cooking and water heating	Average cost (cents per kilowatt-hours)								
			Name of company	Date	Minimum bill		15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours				40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	150 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
					Amount	Kilowatt-hours, inclusive														
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	75,460	S.	Niagara Electric Service Corporation.	Jan. 1, 1935	\$0.75	15	\$0.75	\$1.13	\$1.70	\$3.06	\$3.81	\$5.31	\$9.06	3.52	3.06	2.12	1.81			
Do.	75,460	S.	Niagara Falls Gas & Electric Light Co.	do.	.75	15	.75	1.19	1.90	4.75	7.13	11.88	(9)	4.76	4.75	4.75	----			
Oak Park, Ill.	63,982	L.	Public Service Co. of North Illinois.	do.	.50	7	1.02	1.70	2.63	4.68	5.68	7.68	10.68	6.80	4.68	3.07	2.14			
Pasadena, Calif.	76,086	L.	Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.	do.	1.00	20	1.00	1.25	2.00	5.00	7.50	7.00	9.25	5.00	5.00	2.80	1.85			
Do.	76,086	M.	Municipal light and power department.	do.	.50	11	.68	1.13	1.80	3.30	4.45	5.95	8.20	4.52	3.20	2.38	1.64			
Passaic, N. J.	62,959	S.	(Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.48			
Pawtucket, R. I.	77,149	S.	Blackstone Valley Gas & Electric Co.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46			
Pontiac, Mich.	64,928	S.	Consumers Power Co.	do.	.45	5	1.03	1.39	1.93	3.53	4.66	6.91	9.25	5.56	3.53	2.76	1.85			
Port Arthur, Tex.	50,902	S.	Gulf States Utilities Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	10	1.43	2.38	3.43	5.45	6.95	8.25	10.75	9.52	5.45	3.30	2.15			
Do.	50,902	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.28	2.13	3.18	5.45	6.95	8.25	10.75	8.52	5.45	3.30	2.15			
Portland, Maine.	70,810	S.	Cumberland County Power & Light Co.	do.	1.00	12	1.20	1.88	2.63	4.73	5.73	7.73	12.73	7.52	4.73	3.09	2.55			
Pueblo, Colo.	50,096	S.	Southern Colorado Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	12	1.20	2.00	2.70	4.80	6.55	10.05	12.10	8.00	4.80	4.02	2.42			
Do.	50,096	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	12	1.20	2.00	2.70	4.50	6.00	9.00	11.50	8.00	4.50	3.60	2.30			
Quincy, Mass.	71,983	S.	Quincy Electric Light & Power Co.	do.	.50	7	.98	1.63	2.38	4.33	6.34	9.70	13.95	6.52	4.33	3.88	2.79			
Racine, Wis.	67,542	S.	Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co.	do.	.50	7	1.07	1.79	2.30	4.01	5.43	7.33	8.86	7.16	4.01	2.93	1.77			
Roanoke, Va.	69,296	S.	Appalachian Electric Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	12	1.20	2.00	3.20	4.75	6.25	9.25	12.25	8.00	4.75	3.70	2.45			
Do.	69,296	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.28	1.88	2.48	4.63	6.13	9.13	11.83	7.52	4.63	3.65	2.37			
Rockford, Ill.	85,864	S.	Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co.	do.	.50	7	1.02	1.56	2.16	3.96	5.36	8.16	11.91	6.24	3.96	3.26	2.38			
Sacramento, Calif.	93,750	S.	Great Western Power Co. of California.	do.	.50	-----	1.18	1.63	2.20	4.30	6.05	7.95	10.05	6.52	4.30	3.18	2.01			
Do.	93,750	I.	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.50	-----	1.18	1.63	2.20	4.30	6.05	7.95	10.05	6.52	4.30	3.18	2.01			
Saginaw, Mich.	80,715	S.	Consumers Power Co.	do.	.50	5	1.26	1.83	2.28	3.56	4.56	6.56	9.31	7.32	3.56	2.62	1.86			
St. Joseph, Mo.	80,935	S.	St. Joseph Railway, Light Heat & Power Co.	do.	.75	-----	1.50	2.00	2.55	4.35	5.85	8.60	14.85	8.00	4.35	3.44	2.97			
San Jose, Calif.	57,651	I.	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.50	-----	1.18	1.63	2.20	4.30	6.05	7.95	10.05	6.52	4.30	3.18	2.01			
Savannah, Ga.	85,024	S.	Savannah Electric & Power Co.	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.38	4.57	6.07	8.32	11.12	6.52	4.57	3.33	2.22			
Schenectady, N. Y.	95,692	S.	New York Power & Light Corporation.	Jan. 1, 1935	.75	9	1.20	2.00	2.55	4.35	5.85	8.35	11.85	8.00	4.35	3.34	2.37			
Shreveport, La.	76,655	S.	Southwestern Gas & Electric Co.	do.	1.00	14	1.05	1.75	2.65	4.75	6.25	8.75	11.25	7.00	4.75	3.50	2.25			
Sioux City, Idaho.	79,183	S.	Sioux City Gas & Electric Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	18	1.00	1.38	2.20	5.50	7.00	10.00	17.50	5.52	5.50	4.00	3.50			
Do.	79,183	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	18	1.00	1.38	2.20	5.10	6.60	9.10	14.10	5.52	5.10	3.64	2.82			
Springfield, Ill.	71,864	S.	Central Illinois Light Co.	do.	.50	10	.75	1.25	1.90	3.90	4.90	6.90	11.90	5.00	3.90	2.76	2.38			
Do.	71,864	M.	City Water, Light & Power Department.	do.	.50	10	.75	1.25	1.90	3.02	3.77	4.80	7.30	5.00	3.02	1.92	1.46			
Springfield, Mo.	57,527	S.	Springfield Gas & Electric Co.	do.	.75	5	1.25	1.75	2.50	4.50	6.00	9.00	16.50	7.00	4.50	3.60	3.30			
Springfield, Ohio.	68,743	S.	Ohio Edison Co.	do.	.50	7	1.08	1.80	2.70	4.70	6.20	9.20	12.20	7.20	4.70	3.68	2.44			
Terre Haute, Ind.	62,810	S.	Public Service Co. of Indiana	do.	1.00	15	1.00	1.63	2.40	4.30	5.55	8.05	14.30	6.52	4.30	3.22	2.86			
Topeka, Kans.	64,120	S.	Kansas Power & Light Co.	July 1, 1934	.50	8	.90	1.50	2.10	4.00	5.50	7.75	10.50	6.00	4.00	3.10	2.10			
Do.	64,120	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.60	9	.83	1.38	1.98	3.63	4.88	7.38	11.13	5.52	3.63	2.95	2.23			
Troy, N. Y.	72,763	S.	New York Power & Light Corporation.	do.	.75	9	1.20	2.00	2.55	4.35	5.85	8.35	11.85	8.00	4.35	3.34	2.37			
Union City, N. J.	58,659	S.	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	17.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	3.48			
Do.	58,659	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.35	2.15	3.20	5.30	6.80	9.80	12.30	8.60	5.30	3.92	2.46			
Waco, Tex.	52,848	S.	Texas Power & Light Co.	do.	.75	-----	1.60	2.15	2.90	5.50	7.00	8.60	13.60	8.60	5.50	3.44	2.72			
Waterbury, Conn.	99,902	S.	Connecticut Light & Power Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	10	1.50	2.10	2.70	5.10	7.10	10.10	13.80	8.40	5.10	4.04	2.76			
Do.	99,902	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	10	1.50	2.10	2.70	5.10	7.10	9.35	13.30	8.40	5.10	3.74	2.66			
West Los Angeles, Calif.	53,868	L.	Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.	do.	1.00	20	1.00	1.25	2.00	5.00	7.50	7.00	9.25	5.00	5.00	2.80	1.85			
Wheeling, W. Va.	61,659	S.	Wheeling Electric Co.	do.	1.00	8	1.40	2.00	2.60	4.75	6.25	9.25	12.25	8.00	4.75	3.70	2.45			
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	86,626	S.	Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.	do.	1.00	10	1.38	2.05	2.50	5.50	7.00	9.08	13.20	8.20	5.50	3.63	2.64			
Winston-Salem, N. C.	75,274	S.	Southern Public Utilities Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	13	1.14	1.84	2.50	4.75	6.63	9.34	16.84	7.36	4.75	3.74	3.37			
Do.	75,274	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	.80	10	1.13	1.78	2.40	4.20	5.60	8.10	11.60	7.12	4.20	3.24	2.32			
York, Pa.	55,254	S.	Edison Light & Power Co.	do.	1.00	1	1.66	2.14	2.76	4.66	6.08	8.93	13.68	8.56	4.66	3.57	2.74			
Do.	55,254	S.	Metropolitan Edison Co.	July 1, 1934	1.00	11	1.35	2.25	3.40	5.50	7.00	9.50	14.50	9.00	5.50	3.80	2.90			
Do.	55,254	S.	do.	Jan. 1, 1935	1.00	11	1.32	2.12	3.20	5.42	6.92	9.42	14.42	8.48	5.42	3.77	2.83			

COMPARE THE ABOVE RATES WITH THE FOLLOWING RATES WHERE POWER AND LIGHTS ARE FURNISHED BY PUBLICLY OWNED PLANTS

Tupelo, Miss.	7,000	M.	Tennessee Valley Authority	Jan. 1, 1935	\$0.75	25	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$1.20	\$2.50	\$3.50	\$5.00	\$6.90	3.00	2.50	2.00	1.38
Tacoma, Wash.	100,000	M.	City of Tacoma, Department of Public Utilities.	do.	.50	11	.68	1.13	1.80	2.40	2.90	3.90	6.40	4.52	2.40	1.56	1.28
Ottawa, Canada.	130,000	M.	Ontario Hydro Commission.	do.	-----	-----	.75	.75	1.02	1.74	2.05	2.88	3.92	3.00	1.74	1.11	.784

AGRICULTURE LEADS THE WAY TO PROSPERITY

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, since the Republican convention held at Cleveland, Ohio, has declared for the repeal of all of the laws benefiting agriculture, I think something should be said with reference to the benefits derived from the legislation passed by this and the last Congresses for the benefit of the agricultural industry of America, and especially for Illinois.

When the present administration took office on March 4, 1933, the prices of most farm commodities sold directly by the farmers were the lowest in the history of this country. The buying power of the farmers was destroyed because of such pauperous prices. They were heavily in debt, and their earnings from their farms in many instances were not sufficient to even pay the interest on their loans, not to mention principal.

In a few short months after the inauguration of President Roosevelt and the passage through Congress of beneficial agricultural legislation, solvency was restored to the American farmers. There has never been a time in the history of this country, not even during the World War, that agricultural commodity prices rose as rapidly as they did in the spring and summer of 1933; and those prices have been maintained on a stabilized basis down to the present day.

The policy of this administration is not a policy of scarcity; it is a policy of economic production at a profit to the farmers, just as much as economic production in industry supplies the needs of consumption. No Member of this Congress in either House or Senate, no Cabinet officer or any officer under him in the executive branch of the Government, have ever advocated a policy or system of scarcity. They advocate a policy of economic production to supply the needs of consumption at a profit to the farmers. I take pleasure, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in showing what has been done for the farmers of Illinois during the past 3 years; and what is true of Illinois is true of every State in the Nation.

AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT IN ILLINOIS

The agricultural improvement situation in Illinois for the years 1932 to 1935, inclusive, shows that the cash receipts from the sale of principal farm products in Illinois rose from \$228,661,000 in 1932 to \$363,476,000 in 1935, including \$34,009,000 in rental and benefit payments. This is an increase of 59 percent. Cash receipts for Illinois represent approximately 95 percent of the total farm cash income from production.

Mr. Speaker, the price changes on certain selected commodities, which brought about a considerable share of the increased cash receipts indicated above, are shown in a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture, which reads as follows:

Average prices received by Illinois farmers for commodities listed on dates specified

Commodity	Aug. 15, 1932	Mar. 15, 1933	Dec. 15, 1935
Wheat.....per bushel..	\$0.41	\$0.40	\$0.93
Corn.....do.....	.23	.15	.48
Oats.....do.....	.12	.11	.23
Barley.....do.....	.25	.23	.46
Rye.....do.....	.28	.28	.45
Buckwheat.....do.....	.50	.45	.45
Potatoes.....do.....	.55	.55	.75
Hay (all loose).....per ton..	5.30	4.80	7.60
Apples.....per bushel..	.70	1.00	.80
Hogs.....per hundred..	4.30	3.40	9.00
Beef cattle.....do.....	5.50	4.15	7.90
Veal calves.....do.....	5.30	5.40	9.10
Lambs.....do.....	4.80	4.70	9.30
Milk cows.....per head..	37.00	34.00	55.00
Chickens.....per pound..	.115	.085	.165
Butter.....do.....	.20	.18	.33
Eggs.....per dozen..	.137	.087	.295
Wool (unwashed).....per pound..	.09	.10	.25

For the United States as a whole, the yearly average price for all groups of farm products increased from 65 percent to 108 percent of the pre-war level during the period 1932-35, an increase of 66 percent. The low point occurred in March 1933, when prices were only 55 percent of the pre-war level,

whereas in December 1935 they averaged 110 percent of that level. These figures do not include rental and benefit payments. The gain in exchange value of farm products per unit was somewhat less than the gain in farm prices, since prices farmers pay for commodities used in living and production also advanced about 17 percent during the period. The exchange value per unit of farm products increased from 61 percent of the pre-war level in 1932 to 86 percent in 1935, a gain of about 41 percent.

FARM REAL ESTATE APPRECIATION

A new appreciation of farm real estate in Illinois has been one result of increased farm income. Voluntary sales and trades of farms increased from 13.6 per thousand for the year ending March 15, 1933, to 15 for the year ending March 15, 1935. During the same period the number of forced farm sales per thousand declined from 50.7 to 25.1. For the first time since 1920, the decline in value of farm real estate per acre halted in the year ending March 1, 1933, when it stood at a low of 54, the State average value from 1912 to 1914 being 100. From this low of 54 in 1933 the estimated value per acre rose to 61 for the year ending March 1, 1935.

IMPROVEMENT EXTENDED TO FARM LABOR CONDITIONS

On January 1, 1933, the demand for farm labor in Illinois was 41 percent below normal, and the supply was 28 percent above normal. At this time the farm wage rate per person, with board, was \$18.75 per month. Three years later, on January 1, 1936, the farm labor supply was 2 percent below normal. Demand was only 20 percent below normal; that is, it had improved 105 percent in the 3-year period. The farm wage rate per person, with board, stood at \$23.25 per month, having advanced 24 percent above the 1933 level.

SOIL-CONSERVATION PRACTICES UNDER A. A. A.

The programs of agricultural adjustment, from their launching in the spring of 1933, were concerned with good use of the land of cooperating farmers, as well as with adjustment of crop acreage in line with effective demand. Farm leaders and administration officials recognized from the start that relieving a proportion of farm land from the soil-exhausting burden of major crop production created an unprecedented opportunity for putting this land to the soil-conserving uses which farm specialists had been advocating for many years. The first corn-hog contract—that for the 1934 crop year—authorized use of the rented acreage only “for planting additional permanent pasture; for soil-improving and erosion-preventing crops not to be harvested; for resting or fallowing the land; for weed eradication; or for planting farm wood lots.” The first wheat contract contained similar provisions regarding the rented acreage. The cotton contract for 1934-35 specified use of the rented acres only for “soil-improving crops; erosion-preventing crops; good crops for consumption by the producer on his farm; feed crops for the production of livestock or livestock products for consumption or use by the producer on his farm; or fallowing; or such other uses as may be permitted by the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agent.” Food and feed crops for home use were authorized on rented acres in the South, as it was recognized that the standard of farm living in that region might thereby be improved. The tobacco contracts carried similar provisions. The corn-hog, cotton, and tobacco contracts further specified that the total acreage planted to commercial crops on a given farm be not increased over the acreage during the base period less the amount of the rented acreage.

These provisions meant a real net increase in the proportion of land on a given farm that could be put to less intensive uses through the adjustment contract.

In the 1934 crop year, the first in which the adjustment programs were in full swing, farmers agreed to shift nearly 36,000,000 acres. About two-thirds of these shifted acres were put in soil-building and soil-conserving crops, and one-third were used for emergency forage crops and for crops that supplied food and feed for home use. These shifted acres represented one out of every nine acres of cultivated

land in the country. Farmers in Illinois in 1934 shifted more than 1,700,000 acres from the production of corn, wheat, and tobacco.

DAIRY CATTLE DISEASE ERADICATION

In my State milk has been an important source of farm income. For the past few years over \$50,000,000 annually has been returned to milk producers.

Approximately \$50,000,000 of Agricultural Adjustment Administration funds have been made available for use in the country as a whole in eradicating cattle diseases, primarily bovine tuberculosis, Bang's disease, and mastitis. This work is being done in cooperation with the Bureau of Animal Industry. As of December 31, 1935, some 1,892,000 cattle in Illinois had been given the tuberculin test and approximately 136,000 the agglutination test for Bang's disease. Since the work of tuberculosis is financed by State and regular Department of Agriculture funds, no emergency funds have been expended by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in Illinois. My State was allocated \$800,000 for the eradication of Bang's disease and of this amount indemnities and operating expenses as of December 31 last totaled \$554,960.

EXTENT OF FARMER PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS

From the inauguration of the adjustment programs in 1933 through January 6, 1936, a total of about 284,122 crop-adjustment contracts signed by Illinois farmers had been accepted by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Of this number of contracts, 214,480 were corn-hog, 69,436 wheat, 140 sugar beet, 134 cotton, and 32 tobacco.

Four important referenda among producers were held in Illinois during the continuation of the agricultural-adjustment program. During the first 2 weeks in October 1934 corn-hog producers were asked whether they favored an adjustment program for 1935. In this referendum returns showed that 33,602 contract signers favored a 1935 program, while 11,111 opposed. In the Bankhead referendum conducted on December 14, 1934, to decide upon the applicability of the Bankhead Act to the 1935-36 cotton crop, 245 votes were cast in the State, of which 199 favored application of the act. A Nation-wide wheat referendum was held on May 25, 1935, in which producers were asked: "Are you in favor of a wheat production adjustment program to follow the present one which expires with the 1935 crop year?" In Illinois 23,706 votes were cast by producers, of which 21,177 or 89.3 percent, favored a program and 2,529 opposed. The last referendum in Illinois was that conducted on October 26, 1935, in which corn-hog producers were asked whether they favored a corn-hog program for 1936. Official returns indicated that 79,208 producers favored such a program while 5,605 opposed.

RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS

As of December 31, 1935, rental and benefit payments disbursed among cooperating producers in this State from the beginning of the program totaled \$56,886,049.18. Of this amount, corn-hog raisers received \$50,135,224.01; wheat growers, \$6,700,477.19; sugar-beet producers, \$45,296.60; cotton farmers, \$3,285.57; and tobacco producers, \$1,765.81.

Funds to provide these rental and benefit payments were raised through processing taxes. As of December 31, 1935, processing and related tax collections made at points in Illinois aggregated \$155,874,891.04. Processing taxes were collected through the medium of first processors, or converters of the raw product—millers, packers, cotton and tobacco manufacturers—wherever these processing establishments were located. They were paid by consumers throughout the Nation, wherever the processed products were sold.

THE DROUGHT EMERGENCY

Twelve counties in Illinois were severely affected by the drought of 1934. In this emergency A. A. A. rental and benefit payments, calculated on the farmers' production during a previous base period rather than upon the current year's production, served as a form of crop insurance. For their 1934 corn crop reduced to 146,760,000 bushels by the drought, Illinois farmers received only \$34,030,000 at the market; but their rental and benefit payments brought their cash income from the 1934 corn crop to \$51,731,000. This

was 4 percent more than they received for their 1932 crop, amounting to 402,179,000 bushels, which was more than two and seven-tenths times as large.

In 1934 drought threatened Illinois farmers with the loss of thousands of cattle and sheep by thirst and starvation. On June 19, 1934, the Emergency Appropriation Act was approved. It allotted \$525,000,000 to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for financing a drought program to relieve distress in certain areas of the United States. The object of the program was (1) to maintain the foundation for a balanced or diversified farming system in the drought areas; (2) to preserve animals or herds of high producing quality; (3) to relieve some of the financial load carried by both borrower and lender; and (4) to perform these tasks quickly, efficiently, and economically. The purchase and disposition of cattle was conducted jointly by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, the Federal Emergency Administration, and other governmental agencies. During September and October 2,587 head of cattle were purchased by the Government in Illinois at a cost of \$42,650.

In the seed-purchase program the A. A. A. acquired about 18,000,000 bushels of grain for seed in the Nation's drought-stricken areas. The cost to the Government of purchasing and selling these seeds amounted to about \$19,000,000. In Illinois alone nearly \$220,000 were spent in this work. The seed later offered for sale was accumulated to meet an emergency and was intended to supplement rather than to supplant locally obtainable supplies. Under this program about 15,000 bushels of seed and screenings were sold to distressed farmers in this State.

FARMERS' MONEY GOES TO TOWN

The extent to which increased farm income during the past 3 years enabled farmers to increase their purchases of city-made goods is reflected in a number of ways.

New automobile registrations in Illinois during the period 1932-35 have been approximately as follows:

1932	69,894
1933	97,224
1934	126,871
1935	205,248

The increase from 1932 to 1935 was 194 percent.

The purchases of new automobiles, among other things, meant an increased gasoline consumption. Consumption rose from 950,822,000 gallons in 1932 to 1,025,918,000 in 1934, and to 1,069,243,000 in 1935. From 1932 to 1935, therefore, the increase amounted to 12 percent.

The sales of new ordinary paid-up life insurance in Illinois increased by \$13,436,000, from \$489,567,000 in 1933 to \$503,003,000 in 1935.

Now, along with these indexes of increased business activity, resulting in part from renewed purchasing power, there have been others. Monthly statements issued by the Federal Reserve System indicate that debits to individual accounts increased greatly from 1933 to 1935. For 1933, debits in the Chicago Federal Reserve district amounted to \$32,129,366,000; but by 1935, according to preliminary figures, they totaled \$49,643,653,000, an increase of about 55 percent over the 1933 figure.

During a recent study of freight way bills on car-lot shipments of industrial products over four railroads, from 16 industrial States of the North, including Illinois, to 10 agricultural States of the Southeast, shows that shipments in the year ending June 30, 1934, were greater by 816,302,238 pounds, or 38.8 percent, than in the preceding 12 months. Shipments from the State of Illinois to these 10 Southeastern States totaled 471,597,096 pounds in the year ending June 30, 1933, whereas during the following year ending June 30, 1934, after the farm program and other recovery measures went into effect, the total was 589,605,633 pounds, an increase of 25 percent.

Illinois products of a widely diversified nature were affected by the increased buying. Several outstanding groups were farm implements and machinery, which increased by 212.5 percent, from 4,523,515 pounds to 14,134,078 pounds; automobiles, which increased by 110.5 percent, from 2,497,777 pounds

to 5,258,311 pounds; hides and pelts, by 103.1 percent, from 3,627,191 pounds to 7,366,063 pounds; refrigerators, by 103.1 percent, from 508,973 pounds to 1,019,264; wire and fencing, by 58.7 percent, from 15,607,536 pounds to 24,770,238 pounds; and gasoline, oil, and petroleum products, by 8.3 percent, from 142,088,937 pounds to 153,900,446 pounds.

Shipments from Chicago to the Southeast by way of the four railroads increased 36.8 percent, from 106,830,955 pounds to 146,145,430 pounds. Of the classes of products shipped, steel and iron products bulked the largest, with carlot shipments increasing from 15,656,053 pounds in the earlier year to 37,636,356 pounds in the later, or 140.4 percent. Shipments of industrial materials and supplies increased from 6,159,876 pounds to 9,578,077 pounds, or 55.5 percent. Food and related products shipments increased 9.3 percent, from 12,167,336 pounds to 13,299,202 pounds. The survey shows notable increases in the shipments of commodities used, especially by farmers. These included farm implements and machinery, tractors and parts, steel fence posts, wire and fencing, and wagons and wheels. Shipments of such commodities used by farmers totaled 3,810,945 pounds in the first year of the survey and 9,301,220 pounds in the second year. This represents an increase of 144.1 percent.

In a similar study of the freight waybills on five railroads of carlot shipments of industrial products, from the 16 Northern States to 10 Southwestern States, shipments were shown to increase from 2,398,582,166 pounds to 3,294,993,200 pounds, or 37.4 percent. For Illinois shipments increased from 969,169,842 pounds to 1,071,939,711 pounds, a gain of 10.6 percent. The above figures for the Southwest do not include coal shipments.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these facts, compiled by the Agricultural Department, as Government reports show conclusively, beyond a doubt, what this administration, under the leadership of our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has done for the farmers of America. They are not going to be deceived in this approaching campaign. The American farmers for the first time in history have been given a parity price and equality with industry, and they are going to the polls on November 3 and support not only the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, but support the men in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate who have made such a program possible.

JAMES P. HORNADAY—A GENTLEMAN OF THE PRESS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the necrology of the last eventful year will be forever memorable in respect to the unusually large number of illustrious persons who have been gathered to their fathers. It has been said—and seemingly with much truth—that “death loves a shining mark.” Never within my recollection as a Washington newspaper correspondent and as a Member of Congress, spanning a period of 35 years, has the grim reaper, in a similar period of time, laid such a heavy toll on both the Congress of the United States and the press gallery, which is so intimately associated with the workings of the legislative body. With unerring aim and bewildering suddenness death has removed, one after another, many of the most shining lights in the constellation of brilliant minds assembled here in the kindred occupations of making and recording history.

It is worthy of mention that in a period of less than 6 months death removed under circumstances that were amazingly parallel the stellar figure of the House of Representatives, Joseph W. Byrns, and the dean of the press gallery, James P. Hornaday, both equally outstanding and beloved in their respective spheres. Both died as they would have wished to die—in active service; Mr. Hornaday at his desk and Speaker Byrns just at the close of a hard day's work. In many respects these two great men, one eminent in the realm of statesmanship and the other distinguished in the art of gathering and writing news, were very much alike. They had the same lovable characteristics, the same high ideals, the same passion for service.

As one who was privileged to be associated with Mr. Hornaday for many years, when we were coworkers in the newspaper field, though on opposition newspapers, I doubt whether I could pay him a higher tribute than to make a simple statement that was true in regard to him, everlastingly and under all circumstances, and that simple statement of fact is this:

He knew when not to print the news as well as when to print the news.

A newspaperman who knows when not to print the news, and acts accordingly, is usually a man of courage, of big heart, and infinite compassion, and all of these qualities Mr. Hornaday possessed in marked degree. If the publication of a story would violate a confidence or do a grievous wrong or cause innocent hearts to ache, it could be taken for granted it would never see the light of day through any act of his. I have always believed that the ability to know what should not be printed is one of the highest qualifications of journalism, and certainly Mr. Hornaday had that discriminating judgment in a degree that approached perfection. As for myself, while I think I may modestly lay claim to my share of important “scoops”, I shall always feel as much pride in the stories I did not print as in the stories I did print. It was, I think, this ability of Mr. Hornaday to respect the rights of others and to feel the touch of human sympathy in a world where selfishness is too rampant that caused this genial and gracious journalist to become known far and wide as “a gentleman of the press”, a title conferred on him by President Roosevelt in February 1934, when he attained his fiftieth anniversary as a newspaperman. There was the warmth of genuine affection in President Roosevelt's voice when he called Mr. Hornaday to him during a White House press conference and said:

The nicest and truest thing I can say about you is that you are a gentleman of the press.

Mr. Hornaday's constructive and creative genius as a journalist was exemplified during 46 years of continuous service for one great newspaper—the Indianapolis News. When he was a slender, black-haired youth he began his active career in metropolitan newspaperdom on that paper as a reporter, and when his hair was silver with age he was still true to his first attachment, and always, in youth and age, he was the same understanding soul who liked to help others and who was never known to violate a confidence. He was indefatigable in the search for news and his dependability made him the friend and confidant of Presidents. He derived the keenest pleasure in helping young men who came to consult him in regard to a journalistic career, and his fondness for his fellow workers was demonstrated by his activity in organizations created in their behalf. He was one of the founders of the National Press Club and was a member and past president of the Gridiron Club.

There was no base alloy in the character of this good man. He was pure gold. He was not of that happily diminishing school of journalists of whom it is sometimes said, “They never allow the truth to spoil a good story.”

He was passionately wedded to the truth and the Nation-wide and honorable reputation which he achieved as a journalist was founded on accuracy. Many a time I have heard the statement solemnly made in regard to some newspaper article, “That story must be true because Jim Hornaday wrote it.”

What a tribute that was, implying as it did that there could be no doubt about the authenticity of an article because of the flawless reputation of the author!

In his private life Mr. Hornaday was a kind husband and father, a devout believer in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and an exemplar of good citizenship. His professional ideals helped to raise the standard of journalism in America and his journalistic career was a credit to American achievement.

I cannot bring this sincere tribute to an old friend to a more fitting close than by quoting the words of President

Roosevelt, spoken with visible emotion when he heard of the sudden death of Mr. Hornaday.

I share with his legion of friends the grief which the passing of James P. Hornaday has brought to all of us at this Christmas time—

said the President—

Dean of White House correspondents, he had through long years faithfully chronicled national events, not less admired for his talents as a newspaperman than he was beloved because of the beauty and strength of his personal character. There was—there is—among Washington newspapermen no gentler, truer soul than Jim Hornaday. We shall long remember him and miss him and mourn him and be thankful that we were permitted to know him and love him.

So say all of us who knew him.

MY DUTY AS A CONGRESSMAN IN TIME OF NATIONAL DISTRESS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 7 years this Nation has experienced a degree of distress that exceeds that of any other similar period in the entire history of our Nation. There has been no way of escape from its ravages by any class of our citizenship. Each has felt in a varying degree some measure of distress. To some it has meant an absolute wiping out of all the material things of life; to others it may have been loss sufficient to awaken fear as to the future ability to carry on; but to some extent all have experienced concern, discouragement, and fear.

In times such as these, what is the duty of a Member of Congress? What should be his attitude toward legislation proposed as a remedy for these distressing conditions? Should he be satisfied to give merely partisan consideration to such measures? Or should he study each proposal in the light of existing conditions and determine whether the proposed remedy will afford the relief that is necessary?

This naturally creates a situation whereby a Member of Congress must decide the extent to which he is willing to set aside party considerations and set up in place thereof the general welfare as of prime importance.

During these times of national stress and strain, both under Republican and Democratic administrations, I have permitted no other consideration than that which I conceived to be for the common good to dictate my actions and votes upon important matters of legislation. To have done otherwise would have given me a consciousness of being unfaithful to the duty expected of me.

To adopt this course of action necessarily creates criticism upon the part of those who feel that loyalty to a party can only find proper expression by a complete subordination of individual thought, the elimination of intelligent consideration, the adoption of no course other than what has been determined by others, regardless of what may be their peculiar interest in the result to be attained; in other words, a rubber-stamp variety of statesmanship.

Whatever may be said in behalf of such a type of statesmanship in normal times does not apply with equal force when the Nation faces a condition that threatens an economic and financial catastrophe involving millions of our people, destroying their opportunity for employment, robbing them of their homes and lifelong savings, placing them in need for the necessities of life, closing the door of opportunity for their children, and creating fear of the approaching insecurity of old age.

These are conditions that call for a statesmanship that recognizes the general welfare of our people as of paramount importance, that places the common good above party gain, that demands a service that goes beyond the restrictions of party labels, and requires of everyone in public office, no matter what may have been the party ticket upon which elected, to think only in terms of those in distress and give support to those measures and policies best calculated to restore and reestablish normal conditions, regardless of party origin.

Realizing as I do the importance of adherence to these principles, it has been my constant endeavor through all of these trying years to determine my course of action and vote upon each legislative measure presented to the House of

Representatives for its consideration solely upon the basis of its merits.

In the fulfillment of my desire to bring relief, provide security, and reestablish faith and confidence I have supported legislation to strengthen our banking structure, guarantee bank deposits, protect labor in its right to bargain collectively, provide means under Federal supervision to settle disputes by peaceful means, security against unemployment, old-age assistance, more adequate provision for the blind, the crippled, and the otherwise handicapped in life; pensions for those engaged in railroad transportation and security for those engaged in industrial pursuits; public-works programs to assist private industry in reducing the ranks of the unemployed; relief for those in necessitous circumstances that none may go unfed, unclothed, or without shelter; educational assistance to communities and individuals; credit for agricultural purposes to farmers; financial assistance to refinance distressed home owners faced with foreclosure, and make possible the construction of new homes and improvements to old ones; removal of slum areas; the building of low-cost housing projects to benefit those of low income and wage; immediate payment of veterans' bonus; disability compensation to veterans; and a multitude of other measures to promote the welfare of our people.

It would be difficult to sustain all that has been done as right, but it would be unjust to break down all that has been done as wrong. Mistakes may have been made that must be corrected in the light of the experience that has been gained. But, whatever estimate may be placed upon the value of the actual good accomplished, I am certain that as I have voted in favor or in opposition of proposed legislation, some enacted and some defeated, there has been no consideration other than the merit of the measure that has controlled or prompted my course of action or vote.

I have been continuously aware of the fact that when prosperity returns it will shine on Republicans and Democrats alike, and therefore faithful fulfillment of my duties as a Member of Congress requires my constant endeavor at all times to do only those things that will in my opinion prove helpful to all our people and refrain from such that may be otherwise, no matter from what party or source the proposal may originate, and such shall continue to be my course of action in the future as in the past.

WHISKY OVERPRODUCTION—WHAT TO DO

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the legislation to enforce the twenty-first amendment focuses attention on problems confronting both the Federal Government and the industry with respect to the traffic in spirits. Two and one-half years have passed since prohibition was repealed. During that time there has been reestablished in the United States the wine and spirit industry. The conditions under which this industry operates today are entirely different from those conditions which were true before prohibition. Beginning with repeal in December 1933, all the alcoholic-beverage industries were controlled by various codes of fair competition enforced by the Federal Alcohol Control Administration. The operations of these codes directed the energies of the various branches of the industry along economic lines differing from those which had been followed before prohibition was adopted in our country.

In the old days most distillers were concerned with the production, storing, and aging of whisky. They did little, if any, merchandising of goods in consumers' packages. Their sales were primarily to wholesalers and rectifiers. The customary procedure was for the distiller to make his whisky, place it in a barrel, and maintain these goods in a Government-bonded warehouse. He would finance himself in the main part by selling warehouse receipts to wholesalers and rectifiers who merchandised the whisky in bottles to consumers. Today practically all of the leading distillers not only make and store the whisky but they also pack the goods in smaller containers and advertise and sell these consumers' goods to the wholesale and retail trade. Legislative attempts have been made to permit return to the old regime, permitting again sales in bulk to rectifiers and wholesalers. Such efforts

have thus far failed. They will undoubtedly be renewed in the next Congress.

When prohibition was finally repealed the stocks of whisky on hand in the United States were so small that it would have been impossible to supply the demand for more than a few days. Importations of American-type whisky from Canada helped fill the gap in part, but in a major way the demand for whisky had been met by marketing whisky after a relatively short period of storage, or after blending with a small proportion of the matured whisky on hand in December 1933.

The distillers viewed their major problem as one of accumulating sufficient stocks of whisky in Government bonded warehouses to permit the aging and maturing in such volume as finally to attain the situation that existed just prior to the World War. At that time, roughly, there were in storage approximately 250,000,000 gallons of whisky, and each year there were withdrawn approximately 75,000,000 gallons of matured whisky, and at the same time the distillers would make approximately that amount and place the new whisky into bonded warehouse for aging.

A serious situation seems to confront the industry today. The Alcohol Tax Unit of the Treasury Department reports that at the close of May 1936 there were actually remaining in Federal bonded warehouses 281,000,000 gallons of whisky. Production is going ahead at a rate of approximately 22,000,000 gallons a month, and tax-paid withdrawals represent, as a rule, not more than 25 to 33 percent of the quantity produced. As a result, the accumulations are now reaching staggering figures. It is predicted that by the middle of summer the quantity of whisky in storage will have passed the 300,000,000-gallon figure. Certainly saturation point will be reached this fall. These figures cannot be viewed with complacency. They may constitute a decided menace.

Two problems present themselves because of this huge stock of whisky now in storage. One is purely an economic problem, and resolves itself solely on the ability of the distilling industry to finance this quantity of whisky and thus avoid the possibility of financially weaker firms being forced to throw the whisky on the market at sacrifice prices in order to meet banking and other financial conditions. The second problem is one which definitely involves the Federal control of the liquor industry. The question naturally arises, Where are the distillers going to find markets for the disposition of this huge accumulation of stocks? Will the distillers continue to keep on making whisky at a rate far in excess of the public demand? That would be suicidal. Will the economic pressure exerted by this huge accumulation force some of the smaller and more weakly financed firms to liquidate their stocks and to resort to markets which are legally closed to them today? That would be dangerous.

It is a well-known fact that the operations of bootleggers, smugglers, and producers of illicit spirits have been sharply curbed by the activities of the Treasury Department. Nevertheless, it is also recognized that a new illicit traffic has developed in the handling of legal tax-paid spirits. In the dry States there appears to be a steady flow of whisky and similar distilled spirits which were produced legally and which paid all Federal taxes. In States which maintain their own liquor-control systems, including State stores, it is also known that there is a considerable business of smuggling into these wet States legal tax-paid liquor to compete on a price basis with the spirits sold by the State. A minor form of illegal activity has developed in the smuggling of legal spirits from one wet State into another where the second State imposes a higher gallonage tax than the first State.

Bearing the foregoing operations in mind, there may be some justification for fearing that the gigantic stocks of whisky may be in part liquidated by sales under the conditions outlined above.

A great many different proposals already have been made with respect to what should be done to control the situation. It has been suggested that the distiller be put on a quota basis for production. Such a proposal would probably base a quota for production on present conditions and would tend to create

a monopoly, because the amount of goods produced by the smaller distillers would virtually be negligible. We had quotas under the N. R. A. The system worked badly. A return to it is unthinkable.

It has been suggested that the distillers reach a voluntary agreement to limit their production. One of the country's largest distilleries in Illinois is now using 20 carloads of grain daily. Instead of curtailment, there seems to be a general stepping up of production. It must be remembered, too, that agreement to limit production might probably be regarded by the Government as a conspiracy in the restraint of trade. It has been suggested that the able and efficient Administrator, Wilford S. Alexander, of the Federal Alcohol Administration, refuse to grant any more permits to new distilling enterprises or for extensions in plant capacity of existing distilleries. All of these proposals go against some of the fundamental business concepts of our country.

Overproduction and accumulation of stocks is not something new for the distilled-spirits industry. The same thing has happened in a thousand and one other industries, and the final cure has been evolved by the same process and the same weeding out of firms who cannot stand the financial burden and who have refused to recognize that the basic laws of supply and demand are still in existence. In my opinion, the Government should participate only in a limited way at this juncture in this problem of overproduction of whisky. It should, of course, prevent the formation of any combination or trust which might be evolved if large quantities of whiskies were thrown on the market at distress prices. The Government should forbid any of our larger distillers or a group of distillers taking over the stocks of the weaker members of the industry. On the other hand, the Government might well emphasize and continue the sort of publicity Mr. Wilford S. Alexander, the able and efficient Administrator of the Federal Alcohol Administration, has resorted to. He announced in a public release on June 5, 1936, the stocks on hand as of March 1936 of whiskies and other distilled spirits and the ages of these spirits. Among the amazing things shown by Mr. Alexander's report is that out of 249,000,000 gallons as of March 31, 1936, only 2,600,000 gallons were over 4 years old. The stocks of whisky over 3 but less than 4 years old amounted to only slightly more than 1,000,000 gallons. The whisky more than 2 years but less than 3 years old amounted to something over 10,000,000 gallons. There was, however, some 56,000,000 gallons of whisky over 1 year but less than 2 years old, and about 179,000,000 gallons of whisky less than 1 year old. These figures indicate that some years will elapse before there will be sufficient whisky in the United States to permit the bottling of bottled-in-bond whisky 4 years or more of age. They indicate also that for some time to come the bulk of the sales of whisky must come from the younger whiskies, which may in some cases be ameliorated and improved by blending with older stocks.

May I be so bold as to make the suggestion that the distinguished head of the Federal Alcohol Administration, Mr. Alexander, confer with our Federal Reserve Board at Washington and urge that it limit the financing of whisky distillation. Mr. Alexander could suggest that the Board inform its member banks to scrutinize with greatest care applications for the advancement of money on whisky warehouse receipts. The latter should not, under any circumstance, be used to finance further production. After careful inquiry, the Board should place a limit upon the rediscountable paper with such warehouse receipts as collateral security. Certainly no one should be permitted to borrow money on warehouse receipts for gambling in the whisky market. In other words, the Federal Reserve bank should refuse to rediscount paper, collateralized by warehouse receipts, beyond the reasonable limits it shall set.

It might be well, too, for Mr. Alexander to contact the Securities and Exchange Commission and officially make known to it the danger of whisky overproduction and stress the fact that great vigilance should be exercised on applications for registration of stock and/or bond issues which have

for their main purpose the financing of additional whisky production.

In citing all of the foregoing I have in mind calling the attention of the industry to the serious situation which may develop if the overproduction of whisky is continued. We who fought prohibition and who did our utmost to bring back the legal sale of spirits and wines are anxious that the industry itself use the utmost care in its relations with the public and the Government. The dries did not vanish in December 1933. They are with us and they are formidable in number and in vociferousness. The distillers of the United States should recognize that if they do not change their methods they are heading for economic disaster, with the attending evils which always come when merchandise is sacrificed and when there is a scramble by terrified producers to get rid of their goods at any price. Distillers themselves should recognize that neither the people of this country nor the Federal Government will countenance the formation of anything remotely resembling a whisky trust. I hope that the industry will come forward frankly and discuss its problems with the highly competent Government officials, such as the Administrator of the Federal Alcohol Administration and the officers of the Treasury Department. I am convinced that a frank, open exposition of the problems to these men will result in sound advice and the planning of future activities which will safeguard the operations of the distillers and reduce the problem of enforcement which the Federal Government now faces with the adoption of the bill to enforce the twenty-first amendment.

NEEDY AND WORTHY HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS GET FEDERAL AID THROUGH THE YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, very few people know the splendid services and the adequate financial support the Roosevelt administration has given to education in general.

To give a comprehensive idea of what is being done throughout the Nation in giving financial aid to high-school students, I will give you the financial help received by the different high schools in my congressional district and the number of students in each high school receiving such aid.

The Federal set-up for next year calls for still greater service for needy and worthy boys and girls.

Fayette County, Pa.

Name of school	Address	Number of students participating
All Saints High School	Masontown, Pa.	15
Belle Vernon Borough	Belle Vernon, Pa.	22
Brownsville Junior High School	Brownsville, Pa.	43
Brownsville Senior High School	do.	395
Connellsville City High School	Connellsville, Pa.	127
Dunbar Borough High School	Dunbar, Pa.	22
Dunbar Township High School	Leisenring, Pa.	27
Everson Public School	Everson, Pa.	14
Fairchance High School	Fairchance, Pa.	40
Fayette City High School	Fayette City, Pa.	42
Georges Township High School	Fairchance, Pa.	135
German Township High School	McClellandtown, Pa.	113
Holy Rosary Parochial High School	Republic, Pa.	2
Immaculate Conception High School	Connellsville, Pa.	9
Masontown Borough	Masontown, Pa.	29
North Union Township High School	Uniontown, Pa.	142
Perry Township High School	Perryopolis, Pa.	58
Point Marion Borough	Point Marion, Pa.	107
Redstone Township High School	Republic, Pa.	44
St. John's	Uniontown, Pa.	15
St. Joseph's	Everson, Pa.	14
St. Mary's	Brownsville, Pa.	11
Smithfield Borough	Smithfield, Pa.	27
South Uniontown Township High School	Uniontown, Pa.	10
Uniontown Senior High School	do.	159
Benjamin Franklin Junior High School	do.	150
LaFayette Junior High School	do.	45
Washington Township High School	Fayette City, Pa.	44
Fayette County pupils in school in Scottsdale, Westmoreland County.		10
Total		1,862

Total different students, including replacements (boys, 1,144; girls, 866)..... 2,010
 Allotment to county for year..... \$42,420

Somerset County, Pa.

Name of school	Address	Number of students participating
Berlin Borough High School	Berlin, Pa.	24
Boswell High School	Boswell, Pa.	20
Confluence High School	Confluence, Pa.	6
Hooversville High School	Hooversville, Pa.	24
Meyersdale High School	Meyersdale, Pa.	36
Rockwood High School	Rockwood, Pa.	20
Salisbury High School	Salisbury, Pa.	14
Shade Township High school	Cairnbrook, Pa.	17
Somerset Borough High School	Somerset, Pa.	102
Somerset Township High School	Friedens, Pa.	11
Stony Creek Township High School	Shanksville, Pa.	58
Windber High School	Windber, Pa.	59
Total		455

Total different students, including replacements (boys, 280; girls, 211)..... 491
 Allotment to county for year..... \$13,338

CONTRAST OF REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE TOWARD COLORED VOTER

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in a speech recently made before this House by our colored Democratic colleague from Chicago [Mr. MITCHELL] he said:

It is only during the past 4 or 5 years that Negroes have found that the Democratic Party is a safe place to live and vote.

A statement of this kind coming from one who was born in Alabama, and it is said lived there until past 40 years of age, but never had the privilege of voting, and who had been a student under that great Negro teacher, Booker T. Washington, challenges our attention.

To contrast his words and thoughts with those of Fred Douglass, who by common consent is regarded by his race as one of the most outstanding it has ever produced in this country, creates an issue or division of thought that justifies a careful study and analysis of the historical background of the subject. The words of Fred Douglass, to which I have referred as being directly opposed to the thought expressed by our colleague, are as follows:

The Republican Party is the great ship of safety for the Negro, and all else is the great wide seething seas.

These were the words of one who had felt the anguish of being taken from his own mother and one whose interest in promoting the welfare of his race was based upon no other consideration than to guard and protect his people and their children, yet unborn, in the rights they had gained through the loss of precious blood, both white and colored, in the great conflict between the States, and whose sincerity of purpose commanded the respect of great men on this as well as on the other side of the Atlantic.

REPUBLICAN PARTY LEADS FIGHT FOR EMANCIPATION

The Republican Party was conceived in and dedicated to the cause of human rights. The principles upon which it was founded recognized that this Nation could not endure "half slave and half free." It sought equality for every race, color, and creed. It determined that this Nation should, in fact as in theory, as expressed at a later date by the Great Emancipator, be "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people", and that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of our country should be so applied that the freedom declared by one and the rights guaranteed by the other should not be denied to anyone, no matter what his color might be.

It was the recognition by the Republican Party of these fundamental principles of justice and right that brought the Republican Party from the day of its birth into direct conflict with the Democratic Party.

On July 6, 1854, under the great oak trees so characteristic of the strength to be ultimately attained by the new party, the Republican Party was born at Jackson, Mich.

The resolutions adopted at this first meeting clearly set forth the reason that had brought the Republican Party into existence and why the adoption of such resolutions made a

conflict with the Democratic Party inevitable. They read as follows:

Resolved, That the institution of slavery, except in punishment of crime, is a great moral, social, and political evil.

Resolved, That slavery is a violation of the right of man as man; that the law of nature, which is the law of liberty, gives to no man rights superior to those of another; that God and nature have secured to each individual an inalienable right of equality.

The Republican platform adopted at its first national convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 17, 1856, contained the following declaration with respect to slavery:

SECTION 1. *Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States must be preserved.

SEC. 2. *Resolved*, That with our Republican fathers we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: * * * it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States by positive legislation prohibiting its existence or extension therein.

SEC. 3. * * * And that in the exercise of this sovereign power it is both the right and the imperative duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery.

By way of contrast to this outspoken denunciation of slavery in the first Republican platform of 1856, compare the attitude of the Democratic Party in the same year. In the Democratic platform adopted at the Democratic national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, June 2-6, 1856, reference was made to the slavery question in the following language:

* * * that all efforts of the Abolitionists, or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take incipient steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences, and that all such efforts have an inalienable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people. * * *

3. That the Democratic Party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

The Republican platform adopted at its national convention, May 16-18, 1860, at Chicago, which nominated Abraham Lincoln, denounced in no uncertain terms the slave policy of the Democratic Party in the following language:

That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave trade, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

Abraham Lincoln was nominated and elected President upon that platform declaration in the election of 1860. It was during this term of office that Abraham Lincoln, as President of the United States, issued the emancipation proclamation that struck the shackles from 4,000,000 of the colored race that had bound them to involuntary servitude for centuries of time.

Permit me to quote a small part of that great and memorable document signed by the Great Emancipator as a Republican President of the United States:

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within designated States and parts of States are and henceforth shall be free; and that the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons.

The Democratic platform adopted by the Democratic national convention at Chicago August 29, 1864, denounced Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party for granting freedom to the Negroes, and demanded that Abraham Lincoln stop the war. This would have permitted the Democratic Party to continue to enslave human beings.

The Republican platform of that year, however, instead of retreating sounded the note for an advance in the cause of human freedom. The platform adopted by the Republican Party convention at Baltimore on June 7, 1864, declared as follows:

Resolved, That as slavery was the cause and now constitutes the strength of this rebellion, and as it must be always and everywhere hostile to the principles of republican government, justice

and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the Republic, and that while we uphold and maintain the acts and proclamations by which the Government in its own defense has aimed a death blow at this gigantic evil, we are in favor, furthermore, of such an amendment to the Constitution, to be made by the people in conformity with its provisions, as shall terminate and forever prohibit the existence of slavery within the limits of the jurisdiction of the United States.

It was upon this courageous and righteous declaration of policy in the Republican platform that Abraham Lincoln was elected President for a second term. We are all familiar with subsequent events that wrote into the Constitution, never to be removed, the amendments that would guarantee the rights of free men to all within our boundaries without regard to race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

From those memorable days, when the principles of human rights were written with the blood of courageous men, until the present time, the Republican Party has never ceased to maintain its allegiance to those principles, and has constantly sought to protect the rights and privileges of those for whom the privileges of citizenship were written into the Constitution.

Contrast this record of Republican interest in the adoption, extension, and continuation of principles that gave the rights of free men to these millions of the colored race with the attitude of the Democratic Party in relation to the same subject.

For 136 years the Democratic Party has been in existence. At no time during these 136 years has the Democratic Party in national convention ever adopted a platform that acknowledged the inherent right of the colored race to participate in government. On the contrary, it has sought wherever possible by every conceivable subterfuge to curtail and even deny the rights guaranteed by the constitutional amendments written into the Constitution under the leadership of the Republican Party.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY DENIES CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO COLORED CITIZENS

The attitude of the Democratic Party, as a national organization, toward the constitutional rights of colored citizens is unmistakably written into the laws and customs that govern the right to vote in those Southern States where the Democratic Party dominates political activities and government. In no such State, even today, is the inherent right of the colored man to vote generally recognized or acknowledged. It is only in the States of the North, East, and West where our colored citizenship can freely express its individual thought by the ballot on election day.

The truth of this statement was recognized by our colored Democratic colleague when, in the course of his speech, he said—and I use his exact words:

I find that in 23 States where we expect to wage a campaign for Negro votes, where the Negro is permitted to vote, and where their votes are counted, we have more than 2,400,000 Negroes who can vote in this election.

Notice it is the purpose of the colored Democratic Member of Congress to campaign among the 2,400,000 colored voters who owe that right of citizenship to the Republican Party. What about the 4,000,000 who live in the Democratic States of the South who are not permitted to vote; whose rights of citizenship are not recognized, notwithstanding the constitutional amendments that give such rights? He also related a conversation he had with a prominent Democrat who said, "The Democratic Party doesn't owe the Negro a damn thing." I say that the Democratic Party does owe him the right to vote. It owes him the right of citizenship, the right of equal justice under the law, the right to protection from the lynching mob, and all the other rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and denied them by the Democratic Party in our Southern States. It is in these same States that over 3,000 lynchings have occurred since 1889, with only 12 apprehensions and convictions of guilty parties, and those in most cases were only given slight punishment.

This condition exists today, and it is astounding to realize that even since the present Democratic administration was inaugurated on March 4, 1933, there have been over 70

authenticated lynchings. This represents an average of one every 15 days. And what has been done about it? A Democratic Congress has refused to do anything. It has even refused to report to the House for action a single antilynching bill from among the 30 and more introduced for the purpose. And yet the colored Democratic Congressman from Chicago intends to campaign among the colored voters and urge them to support the Democratic Party.

Upon what does the colored Democratic Member of Congress base his claim that during the last 4 or 5 years "Negroes have found that the Democratic Party is a safe place to live and vote"? Can he show in any Democratic State where the right of colored citizens to vote has been denied or curtailed; that during the last 4 or 5 years that constitutional right has been observed? Can he show any Democratic State that in the past has had the "grandfather's" clause, or any other similar barrier, that has changed its attitude and given to the colored citizens, whose right to vote has been barred by such restrictions, the full right to vote? The truth is that there has been no change in the attitude of such Democratic States, nor any promise of a change; and yet the Democratic colored Member of Congress will campaign for Democratic support among the voters of his race in those States of the North, East, and West where they do enjoy a right to vote, gained under the leadership of the Republican Party.

I am informed that under the laws passed by a Democratic legislature in the State of Texas, our Democratic colleague would not be permitted to vote in a Democratic primary and he would not be permitted to attend a Democratic convention, and I am also informed that the Democratic Legislature of Texas some months ago adopted a resolution calling upon the Democratic Party of the Nation to prevent Negro delegates from sitting in the Democratic National Convention.

As a further illustration, you will find that in South Carolina a colored citizen can vote in a Democratic primary election only providing 10 good Democrats will make a sworn affidavit that they know the colored voter and have personal knowledge that he voted for Wade Hampton in 1876 and has been supporting the Democratic Party ever since. Wade Hampton was a candidate for office in 1876—60 years ago. Our colored colleague from Chicago is less than 60 years of age. You can see how difficult it would be for him to vote in the Democratic Party.

It is also interesting to study the effective means adopted in Mississippi to deny colored citizens the right to vote. Before he can register he must pass an examination as to his knowledge and ability to interpret the constitution of that State. He must be able to satisfy the registration official as to what is meant by "ex post facto" law, or what does it mean "to suspend the writ of habeas corpus." Or, if this is not difficult enough, then he is required to read a copy of the constitution with some lines printed straight across the page and others printed in an opposite direction from the top to the bottom of the page. All of which is done to confuse the colored voter with the intention of providing an excuse to the registration official for refusing to permit him to vote. And there is no appeal from the decision of the registration officer.

Innumerable illustrations of a similar character could be given as evidence of the antagonistic attitude toward colored voters in these Democratic States. In some of these Democratic States they adopted the so-called "grandfather's" clause, denying the right to vote to those colored citizens whose parents or grandparents as slaves were not entitled to vote. In every one of such Democratic States, so far as I am informed, the Democrats have adopted the "grandfather's" clause, or something equally as effective, or have attempted to do so. The effectiveness of such restrictive laws is demonstrated by the fact that in 15 counties of one of these States in a recent election, I am informed, not a single vote was permitted to be cast by a colored citizen.

REPUBLICAN PARTY PROTECTS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO COLORED CITIZENS

The Republican Party from the time of its birth has fought these efforts of the Democratic Party to disfranchise colored

citizens. The Republican Party has never ceased in its efforts to preserve a free ballot for colored voters and all citizens, without regard to race, color, or creed. The Democratic Party of the States to which I have referred—and we must not overlook the fact that the real strength of the Democratic Party is in such States—has always by every means possible tried to take away the right of the colored people to vote ever since they were granted the right to vote by the Republican Party.

Again I ask in what particular has there been any change in this Democratic attitude toward colored voters that would justify the claim that the Democratic Party has become a safe place for our colored citizen "to live and vote"? There is still restriction of their right to vote, to hold office, or participate in the government of the Democratic States; also, discrimination that prevents the colored Member of Congress from even riding in such States in the same railroad coach as the white Members who sit with him on the Democratic side of this House, and refusal to pass any law that would protect from mob lynchings or give any remedy, financial or otherwise, to the family of any who might suffer by reason of such; and yet, in the face of this outstanding record of Democratic antagonism to the rights guaranteed to colored citizens by the Constitution of the United States and its amendments, an appeal will be made to colored voters, in States where, through Republican leadership, they enjoy such right, to support the Democratic Party that has in the past refused, does now, and will continue to refuse, to recognize or acknowledge the constitutional rights and privileges of members of the colored race in the Democratic States to which I have referred.

Is not this a strange situation? We are told that a great campaign will be made among colored voters in States where they are permitted to vote to procure their support for the Democratic Party and its candidates. It was the Republican Party of this Nation that fought the battle of freedom, that procured constitutional amendments guaranteeing the right to vote, that has defended and protected them against encroachment, and without such action upon the part of the Republican Party, the colored Member of Congress would not have the right to vote. He would not be a Member of this Congress. He would not have the opportunity to go over the Republican States "where Negroes vote" urging them to vote the Democratic ticket. Why does he not go where the Democratic Party really is, and where there are seven or eight million of his race and some three or four million of whom are not permitted to vote? Why does he not make his appeal, for instance, in the State of Alabama, wherein he was born, or Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, Florida, Georgia, or South Carolina? Here he would find millions of his own race who are anxious and willing to vote but cannot.

DUTY TO HELP DISFRANCHISED COLORED CITIZENS

There is a duty to be performed by the colored voters who do have the privilege of exercising the right to vote. It is a duty they owe to the less fortunate members of their race who live in States where the privilege of voting is denied to them, where mobs override law and justice, and where discriminations of every conceivable kind are practiced. It is a duty in the performance of which they should not permit themselves to be diverted by false or alluring promises, nor bribed by "political plums" in the way of political offices given to a few representatives of the colored race. That may be sufficient reason for the few individuals who have received the financial benefits of such offices to support the Democratic Party, but it should not be sufficient for the great body of colored voters to desert the unfortunate members of their race in their upward struggle, nor to give support to a party that offers nothing to them as a race in its aspiration to gain and profit by the privileges given to them in the Constitution and its amendments and now denied to them in Southern States controlled by the Democratic Party.

There could be no more fitting conclusion to these remarks than for me to again emphasize that wise and prophetic utterance of that great outstanding colored citizen, Fred Douglass, who seemed to have a vision that enabled him to look down through the years and see conditions affecting his race,

and the relative worth of political parties today, as clearly as if he were here in our midst and pointing the way for his race—"The Republican Party is the great ship of safety for the Negro, and all else is the great wide seething seas."

UNWISE LEGISLATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, one important thing we older Members, and some of the new Members, have learned in the discharge of our duties here is to be very vigilant in watching legislation that comes to the floor during the last week, and especially the last day, of a session to see to it that no improper legislation is enacted by unanimous consent and after it has received little or no consideration.

Despite the vigilance several of us tried to maintain at all times during the last week of the session just ended, I am surprised to find that at least a few pieces of legislation got through without any objection that probably should not have been passed.

I refer to House Resolution 482, which increases the salaries of our six official reporters of debates by \$640 a year each; increases the salaries of the six transcribers in the office of the official reporters of debates by \$260 a year each; and abolished the position of janitor to the official reporters of debates at \$1,440 a year and creates a new position of assistant clerk in the office of the official reporters of debates at \$2,000 a year.

House Resolution 518 abolishes the position of janitor to the official stenographers to committees at \$1,440 and creates a new position of clerk to official committee stenographers at \$3,360 per annum.

This legislation fixes the salary of each reporter of debates at \$8,140 a year. In this connection I want to remark that such is a very good salary, and only 10 States in the Union pay their Governors as much. For instance, the great State of Michigan pays its Governor only \$7,000 per annum. Connecticut pays her Governor only \$5,000 per annum. Ohio pays her Governor only \$8,400 per annum. This information is shown at page 249 of the January 1936 Congressional Directory.

The House handles its committee reporting differently than the Senate, the Senate having no official corps, thereby paying only for work actually performed. The House has four official committee stenographers at \$7,000 each, and is, according to this resolution, to have a clerk, which is a new job, at \$3,360. That is, though, not the only expense of this corps. The contingent fund of the House provides "for the amounts actually and necessarily paid out by them for transcribing hearings." That item amounts to 1,500 pages a month for each reporter, and the pages are paid for at the rate of 12 cents each. A page consists of any number of words from 1 to 125, or a page may consist of something pasted upon a page and simply given a number. Therefore, while Congress is in session, each committee stenographer gets \$185 a month to reimburse himself for expense of transcribing, excluding the items of office space, office supplies, such as notebooks, ink, Ediphone cylinders, and so forth. In other words, each stenographer costs about \$768 a month while the Congress is in session, excluding the items of supplies and the cost of the \$3,360 clerk. During any 6 months or any other time the Congress is not in session the stenographers, and their clerk, will cost the Government \$839 each a month. In other words, the Government will expend at least \$15,710 a year and get absolutely no return therefor. The official committee stenographers occupy five rooms, and if the House Office Building cleaning force should clean those rooms, I see no reason for the employment of any assistant for the committee stenographers.

The Government Printing Office could, as it does for the Senate and other branches of the Government, estimate the work performed for House committees by unofficial reporters. I am told that the Government Printing Office is the most reliable source of estimating words in a manuscript, and that the Senate requires such a certificate from the Government Printing Office when paying for its committee reporting. I say that \$31,360 for the salaries of four

committee reporters and a clerk for that corps, and \$4,440 a year for transcribers for this corps, means a very great deal of money.

The one who is expected to become clerk to the official committee stenographers is now the janitor for that corps, and in addition to his salary of \$1,440 a year he receives \$185 a month, while Congress is in session, indirectly from the Government through a committee stenographer for whom he transcribes. At the new rate of pay he will receive \$3,360 a year and in addition \$180 a month during 5 or 6 months of the year, yet there will not be any change in the duties performed by this employee.

I am calling this matter to the attention of the Congress, and especially the members of the Committees on Appropriations and Accounts, in the hope that, if it is concluded these increases should be ratified, this clerk to committee stenographers may be required to do his stenographer's transcribing without additional cost to the Government. I submit that \$471 a month for such work is too much.

If anybody says that only a small amount of money is involved I remind you that this is something that will continue forever.

I was pleased by the action of the Committee on Accounts holding down increases in pay until last year. When we made those increases in pay last year I knew that, after they were granted, further drives would be made for increases. It must be said for the credit of the subcommittee on legislative appropriations that it last year withstood the drive by the official committee stenographers in behalf of their janitor. I now predict that if these increases are ratified by the Committee on Appropriations we shall be harassed by other demands for increases; and certainly this is no time to consider increasing salaries here.

REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the oldest pension committee of the Congress, the Committee on Invalid Pensions, which on January 10, 1936, had its one hundred and fifth birthday under its present title and which is the successor to and has in its library the reports of the Committee on Pensions and Revolutionary Claims, established in 1813, and for the information of the Congress and others interested in legislation referred to the committee, I submit herewith my report relative to the work accomplished by the committee during the Seventy-fourth Congress.

There were introduced in the House of Representatives during the Seventy-fourth Congress 13,026 private and public bills, and of that number 3,057 private bills and 5 public bills were referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I am justly proud of the record of the committee in handling this deluge of work and having it current at the adjournment of the Congress. The records of the committee disclose that 2,211 private bills were included as items in the 14 omnibus pension bills reported to and passed by the House. Under the provisions of the rules and practices jointly adopted by the committee and the Senate Committee on Pensions, it was found necessary to deny favorable action on 675 private bills. No action was taken by the committee on 122 private bills because evidence was not filed in support of same, although letters were addressed to my colleagues who introduced the bills advising them of the committee requirements, and 49 private bills were rereferred back to the House under the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives because of improper reference.

The legislative history of the 14 omnibus pension bills reported to and passed by the House is as follows:

H. R. 8421: 374 private bills, introduced by 145 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives June 10, 1935; Report No. 1141. Private Calendar. Passed House August 6, 1935. Reported in Senate August 13, 1935; Report No. 1244. Passed Senate, amended, August 16, 1935. House agreed to Senate amendments August 20, 1935. Pocket veto September 2, 1935.

H. R. 8422: 25 private bills, introduced by 19 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions

to the House of Representatives June 10, 1935; Report No. 1142. Private Calendar. Passed House August 6, 1935. Reported in Senate August 13, 1935; Report No. 1246. Passed Senate, amended, August 16, 1935. House agreed to Senate amendments August 20, 1935. Pocket veto September 2, 1935.

H. R. 8423: 29 private bills, introduced by 24 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives June 10, 1935; Report No. 1143. Private Calendar. Passed House August 6, 1935. Reported in Senate August 13, 1935; Report No. 1247. Passed Senate, amended, August 16, 1935. House agreed to Senate amendments August 20, 1935. Pocket veto September 2, 1935.

H. R. 8424: 478 private bills, introduced by 105 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives June 10, 1935; Report No. 1144. Private Calendar. Passed House August 6, 1935. Reported in Senate August 13, 1935; Report No. 1248. Passed Senate, amended, August 16, 1935. House agreed to Senate amendments August 20, 1935. Pocket veto September 2, 1935.

H. R. 8425: 156 private bills, introduced by 71 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives June 10, 1935; Report No. 1145. Private Calendar. Passed House August 6, 1935. Reported in Senate August 13, 1935; Report No. 1245. Passed Senate, amended, August 16, 1935. House agreed to Senate amendments August 20, 1935. Pocket veto September 2, 1935.

H. R. 8426: 20 private bills, introduced by 16 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives June 10, 1935; Report No. 1146. Private Calendar. Passed House August 6, 1935. Reported in Senate August 13, 1935; Report No. 1249. Passed Senate, amended, August 16, 1935. House agreed to Senate amendments August 20, 1935. Pocket veto September 2, 1935.

H. R. 8936: 13 private bills, introduced by 12 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives July 23, 1935; Report No. 1623. Private Calendar. Passed House January 7, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2345. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 8937: 31 private bills, introduced by 27 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives July 23, 1935; Report No. 1624. Private Calendar. Passed House January 7, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2346. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 8938: 43 private bills, introduced by 35 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives July 23, 1935; Report No. 1625. Private Calendar. Passed House January 7, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2347. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 12700: 10 private bills, introduced by 8 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives May 13, 1936; Report No. 2647. Private Calendar. Passed House May 14, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2348. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 12701: 134 private bills, introduced by 59 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives May 13, 1936; Report No. 2648. Private Calendar. Passed House May 14, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2349. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 12702: 478 private bills, introduced by 107 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives May 13, 1936; Report No. 2649. Private Calendar. Passed House May 14, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2351. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 12703: 375 private bills, introduced by 133 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives May 13, 1936; Report No. 2650. Private Calendar. Passed House May 14, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2352. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

H. R. 12908: 45 private bills, introduced by 38 Members, reported by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the House of Representatives May 29, 1936; Report No. 2889. Private Calendar. Passed House June 2, 1936. Reported in Senate June 15, 1936; Report No. 2350. Passed over in Senate Thursday, June 18, 1936, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9846-9847.

The private bills approved by the committee and passed by the House this Congress were carefully scrutinized and were of an especially meritorious character, conforming strictly to the rules and practices jointly adopted by the committee and the Senate Committee on Pensions. While I have advocated the adoption of a uniform national policy with respect to benefits extended our veterans and their dependents, I regard private pension bills as a legislative necessity, as they tend to reduce the pressure for additional general pension legislation which would cost the Government much more annually. A survey of the private pension legislation enacted from the Thirty-seventh Congress in 1861 to the adjournment of the Seventy-second Congress in 1932 discloses that the House and Senate have been very conservative in the enactment of such bills, and the following is a compilation by Congresses of the number of bills enacted:

Thirty-seventh	12
Thirty-eighth	27
Thirty-ninth	138
Fortieth	275
Forty-first	85
Forty-second	167
Forty-third	182
Forty-fourth	98
Forty-fifth	230
Forty-sixth	96
Forty-seventh	216
Forty-eighth	598
Forty-ninth	856
Fiftieth	1,016
Fifty-first	1,388
Fifty-second	217
Fifty-third	119
Fifty-fourth	378
Fifty-fifth	694
Fifty-sixth	1,391
Fifty-seventh	2,171
Fifty-eighth	3,355
Fifty-ninth	6,030
Sixtieth	6,600
Sixty-first	9,649
Sixty-second	6,350
Sixty-third	5,061
Sixty-fourth	5,885
Sixty-fifth	3,641
Sixty-sixth	2,200
Sixty-seventh	2,319
Sixty-eighth	2,436
Sixty-ninth	5,375
Seventieth	7,569
Seventy-first	5,987
Seventy-second	438
Total	83,248

As heretofore stated, five public bills were referred to the committee. These bills proposed to give additional benefits to the survivors of the Civil War and their dependents. Each of the bills was transmitted to the Veterans' Administration for a report and which in each instance was adverse and the bills were tabled by the committee.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation for the loyalty and cooperation of each member of the committee and my sincere thanks to the membership of the House for their many courtesies.

THE TAX AND TARIFF ISSUES IN THE COMING CAMPAIGN

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, there will be many major issues before the American people in the coming election campaign. I shall direct these remarks principally to two of these important issues, namely, taxation and the tariff.

I. TAXATION AND SPENDING UNDER THE NEW DEAL

Any discussion of the tax question necessarily involves a collateral discussion of governmental expenditures, for without the latter there would be no need for taxes. Every dollar the Government spends must be collected from the people in some way and at some time. No one escapes the tax burden. Those taxes which we do not pay directly to the Government we bear in the form of increased prices for what we buy. Hence it follows that every man and woman, every boy and girl, has a vital interest not only in the total amount of Federal expenditures but in whether the money is being spent wisely, prudently, and economically, or unnecessarily, wastefully, and extravagantly.

NEW DEAL EXPENDITURES EXCEED TWENTY-FIVE BILLIONS

Due to the fact that the present Dew Deal administration has been the most reckless spending administration in peacetimes in all our history, the taxes which must be imposed to pay for its unprecedented spending must be higher and more burdensome than ever before.

It is only possible to realize the enormity of the present administration's orgy of extravagance and waste when we consider the fact that up to the present time President Roosevelt has spent more than was spent by all the administrations from President Washington's down to and including that of President Taft. This amazing fact can readily be proven by reference to the official records. The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that the total expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes in the 124-year period from 1789 to 1913 were \$24,521,845,000. From March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1936—a period of a little over 3 years—President Roosevelt has spent \$25,127,000,000.

This total only covers cash outlays, and therefore does not include any of the contingent liabilities which have been incurred, amounting to several billions of dollars, which some day, to some extent at least, will become actual liabilities.

COST OF GOVERNMENT ON INCREASE UNDER NEW DEAL

It will be recalled that the Democratic platform of 1932 called for a drastic reduction in Federal expenditures. Candidate Roosevelt accepted that platform "100 percent." Speaking at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932, he said:

I shall carry out the plain precept of our party, which is to reduce the cost of the current Federal Government operations by 25 percent.

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues in this campaign. In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that government can make to business.

If reduction of Federal expenditures was one of the most important issues in the campaign of 1932, it is going to be an even greater issue in the campaign of 1936. President Roosevelt has not only failed to carry out the "plain precept" of his party to reduce expenditures but he has increased them by several billions over the expenditures which he described in 1932 as "staggering." The following table shows the rise in the cost of government under the Roosevelt regime:

Increased cost of Government, 1932 to 1936

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Expenditures	Increase over 1932
1932 (Hoover)	\$5,154,000,000	
1933 (8 months Hoover; 4 months Roosevelt)	5,143,000,000	
1934 (Roosevelt)	7,105,000,000	\$1,951,000,000
1935 (Roosevelt)	7,376,000,000	2,222,000,000
1936 (Roosevelt)	8,880,000,000	3,726,000,000

INCREASE NOT ALL DUE TO EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

I call particular attention to the fact that the increase in Federal expenditures is not altogether due to appropriations for recovery and relief. Any effort on the part of administration spokesmen to convince the people that such is the case is pure and unadulterated deception, as is proven from the figures submitted to the Ways and Means Committee by Budget Director Bell. The following table, based on his testimony before the committee, shows that there has been a

gradual increase even in the so-called ordinary or permanent expenditures under the present administration:

Increase in ordinary Federal expenditures (excluding recovery and relief)

Fiscal year ending June 30—	
1934	\$2,822,000,000
1935	3,128,000,000
1936 (Budget estimate)	3,627,000,000
1937 (Budget estimate)	5,650,000,000

NEW DEAL HAS SPENT OVER \$2 FOR EACH \$1 OF REVENUE COLLECTED

In spite of the fact that the Roosevelt administration has constantly increased the tax burden, the Federal revenues are today less than one-half the present cost of government. The New Deal is spending more than \$2 for every \$1 it collects. As compared with expenditures of \$25,127,000,000 between March 4, 1933, and June 30, 1935, receipts in the same period have only been \$11,894,000,000.

At this rate the present tax load, burdensome and oppressive as it is, would have to be more than doubled to put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis.

ACCUMULATED DEFICIT OF THIRTEEN BILLIONS FILED UP UNDER ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

This reckless and dangerous policy of spending money twice as fast as it comes in has resulted in an accumulated deficit between March 4, 1933, and June 30, 1936, of the staggering total of \$13,233,000,000. This is the extent to which the Roosevelt administration has lived beyond its income.

In order to spend the money, the administration, of course, had to raise it. This was done by the flotation of bonds, which were largely taken up by banks, often under pressure from Washington.

By absorbing the lending capacity of the banks in this way the administration thereby took that much available credit away from business.

NATIONAL DEBT INCREASED BY NEW DEAL TO UNPRECEDENTED TOTAL OF THIRTY-FOUR BILLIONS

When President Roosevelt took office on March 4, 1933, the gross national debt stood at \$20,937,000,000. At the close of the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, it stood at \$33,779,000,000, the highest in all history, in peace or war. This is an increase of almost \$13,000,000,000 since the inception of the New Deal.

This colossal debt represents a tax burden which the present and future generations must bear in addition to that necessary to pay the ordinary running expenses of the Government. If the Government would start in at the present time to retire it at the rate of \$500,000,000 annually, which is approximately the amount budgeted for debt retirement, it would take nearly 70 years to pay it off. A child born today would still be contributing to the reduction of the debt when an old man.

When I came to Congress 23 years ago, it required about a billion dollars annually to run the country. Now it takes that much just to pay the interest on the debt, without allowing a cent for amortization.

THE SO-CALLED RECOVERABLE ASSETS

At this point it might be advisable to say a word about so-called recoverable assets. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his radio address of July 1, stated that the total national debt was offset by certain recoverable loans made by the R. F. C. and other lending agencies, amounting to \$4,000,000,000. According to a statement furnished to the Ways and Means Committee by the Director of the Budget, some \$2,284,000,000 of these loans were recoverable on March 1, 1933, and therefore are not properly credited to the Roosevelt administration. In effect, they reduce the "net" debt when Mr. Roosevelt took office to \$18,653,000,000. Any net increase in the debt under his administration should be figured from this base.

CANDIDATE ROOSEVELT'S VIEWS ON DANGER OF CONTINUED DEFICITS

During the 1932 campaign the country heard a great deal about the danger of continually piling up deficits. Speaking at Albany on July 30, 1932, Candidate Roosevelt said:

Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits.

Later on, in his Pittsburgh speech of October 19, 1932, he said:

Now the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If in some cases it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

The Roosevelt administration has not had the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. It has not stopped the deficits. On the contrary, it has thrown discretion to the winds, has been willing to make no sacrifice in spending, has extended the Federal taxing power to the limit of the people's power to pay, and has continued to pile up deficits. The result has been to carry the Nation further on the road to bankruptcy and at an accelerated pace.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMY MESSAGE AN INDICTMENT OF HIS OWN ADMINISTRATION

Allow me to paraphrase President Roosevelt's now-forgotten economy message of March 10, 1933. The only substantial change I shall make is to bring the figures up to date:

For 6 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was \$903,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1932 it was \$3,153,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1933 it was \$3,068,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1934 it was \$3,989,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1935 it was \$3,575,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1936 it was \$4,764,000,000.

Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of \$19,452,000,000.

With the utmost seriousness I point out to the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. 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.

Thus, President Roosevelt's own language, taken from one of his messages to Congress, may be used as an indictment against his own administration. When he uttered the words of which the foregoing are a paraphrase, he was referring to an accumulated deficit of \$5,000,000,000. Now it is nearly four times as much.

The fact that the President has failed to follow his own warning doubtless accounts for the fact that the New Deal administration has constituted a definite drag on recovery. Perhaps it accounts for the fact that some 12,000,000 men are still unemployed. Unquestionably, the administration's loose fiscal policy has undermined confidence and engendered fear as to our economic and financial stability.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE BUDGET-BALANCING PROMISES

It will be recalled that the Democratic platform of 1932 promised a Budget "annually balanced * * * within revenues." The first definite assurance of when the Budget would actually be balanced was made by President Roosevelt in his economy message of March 10, 1933. He said:

I ask that this legislation go into effect at once, without even waiting for the beginning of the next fiscal year. I give you assurance that if this is done, there is reasonable prospect that within a year the income of the Government will be sufficient to cover the expenditures of the Government.

FAILURE TO BALANCE BUDGET IN 1934 AS PROMISED

Congress enacted the legislation, but "within a year" the income of the Government was still a long way from being sufficient to cover its expenditures. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, closed with a deficit of nearly \$4,000,000,000, which was a billion dollars greater than the year before. The income of the Government had increased from \$2,000,000,000

to \$3,000,000,000, but the expenditures, instead of being reduced, had increased from \$5,000,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000.

BUDGET BALANCING POSTPONED UNTIL 1936

When President Roosevelt sent his Budget message to Congress on January 4, 1934, he realized he would not be able to make good on his assurance to balance the Budget by June 30 of that year. He therefore postponed Budget balancing until 1936, saying:

The Government during the balance of this calendar year should plan to bring its 1936 expenditures, including recovery and relief, within the revenues expected in the fiscal year 1936.

It was well that the President postponed the date for 2 more years, because the fiscal year 1935 closed with a deficit of \$3,575,000,000. Expenditures continued their upward trend, and the public debt rose to \$28,701,000,000.

PRESIDENT HEDGED ON PROMISE IN 1935 BUDGET MESSAGE

In his Budget message of January 7, 1935, the President had already begun to hedge on his promise of a balanced Budget in 1936 which he had made the year before. Pointing out that unemployment was still large, he added:

For this reason it is evident that we have not yet reached a point at which a complete balance of the Budget is possible.

This was a frank admission that the spending program was a failure. Billions had been poured out, but we still had 12,000,000 unemployed.

FAILED TO BALANCE BUDGET IN 1936 AS PROMISED

The fiscal year 1936 has come to a close, but we find that the Budget is further out of balance than ever. With total expenditures of \$8,880,000,000 against receipts of only \$4,116,000,000, there was a deficit for the current year of \$4,764,000,000.

Thus for "3 long years" we have been hearing promises of a balanced Budget, but as yet we have seen no performance. Matters are going from bad to worse.

PRESIDENT NOW AVOIDS DEFINITE PROMISE

When the President appeared before Congress at the opening of the present session of Congress the best he could say was that—

We approach a balance of the National Budget.

What he meant by that statement is hard to say. He certainly could not have used the word in the sense of making any progress toward a balanced Budget, because no progress has been made. The administration is not even "creeping" toward a balanced Budget. It can never hope to achieve a balance as long as it keeps increasing expenditures year by year.

NEW DEAL PLATFORM OF 1936 STILL PROMISES BALANCED BUDGET BUT DOES NOT SAY WHEN

The New Deal platform for 1936, as adopted by the Philadelphia convention, has this to say respecting expenditures and the Budget:

We are determined to reduce the expenses of government. * * * Our retrenchment, tax, and recovery programs thus reflect our firm determination to achieve a balanced Budget and the reduction of the national debt at the earliest possible moment.

In the light of the failure of the administration to carry out the 1932 platform pledges and all subsequent assurances of the President, this promise can be disregarded. How can the New Deal be determined to reduce governmental expenses when it increases them year by year? And who ever heard of the New Deal's "retrenchment program"? When did it ever have a definite tax program? How can the New Deal expect ever to reduce the national debt when it keeps piling up deficits at the rate of \$4,000,000,000 annually? The "earliest possible moment" date for Budget balancing is extremely vague and is even more meaningless than the definite promises to achieve a balanced Budget in 1934 and again in 1936.

SUMMARY OF FISCAL RECORD OF THE NEW DEAL

At this point I shall insert in the RECORD a table which I have prepared which gives the complete fiscal record of the New Deal to date, that is, from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1936:

Fiscal record of the New Deal, Mar. 4, 1933, to June 30, 1936

Date	Expenditures	Receipts	Deficit	Tax measures enacted during fiscal year with estimated revenue ¹	Public debt
Mar. 3, 1933					\$20,937,000,000
Mar. 4, 1933, to close of fiscal year ending June 30, 1933 (4 months).	\$1,767,000,000	\$862,000,000	\$905,000,000	Beer tax..... \$150,000,000 Processing taxes..... 500,000,000 N. I. R. A.: Special taxes..... 227,000,000 Extension of nuisance taxes..... 300,000,000 Extension of gasoline tax and 3-cent postage rate..... 200,000,000	22,539,000,000
				1,377,000,000	
Fiscal year ending June 30, 1934.	7,105,000,000	3,116,000,000	3,989,000,000	Liquor taxes..... 467,000,000 Revenue Act of 1934..... 417,000,000	27,053,000,000
				884,000,000	
Fiscal year ending June 30, 1935.	7,375,000,000	3,800,000,000	3,575,000,000	Extension of nuisance taxes, including gasoline and 3-cent postage..... 500,000,000	28,701,000,000
Fiscal year ending June 30, 1936.	8,880,000,000	4,116,000,000	4,764,000,000	Pay roll taxes, Social Security Act..... ² 2,500,000,000 Pay roll taxes, Railroad Retirement Act..... ³ 100,000,000 Revenue Act of 1935..... 250,000,000 Revenue Act of 1936..... 800,000,000	33,779,000,000
				² 3,650,000,000	
Totals.....	25,127,000,000	11,894,000,000	13,233,000,000	(⁴)	
Increased in public debt.....					12,842,000,000

¹ List does not include taxes under Bankhead Cotton Act, Smith-Kerr Tobacco Act, or Potato Control Act, all of which have been repealed, or under Bituminous Coal Act, which was held unconstitutional.

² Budget estimate for pay roll taxes for 1937 is \$433,000,000. Amount increases gradually until maximum rates become applicable in 1949, yielding \$2,500,000,000 annual revenue.

³ Budget estimate for 1937.

⁴ Not possible to total due to overlapping, repeals, etc.

THREE WAYS TO BALANCE A BUDGET

The uncontrolled spending orgy of the New Deal, coupled with the policy of borrowing without limit to meet recurring deficits of gigantic proportions, will eventually lead the country to ruin. The only question is how soon.

The Nation's credit can be saved only by a determined effort at Budget balancing. There are three ways by which this may be done: (1) By imposing sufficient new taxes to meet the prodigal spending program; (2) by reducing expenditures to meet existing revenues; or (3) by a combination of increased taxes and reduced expenditures. Those in charge of the New Deal's spending program seem to know little about these elementary facts and they care less.

NEW DEAL TAXES FAILED TO HELP BUDGET BALANCING

Since the New Deal administration has been in power, numerous taxing statutes have been enacted, but with no apparent effect on Budget balancing. This is not strange, however, since none of its taxing acts have been aimed at balancing the Budget.

The \$150,000,000 of new revenue under the 3.2 percent beer law of 1933 was purely incidental to the modification of the Volstead law.

The \$500,000,000 annual processing taxes imposed under the Agricultural Adjustment Act were earmarked for payment to farmers.

The \$227,000,000 of special taxes imposed under the National Industrial Recovery Act were earmarked for amortization of the \$3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation which that act provided.

The extension of the nuisance taxes for an additional year under the same act provided no new revenue.

The extension of the tax on gasoline and the 3-cent rate on first-class postage also produced no new revenue.

The \$467,000,000 of new revenue under the Liquor Taxing Act of 1934 was purely incidental to the repeal of the eighth amendment.

The \$417,000,000 of new revenue under the Revenue Act of 1934 resulted incidentally from plugging up loopholes in the tax law.

The extension of the nuisance taxes for a second time again produced no new revenue.

The two pay-roll taxes under the Social Security Act, which will eventually impose a burden of \$2,500,000,000 annually on employers and employees, are earmarked for unemployment insurance and old-age retirement.

The pay-roll tax under the Railroad Retirement Act is also earmarked.

The \$250,000,000 of revenue resulting from the Revenue Act of 1935, otherwise known as the President's "share the wealth" tax measure, was purely incidental to the social purposes of the act.

Of the \$800,000,000 of new revenue under the recently enacted Revenue Act of 1936, \$500,000,000 takes the place of the unconstitutional processing taxes and is earmarked for benefit payments to farmers. Another \$120,000,000 is for amortization charges incident to the payment of the bonus before maturity. The balance goes to reimburse the Treasury for processing taxes it was unable to collect on account of the invalidation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Hence all the Revenue Act of 1936 does is to preserve the status quo as it existed prior to the Supreme Court's decision in the A. A. A. case and prior to the legislation providing for the bonus payment. The 1936 and 1937 Budgets are as much out of balance as they were before the new tax law was enacted.

TENDENCY OF NEW DEAL TAXATION HAS BEEN TO SHIFT BURDEN TO THOSE LEAST ABLE TO PAY

In connection with the tax legislation enacted under the present administration, it should be pointed out that the New Deal has shifted the burden of taxation from those best able to bear it to those least able.

The Democratic platform of 1932 calls for taxes "levied on the principle of ability to pay." Candidate Roosevelt, in his Albany speech of July 30, 1932, interpreted this platform plank as follows:

This is a declaration in favor of graduated income, inheritance, and profits taxes, and against taxes on food and clothing, whose burden is actually shifted to the consumer.

In spite of this declaration, the second taxing act of the Roosevelt administration was that providing for processing taxes on the very necessities of life—food and clothing. Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in his annual report for 1934 admitted that these taxes fell heaviest on the "poorer people." Translated into increased costs of food and clothing, they were higher in proportion than the income and estate taxes, which are based on ability to pay.

The Roosevelt administration twice continued the nuisance taxes, once for 1 additional year and again for 2 additional years. These taxes are, of course, levied on consumption, without reference to ability to pay.

In 1930, according to a statement made by the General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue before the Senate Finance Committee last year, 68.2 percent of the taxes collected were based on ability to pay, and only 31.8 percent

were so-called consumption taxes. In 1935, under the New Deal, this situation was completely reversed. At that time 61.3 percent were hidden consumption taxes and only 38.7 percent were based on ability to pay. This is something for the man of small income to ponder over. It is not merely another broken campaign promise but it is a broken promise that adversely affects every single person in the country who has limited means.

WHERE WILL MONEY FOR NEW TAXES COME FROM?

If the administration were to balance the Budget by the imposition of new taxes, we have seen that it would have to double the present tax load. Some \$4,000,000,000 of additional revenue would have to be raised, and the question is, Where can it be had?

The answer is very simple. The taxes on the wealthy have been increased several times and they now border very near to confiscation. Even if actual confiscation took place, there would not be much more revenue from this source. Business has been taxed and taxed until it can hardly exist under the load. The only place to turn for more money is to the great masses of our people—those with small and moderate means. The sooner the people realize this the sooner the spending orgy is going to stop.

HOW TAXES HAVE INCREASED UNDER NEW DEAL

The increase in the tax burden under the New Deal is shown in the following table of tax collections since the fiscal year 1933:

1933	\$1,620,000,000
1934	2,672,000,000
1935	3,299,000,000
1936	3,513,000,000
1937 (Budget estimate)	5,140,000,000

It will be seen that there has been a steady increase year by year.

It is possible that eventually, if enough taxes were piled upon the backs of the taxpayers, the Budget could be balanced by this method. However, there is grave question whether business and the people could stand the load. Certainly, any further increase would be a serious threat to recovery.

A few moments ago I pointed to three ways by which the Budget could be balanced. The New Deal has not tried any one of these three ways. It has imposed taxes, it is true, but never with a view to Budget balancing.

The second of these three methods was by reducing expenditures. The New Deal has never tried this method. Nor has it tried the third method of combining increased taxes with reduced expenditures.

EVERY DOLLAR OF EXPENDITURES SAVED MEANS A DOLLAR OF NEW TAXES AVOIDED

It goes without saying that every dollar of unnecessary expenditure saved means a dollar of new taxes avoided. In view of the exhaustion of other tax sources by the administration, savings by this method would really mean the avoidance of new taxes on the great masses of our people.

The Republican minority in Congress, in opposing the administration's tax legislation, have taken the view that if Government expenditures were reduced to a reasonable basis a large part of the coming tax burden could be avoided.

TAXPAYERS' MONEY BEING SQUANDERED

There can be no question but what the administration spendthrifts are wasting hundreds of millions on every hand. There can be no question but what hundreds of millions are being spent unnecessarily and extravagantly. There also can be no question but what hundreds of millions are being spent for purely political purposes with a view to entrenching the New Deal political machine in power.

THE QUESTION OF RELIEF

I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that all relief expenditures should be abandoned. There has already been some evidence that New Deal partisans will attempt to sway thousands of votes during the coming election campaign by making the charge that if the Republican Party is put in control there will be no more relief. Of course, any such charge is utterly false and deliberately misleading. The Republican

Party is committed to the continuance of necessary Federal appropriations for relief, but in the interest of economy, efficiency, and humanity it proposes to transfer the actual administration of relief to nonpolitical local agencies familiar with local relief problems.

ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES SHOULD PRECEDE ANY TAX INCREASE

Along with my Republican colleagues in Congress I am unalterably opposed to any further increase in the tax burden until it can be determined to what extent expenditures can be reduced without impairing any of the ordinary functions of Government and without denying adequate relief to the needy. After that is done, I am willing to cooperate in the enactment of the necessary tax legislation to assure the maintenance of the Nation's credit, and I am sure that the people will shoulder any necessary increase in taxes under those conditions. But the New Deal is not giving the people a square deal when it wantonly squanders their hard-earned tax money, keeps calling for more and more, and even mortgages their future earnings by piling up huge deficits that they must eventually pay.

It is a difficult task for Congress to find sources of taxation where it can raise new revenue. Likewise, it is difficult for those who are called upon to pay increased taxes to find the money with which to meet them. But it would be an easy matter for the administration to eliminate \$100,000,000 or \$500,000,000, or even \$1,000,000,000, of unnecessary expenditures and thus avoid the necessity for new taxes of a corresponding amount. This is a matter which the New Dealers do not seem to understand.

REPUBLICANS REDUCED WORLD WAR DEBT AND TAXES AT SAME TIME

Contrast the record of the Republican Party with that of the new dealers. The Republicans inherited the World War debt. The highest post-war debt, according to the Treasury Department, was \$26,597,000,000 on August 31, 1919. In December 1919 the Republicans came into control of both Houses of Congress. While a Democrat was still President, the Republicans had the supervision of the Nation's purse strings. The lowest post-war debt was \$16,026,000,000 on December 31, 1930. From December 1919 down to and including December 1930 the Republicans were in control of both branches of Congress, and they were in control of the Presidency after March 1921. During this period the debt was reduced by \$10,500,000,000, or at the rate of approximately \$1,000,000,000 annually. Not only did the Republican Party reduce the debt by that amount, but during the same period it reduced taxes four separate times, as follows:

Republican tax reductions

Revenue Act of 1921	\$663,000,000
Revenue Act of 1924	519,000,000
Revenue Act of 1926	422,000,000
Revenue Act of 1928	222,000,000

Total reductions..... 1,826,000,000

The new dealers increase taxes all the time yet keep on increasing the public debt. The Republican Party reduced taxes and still reduced the public debt. If the Republicans are returned to power in November, business would undoubtedly recover to such an extent that the present tax structure would more than be sufficient to meet all necessary expenditures, and possibly the history of the 1920's would repeat itself—tax reduction and debt reduction going hand in hand.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1936 PLEDGES BUDGET BALANCING BY REDUCED EXPENDITURES RATHER THAN INCREASED TAXES

The financial plank of the Republican platform of 1936 constitutes a reassuring and welcome message to the American people. It reads:

The New Deal administration has been characterized by shameful waste and general financial irresponsibility. It has piled deficit upon deficit. It threatens national bankruptcy and the destruction through inflation of insurance policies and savings-bank deposits.

We pledge ourselves to—
Stop the folly of uncontrolled spending.
Balance the Budget—not by increasing taxes but by cutting expenditures, drastically and immediately.

Revise the Federal tax system and coordinate it with State and local tax systems.

Use the taxing power for raising revenue and not for punitive or political purposes.

I call particular attention to the pledge to balance the Budget "not by increasing taxes but by cutting expenditures, drastically and immediately." This pledge will be kept. The people know it will be kept. At the same time, they know by past experience that the pledge to reduce expenditures contained in the New Deal platform will not be kept.

DISCUSSION OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1936

I shall now refer briefly to the details of the new revenue law enacted by the present session of Congress under the lash of the President, which is known as the Revenue Act of 1936. This is really a misnomer, however, as the measure is not entirely one to raise revenue, but, like many other New Deal measures, it uses the taxing power as a means of achieving other ends which cannot be reached directly. In this case the end sought is to force corporations to distribute their current earnings, irrespective of the needs of the business.

In his message to Congress of March 6, 1936, President Roosevelt outlined his proposed plan substantially as follows: All existing corporate taxes yielding an assured revenue of over \$1,000,000,000 annually were to be repealed. In their place was proposed a graduated tax or penalty based wholly on the percentage of current corporate income not distributed to stockholders.

The Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee, while not at all enthusiastic about the President's proposal, decided that with a Presidential election in the offing they could not afford to disregard his wishes and accordingly set to work to draft a bill in conformity with his suggestions.

OVERWHELMING OPPOSITION TO PRESIDENT'S PLAN AT HEARINGS

Hearings were held before any bill had been prepared, and witnesses therefore were handicapped in testifying. Outside of Treasury officials, and one other Government employee, only two persons appeared in support of the President's plan. One was a young lawyer with certain theories of his own regarding taxation, and the other was a representative of the Communist Party. Every businessman who appeared opposed the plan as revolutionary, dangerous, unwise, and unjust. No one of experience or ability in the field of taxation supported it. Even the committee's own tax expert, Mr. L. H. Parker, was on record as being opposed to the plan.

While the scheme was in line with Professor Tugwell's proposal to use the Federal taxing power as a means of forcing the distribution of corporate earnings, the moving spirit behind it seemed to be Professor Oliphant, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, who has rapidly risen in the good graces of the President but whose only knowledge of tax problems and business affairs had been gleaned from books and the classroom.

DEMOCRATS DRAFT BILL IN SECRET MEETINGS

In spite of the overwhelming opposition to the plan, the Democratic majority on the committee went into secret executive sessions to draft a bill. The Republican members of the committee saw the bill for the first time the day it was introduced and reported to the House.

As worked out by the Democrats on the committee, the bill repealed all existing corporate taxes as recommended by the President, and provided for a tax of as high as 42½ percent on corporate incomes, graduated according to the amount of current earnings not distributed.

REPUBLICANS OPPOSED PROPOSED SCHEME

I joined with my Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in a minority report opposing the bill on numerous grounds. One of the principal objections was that it would allow a large, well-financed corporation, which could afford to distribute all its current earnings, to avoid taxation altogether, while absolutely crucifying a small, weak corporation which must retain its earnings. In the case of a cor-

poration with \$100,000 income, for example, the most that it could possibly have retained under the House bill was \$57,500, because the 42½-percent tax would take the balance.

SENATE REJECTED HOUSE BILL

The bill passed the House over Republican opposition, but the Senate very wisely refused to accept the President's radical tax plan. The Senate Finance Committee, in reporting against the House bill, raised virtually the same objections to it that the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had raised. As a substitute for the House bill the Senate retained the existing corporate-income tax but increased the rates by 3 percent. Then, as a gesture to the President, it reluctantly adopted a flat tax of 7 percent on undistributed earnings to be imposed in addition.

COMPROMISE BILL MOSTLY RESEMBLED HOUSE PROVISIONS

The bill was then sent to conference to adjust the differences between the Senate and House provisions. The result was a hybrid measure combining the conflicting tax schemes of both bills, but which in its general outline mostly resembled the discredited House bill.

The compromise was based upon no sound premise, but was accepted only in order to eventually comply with the dictates of the President. In the haste to come to some agreement, so that the Democratic Members of Congress could attend the Democratic convention in Philadelphia, the conferees did not even take the trouble to agree upon definite provisions. The legislative drafting experts were practically given a blank check to write the bill. Not a single member of the conference committee in either branch saw a copy of the completed draft before the conference reports were made to each House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ADOPTED WITHOUT PRINT AVAILABLE

The conference report was called up in the House without even a print of it available. There was not even an extra typewritten copy for the minority members to see. I doubt if even the majority members had a copy. It is possible that even the reading clerk did not have one, because the report was not read, as is the ordinary custom. No one attempted to explain the report in any detail, because no one was able to. It was under these circumstances that an \$800,000,000 revenue bill became a law. This measure was an outstanding example of the type of ill-advised legislation that is sure to result from an effort to carry out an arbitrary "must" program of the President in the closing hours of a congressional session without adequate consideration or study and without intelligent debate.

PROVISIONS OF 1936 REVENUE ACT AS FINALLY PASSED

The new act provides the following plan of corporate taxation:

First. The present graduated income tax on corporations is retained, but with the following rates:

<i>Net income</i>	<i>Percent</i>
First \$2,000.....	8
Next \$13,000.....	11
Next \$25,000.....	13
All over \$40,000.....	15

Second. In addition, there is imposed on that part of the corporate earnings withheld from distribution a supertax, as follows:

<i>Income not distributed</i>	<i>Percent</i>
First 10 percent.....	7
Next 10 percent.....	12
Next 20 percent.....	17
Next 20 percent.....	22
All over 60 percent.....	27

The normal corporate income tax is treated as a distribution and is therefore deducted in computing the percentage of income withheld. In the case of corporations with adjusted net incomes of less than \$50,000 the minimum rate of 7 percent is applicable to the first \$5,000 withheld, regardless of the percentage which it bears to the total.

Third. Corporate dividends received by stockholders are henceforth to be subject to the normal individual income tax

of 4 percent as well as to the surtax. This, of course, constitutes double taxation.

Fourth. Banks and insurance companies are to be taxed at a flat rate of 15 percent on their income and are to be exempt from the supertax on amounts withheld from distribution.

Fifth. Corporations in receivership are to be subject to the graduated corporate income tax, but exempt from the super-tax. Corporations under contract not to pay dividends are to be subject to the graduated corporate income tax, but exempt from the supertax to the extent to which they are restricted. Common trust funds operated by banks and certain classes of investment trusts are also given special treatment.

Sixth. Foreign corporations are exempted from both the graduated corporate income tax and the supertax, but pay a flat tax on their income. The rate is 15 percent on non-resident foreign corporations and 22 percent on resident foreign corporations.

Seventh. The special taxes on corporations improperly accumulating surpluses and on personal holding companies are reduced by 10 percent and 12 percent, respectively.

Eighth. The present exemption of intercorporate dividends from the normal corporate income tax is reduced from 90 percent of the amount of such dividends to 85 percent.

Ninth. The present capital-stock tax is continued, but the rate reduced to \$1 per \$1,000 of declared value. The present excess-profits tax is continued at the existing rates.

EFFECT OF LAW NOT CONFINED TO CORPORATIONS

The foregoing are the important provisions of the new law in connection with corporations. Their net effect, along with certain other provisions of the bill, will be to increase the tax burden by approximately \$800,000,000. This money will come not only from corporations themselves but from their stockholders as well, both large and small. While it may appear at first blush that this new tax measure is imposed primarily on business, its effect will be felt by every citizen. Simply because the man on the street is not directly taxed by the bill is no assurance that he will not be affected by it. As Candidate Roosevelt said in his Pittsburgh speech during the 1932 campaign:

Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or (as now) in broad cessation of employment.

Never was this more true than with respect to the measure just enacted.

It not only increases the tax burden, but by penalizing the accumulation of "rainy day" reserves it tends to weaken the whole business structure, thereby jeopardizing the stability of our economic system and threatening the security of jobs and investments.

IMPORTANCE OF CORPORATE RESERVES

The importance of corporate reserves to business stability and to the maintenance of employment has been clearly demonstrated during the depression. Thousands of businesses were enabled to keep their doors open, maintain employment, and pay dividends because they had built up reserves during good times. If the tax policy prior to the depression had been such as to penalize prudent business management, as does the act just passed, there is no telling how much worse the depression might have been.

According to figures published by the Department of Commerce, American business in the 5-year period from 1930 to 1934, inclusive, distributed in wages, dividends, and so forth, \$26,600,000,000 more than it earned. This contribution which business made to recovery was made possible only by drawing upon its savings, which the law just passed would now discourage. No stronger argument could be advanced against the President's unsound plan of penalizing the accumulation of reserves than this.

NEW TAX PLAN WILL HAVE RETARDING EFFECT ON RECOVERY

Not only does the new tax on undistributed earnings discourage prudence and thrift but it also puts a penalty on earnings used for purposes of business expansion and business rehabilitation. This will have a retarding effect upon recovery and reemployment.

The President's new tax plan encourages monopoly by imposing higher taxes on financially weak corporations which are not in a position to distribute all their earnings than on large, strong corporations which have huge reserves on hand and can thus avoid the penalty tax by distributing all current earnings to stockholders. It further encourages monopoly by making it more difficult for new corporations to become established in competition with those already in the field.

The President's new tax plan brings about unequal competitive conditions between corporations by imposing a higher tax on one than on another, even though the net income may be the same.

Corporations which must borrow money to carry on their business are penalized because they must pay a penalty on earnings retained for debt-paying purposes.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF REGIMENTED FEDERAL CONTROL

In effect, the undistributed earnings tax is simply the exertion of pressure by the Government, under the guise of the taxing power, to force the distribution of corporate earnings, irrespective of the needs of the business. It substitutes regimented Federal control for the prudent business judgment of the officers and directors of the corporation. Scores of other objections could be cited to this unwise and unsound policy. It will certainly be abolished just as soon as the New Deal theorists and experimenters can be turned out of office.

II. TARIFF REDUCTIONS UNDER THE NEW DEAL

With respect to the tariff question, the issue is clearly drawn between the New Deal and the Republican Party. The New Deal stands for the increased importation of foreign goods that compete with the products of American farmers, manufacturers, and workingmen. The Republican Party, on the other hand, stands for a protective-tariff policy that will insure American agriculture, industry, and labor the first opportunity to supply the goods consumed in the home market and that will maintain American wages and the American standard of living.

NEW DEAL HAS REDUCED TARIFFS ON HUNDREDS OF ITEMS

The New Deal tariff policy is exemplified by its foreign trade treaty program, which is being carried on under the direction of the Secretary of State, an acknowledged low-tariff advocate. Under the 14 trade treaties which thus far have been negotiated, our tariff rates have been drastically lowered on several hundred agricultural and manufactured products. These trade treaties are supposedly reciprocal, but they have had the effect of trading off our rich home market for lean foreign markets. They hold out no hope of any net benefit to this country, since the tariff concessions which we make under a treaty with one country are extended to all other countries in the world, with the exception of Germany, without requiring these other countries to give us reciprocal concessions in return. Thus, to say the least, the treaties are extremely one-sided in favor of foreign countries.

The New Deal platform of 1936 attempts to cover up the administration's disastrous tariff policy of the last 3 years by advocating "adequate protection to our farmers and manufacturers." We are warned by the Good Book that "by their deeds ye shall know them."

We also know that actions speak louder than words. Under its trade-treaty program the administration has carried on a piecemeal destruction of the tariff protection afforded by the Republican Tariff Act of 1930. Following are a few of the agricultural products on which duties have been reduced under the 14 New Deal trade treaties which have been negotiated up to the present time: Cattle, cream, cheese, poultry, honey, pearl barley, corn, apples, cherries, blueberries, grapefruit, lima beans, peas, potatoes, tomatoes, turnips, cucumbers, eggplant, okra, peppers, squash, cabbage, hay, cane and beet sugar, maple sugar, wrapper tobacco, filler tobacco, potato starch, wines, and flax.

The list of manufactured products on which reductions have been made is very long, and it would be difficult to pick out representative items. However, it may be pointed out that numerous reductions are made in each of the 15

dutiable schedules, affecting imported products that compete directly with goods manufactured in this country.

TRADE-TREATY PROGRAM BASED ON FALSE PREMISE

It is thus clear that instead of protecting the home market the New Deal has invited further competition from abroad. Such was its declared purpose when the legislation authorizing the trade-treaty program was passed. It was argued that the only way we could regain our foreign trade was by allowing foreign countries to sell us more of their products. In spite of the fact that two-thirds of our imports, on a value basis, were already free of duty, the New Deal insisted that the gates should be opened wider to foreign goods.

The fallacy of the administration's program has already been demonstrated. Although in 1935 we increased our merchandise imports by \$392,000,000 over the previous year, our exports only increased by \$149,000,000. In other words, for every \$3.92 in additional purchasing power we gave to foreign countries we received back \$1.49, leaving us with a net loss of \$2.43 on the transaction. When we take into consideration the other items entering into our foreign commerce, such as our gold and silver purchases, tourists' expenditures, immigrant remittances, and so forth, our loss is much greater, and the administration's false theory is more completely exploded. For example, in 1934 these items transformed our favorable balance of merchandise trade into a net unfavorable balance of total trade of \$970,000,000. In 1935 the net unfavorable balance was in excess of \$2,000,000,000. In 2 years, therefore, we had a net unfavorable balance of total trade of nearly \$3,000,000,000. This huge sum represented the excess of dollar credits in the hands of foreigners over the amount necessary to pay for the goods purchased in this country. This net debt was paid to the foreigners not by the sale of more goods but by the transfer of capital assets.

AMERICAN PRODUCERS BEING SOLD OUT UNDER NEW DEAL PROGRAM

These trade treaties do not bind foreign countries to purchase any goods in our markets. What is happening is that they are taking advantage of the opportunity which the New Deal afforded them to sell in the United States, but they are spending their money elsewhere. There is nothing to indicate that a continuation of the New Deal's good-neighbor policy will have any different result. American producers are being sold out and we are receiving no compensating benefits from foreign countries.

FARM EXPORTS DECLINING—FARM IMPORTS INCREASING

Our farmers were promised an outlet for their surplus commodities as soon as the trade-treaty program got under way. Instead they have seen their foreign markets shrink still further. For example, our exports of wheat and wheat flour declined from 36,000,000 bushels in 1934 to 16,000,000 bushels in 1935. In the same period, exports of tobacco declined from 419,000,000 pounds to 381,000,000 pounds. Exports of pork declined from 84,000,000 pounds to 62,000,000 pounds. Exports of lard declined from 431,000,000 pounds to only 96,000,000.

While farm exports have declined, farm imports have tremendously increased. From 1934 to 1935 imports of canned beef rose from 47,000,000 pounds to 76,000,000 pounds; wheat from 8,000,000 bushels to 27,000,000 bushels; corn from 3,000,000 bushels to 43,000,000 bushels; oats from 5,000,000 bushels to 10,000,000 bushels; barley malt from 193,000,000 pounds to 320,000,000 pounds; and egg products from 3,000,000 pounds to nearly 8,000,000 pounds.

EXPANSION OF FOREIGN TRADE NOT A NEW DEAL ACHIEVEMENT

Senator BARKLEY, in his keynote address before the Democratic Convention, sought to give the administration's trade-treaty program sole credit for the increase in our foreign trade from \$2,933,000,000 in 1932 to \$4,330,000,000 in 1935. As a matter of fact, the trade-treaty legislation was not passed until June 1934, and the first treaty, which was that with Cuba, did not go into effect until September 1934. Only three additional treaties became effective in 1935, that with Belgium on May 1, that with Haiti on June 3, and that with Sweden on August 5.

From 1932 to 1933 our total foreign trade increased from \$2,933,000,000 to \$3,125,000,000, or by \$192,000,000. This increase was wholly under the much-maligned Republican Tariff Act of 1930.

From 1933 to 1934 our total foreign trade increased from \$3,125,000,000 to \$3,788,000,000, or by \$663,000,000. With the exception of the possible limited effect of the Cuban treaty in the last 4 months of 1934, this increase also was entirely under the Republican Tariff Act of 1930.

From 1934 to 1935 our total foreign trade increased from \$3,788,000,000 to \$4,330,000,000, or by \$542,000,000. It is obvious that the greatest part of this increase must have taken place under the Republican Tariff Act of 1930, since trade treaties were in effect only with four small countries, and for only a part of the year in the case of three of them.

IMPORTS INCREASE MORE THAN EXPORTS UNDER TREATY PROGRAM

When we break down our total trade into imports and exports, the effect of the trade-treaty program can be clearly shown. From 1933 to 1934 our exports increased 27 percent, but from 1934 to 1935 they only increased 7 percent. Thus, so far as our export trade is concerned, the rate of increase has been much smaller since the trade-treaty program became effective than before.

In the case of our import trade, however, the situation is just reversed. Our imports increased only 14 percent between 1933 and 1934 as compared with a 24-percent increase from 1934 to 1935.

This comparison of exports and imports before and after the trade-treaty program is proof of my previous statement that we are trading off our rich domestic market for lean foreign markets. I again point out that while a trade treaty with one country only affects our export trade with that one country, our imports from the whole world are affected, because all countries are given the benefit of our reduced duties which we extend to a particular country although we get no concessions from them. Thus the trade treaties result in a disproportionate increase between exports and imports, which adversely affects our domestic producers.

TRADE TREATIES HAVE RESULTED IN ADVANTAGE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Even as regards our trade with particular treaty countries, excluding the adverse effects of generalizing our reductions in favor of other countries, we have come out on the short end of the bargain. This can be proven by reference to the official trade figures. For example, the Department of Commerce, on March 8, 1936, issued a mimeographed pamphlet dealing with our foreign trade in 1935. On page 7 reference is made to the trade treaty with Sweden. Then follows this statement:

Compared with the corresponding periods of 1934, exports of United States merchandise to Sweden increased 15 percent in the period prior to the effective date of the agreement and 16 percent in the period following the agreement.

Comparing imports during corresponding periods of 1934 and 1935, the value of our imports from Sweden in the period prior to the agreement increased 9 percent and in the period following the agreement increased 34 percent.

Thus we have the story: Exports increased from 15 percent to 16 percent; imports from 9 percent to 34 percent. We give much and get little.

This same Department of Commerce publication also refers to our trade with Belgium. It says:

Our exports to Belgium increased 16 percent over 1934, and our share of Belgium's import trade was larger than in 1934.

It will be noted that the figure is given for the increase in exports, but not for the increase in imports. Perhaps there was a reason. Our imports from Belgium increased from \$26,000,000 in 1934 to \$40,000,000 in 1935, or by more than 50 percent.

The administration is always publicizing the increase in exports, but it says little, if anything, about the increase in imports. The Secretary of the Treasury, in a press release dated October 31, 1935, perhaps inadvertently showed how the Cuban treaty had adversely affected our domestic producers. Comparing our trade with Cuba in the 12-month period prior to and after the effective date of the Cuban treaty, he pointed out that our exports to Cuba increased only

\$21,000,000 as compared with an increase in imports of \$103,000,000. In terms of percentages the respective increases were 58.8 percent in the case of exports and 213.3 percent in the case of imports.

It is quite apparent that the trade treaties which have been negotiated have been bad bargains. What makes them appear even worse is the fact that we have increased our exports to nearly all nontreaty countries without giving up any concessions in our home market in return. In the case of the United Kingdom alone our exports in 1935 were \$50,000,000 greater than in 1934.

TREATIES NEGOTIATED IN STAR-CHAMBER PROCEEDINGS

One of the most reprehensible features of the trade-treaty program is the fact that the treaties are negotiated with foreign representatives by a group of theorists in the State Department in secret star-chamber proceedings, from which American producers are excluded. No opportunity is afforded for the representatives of American agriculture, industry, or labor to be heard with respect to the treaties once they have been negotiated, nor are the treaties subject to ratification by either House of Congress. Under such procedure, representative government becomes a mockery.

NO PRECEDENT FOR PRESIDENT'S POWERS UNDER TRADE-TREATY LEGISLATION

Senator BARKLEY, in his remarks before the Democratic convention, to which I have already referred, attempted to justify the constitutionality of the trade-treaty legislation by saying that Congress had from time to time ever since 1789 conferred similar authority on the President in the interest of foreign trade. Such, however, is not the case.

The Supreme Court has many times held that Congress cannot delegate its legislative authority to the President. The New Deal Congress, in giving the President the right to reduce tariff rates in pursuance of trade treaties negotiated by him, confers on him legislative authority in violation of the Constitution. It is true that the Supreme Court has upheld the powers given to the President under the so-called flexible tariff provisions of the present tariff act, but in so doing it pointed out that Congress did not give the President discretionary authority, since it laid down a definite rule or yardstick which the President was required to follow in adjusting duties either up or down—namely, the difference in cost of production formula. No such rule or yardstick is laid down in the trade-treaty legislation. The President can use his own discretion both as to the items to be affected and as to the rate to be fixed. The only limitation is that he cannot go beyond 50 percent of the statutory rate, but this merely puts a limit on the amount of discretion he may use. Within that limit he exercises legislative powers.

New Deal orators also attempt to show that under past Republican administrations the President has been empowered to enter into trade treaties. It is true that the President was given certain authority under the tariff acts of 1890 and 1897 respecting reciprocal agreements with foreign countries, but in both instances Congress named a specific list of articles which might be the subject of negotiation, and at the same time determined in advance the precise reductions in duty that might be made or the penalty duties that might be imposed. No President had any discretionary legislative authority under any previous Republican tariff legislation.

Where the President has been given general treaty-making authority in the past, it has always been provided that any trade treaties negotiated under such general power should be ratified by the Senate and approved by the House of Representatives before becoming effective. The New Deal treaties are not even ratified by the Senate, as required by the Constitution.

REPUBLICAN ATTITUDE ON RECIPROCITY

The Republican Party has favored reciprocity in the past, but only under constitutional methods and only when it could be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American industry, or American labor. That is the policy of the party today.

In this connection I might point out that the reduction of our duties on competitive foreign products is not the only way of securing benefits for our exports in foreign markets. We should keep in mind that the imposition of provisional penalty duties on the tremendous quantity of foreign products now enjoying free access to our market would be an effective method of securing fair treatment for our export products abroad. Provision could be made for the suspension of such penalty duties with respect to imports from all countries which did not discriminate against American commerce.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM PROMISES REPEAL OF TRADE-TREATY LAW

The Republican platform of 1936 calls for the repeal of the New Deal trade-treaty legislation under which our rich domestic market is being surrendered to foreigners. I have advocated this ever since the law was enacted. I bitterly fought its enactment. It has worked out just as I prophesied, namely, to the great detriment of the country as a whole.

I cannot close this reference to the tariff more appropriately than by quoting the following passage from my remarks of June 14, 1934:

In the coming elections, the Democrats will have to justify their votes in giving the President this unconstitutional and dictatorial authority over the tariff and over all domestic industries dependent upon tariff protection. They will have to answer for giving him this power to say what our people shall produce at home and what they shall buy abroad. They will have to explain by what principles of fairness and justice one industry may be destroyed in order to benefit another. They will have to demonstrate by what economic laws the importation of foreign agricultural products can rid our farmers of their surpluses; how the importation of more industrial products can reopen our own factories, and how the displacement of American by foreign labor can reduce the army of the unemployed. * * *

The Republican Party awaits with expectancy the opportunity to meet the issues raised by this bill before the American people in November. Having adhered to our traditional position of preserving the home market for American industry, agriculture, and labor, we are confident of the outcome.

III. THE ONE BIG ISSUE OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

For practical purposes, all the various issues of the coming election campaign can be summarized into one: Do the people want 4 more years of the New Deal? On this question I think there can be no doubt but that the great majority of the voters in November will give a negative answer. They were misled in 1932 by the promises of the New Deal candidate and the pledges of the New Deal platform, but they will not be misled again.

In 1932 the New Deal platform said:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

This solemn declaration was followed by specific pledges to reduce expenditures, abolish useless bureaus, eliminate extravagance, balance the Budget, preserve a sound currency, free the tariff from Executive interference, strengthen the antitrust laws, remove the Government from business, prevent the improper and excessive use of money in political activities, and to do a host of other things. The New Deal has deliberately broken faith with the people by failing to keep these "covenants."

NEW DEAL PLEDGES BROKEN

Disregarding its pledges, the New Deal has tremendously increased the cost of government; it has set up a vast bureaucracy by the creation of 60 or 70 new Federal agencies, adding 250,000 of the party faithful to the public pay roll; it has squandered and wasted the people's money; it has unbalanced the Budget more than ever; it has undermined the security of our money; it has delegated tariff- and treaty-making authority to the President; it has nullified the antitrust laws; it has put the Government in competition with private business; it has used the Federal Treasury as a campaign chest to intrench itself in power; and it has in many other respects dishonored the people's trust.

CENTRALIZATION OF POWER UNDER NEW DEAL

Not only has the New Deal administration violated its specific pledges, but it has adopted many policies which were

not mentioned in "plain words" in the so-called "contract" to which the voters in 1932 subscribed. It has put into effect many of the proposals advocated by the Socialist Party in its 1932 platform. But of more consequence are the efforts which the New Deal has made to undermine our Constitution, break down its system of checks and balances, destroy our established institutions, infringe upon the liberties of our people, invade the rights of the States, and set up in Washington an all-powerful bureaucratic dictatorship with the President at its head. Nothing was said in the New Deal platform of 1932 about these revolutionary changes in our governmental system.

NEW DEAL PLATFORM NO LONGER A COVENANT WITH THE PEOPLE

It is not strange that the New Deal platform of 1936 fails to renew the declaration that a party platform is a "covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power." It would only have served to emphasize the broken promises of the last platform. By the omission of this declaration the people are put on notice that the New Deal platform of 1936 is made to run on and not to stand on.

It is very significant that the New Deal platform of 1936 also fails to contain any declaration that the people "are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe." The planks of the 1936 platform are couched in such general terms that they can be interpreted to mean most anything and to justify most anything.

REELECTION OF ROOSEVELT WOULD BE MANDATE TO GO THE LIMIT

I think there can be no question but what the reelection of President Roosevelt would be interpreted by him as a mandate to "go the limit." The "breathing spell" which he promised last fall would definitely be over. Experimentation with "brain trust" theories would be resumed. There has already been some indication that the N. R. A. might be revived. Doubtless an amendment would be sought to the Constitution extending the Federal powers. Unbridled spending would be continued. It makes one shudder to think of the possibilities.

EFFECT OF ROOSEVELT'S REELECTION ON SUPREME COURT

One thing the people should bear in mind is that if Mr. Roosevelt is reelected he will undoubtedly have the opportunity of naming several members of the Supreme Court. It is only necessary to mention this fact to call to mind the consequences which would follow. The Court of last resort, instead of being an independent tribunal, would become a part of the New Deal. The "bloodless revolution" would continue unabated. No longer would the people be able to say, "Thank God for the Supreme Court."

The President has been unsparing in his criticism of the Supreme Court. He contemptuously referred to its decision in the N. R. A. case as taking the country "back to the horse and buggy days." As a matter of fact, the decision in that case was the best "break" the President had, because if the N. R. A. had been allowed to continue, the opposition to it would alone have been enough to defeat him for reelection. Because of public opposition it was discredited and virtually dead when the Supreme Court, by a unanimous decision, delivered the fatal blow.

NEW DEAL MEASURES HAVE BEEN DRAG ON RECOVERY

The New Deal is making a determined effort to convince the people that it is responsible for the recovery thus far achieved. Most of the recovery has taken place not because of but in spite of the New Deal. It is generally conceded that the bottom of the depression was reached in 1932. Since that time things have been on the upgrade. Most of the New Deal policies, however, have been a definite drag on recovery. Our greatest improvement has occurred since June 1935, following the invalidation of the N. R. A. by the Supreme Court. While the New Deal criticizes the Court for its opinion in that case, it is glad to take unto itself the credit for the upturn in business which that decision caused.

SPENDING PROGRAM HAS BEEN FUTILE

The spending program of the New Deal has been absolutely futile in promoting recovery. According to the daily statement of the Treasury for June 30, 1936, the tremendous sum

of \$19,140,000,000 has been appropriated for relief and recovery purposes, yet the problem is as great today as ever, with 12,000,000 unemployed walking the streets looking for work and approximately 20,000,000 persons dependent upon the Government for a meager existence. The only solution of the unemployment problem is the recovery of business, but this will never be achieved under the New Deal. If the unemployed want their old jobs back, the New Dealers must be turned out of office. According to a statement appearing in the press a few months ago, American business is ready to expend from fifty to eighty billions of dollars for expansion purposes as soon as the restrictive, costly, and dangerous legislative experiments of the administration are ended. But the New Deal has indicated that its experimental program will be carried forward.

DESTRUCTION AND DROUGHT

While millions have been crying for bread, the New Deal economic planners have plowed under the farmers' crops and destroyed millions of little pigs. In 1934 the country was visited by a devastating drought, which destroyed both crops and livestock and left thousands of farmers destitute. Again this year we are witnessing the ravages of another drought. There are many who believe that these are but the punishment inflicted by an all-wise Providence for the administration's program of destruction.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION UNDER NEW DEAL

The New Deal platform of 1936 states that the administration has sought and will continue to seek to meet the problems at hand "through legislation within the Constitution." Anyone who is in the least familiar with the record of the New Deal knows that this is a deliberate misstatement at least so far as the past is concerned. We have only to recall President Roosevelt's mandate to Congress to pass the Guffey coal bill notwithstanding "any doubt as to constitutionality, however reasonable", and to record the list of major New Deal measures held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. This list includes (1) the oil-control section of the National Industrial Recovery Act, (2) the joint resolution of Congress invalidating the gold clause in Government bonds, (3) the Railroad Pension Act, (4) the National Industrial Recovery Act, (5) the Farm Mortgage Moratorium Act, (6) the removal of Federal Trade Commissioner Humphrey, (7) the Agricultural Adjustment Act, (8) the Guffey Coal Act, and (9) the Municipal Corporation Bankruptcy Act.

COUNTRY HAS BEEN MOST PROSPEROUS UNDER REPUBLICAN RULE

Doubtless during the election campaign New Deal orators will spend much of their time asking the voters if they want to go back to the conditions in 1932, and telling them that this is exactly what will happen if the New Deal is repudiated at the polls and the Government turned over to the Republican Party. Of course, no one wants to go back to 1932, and there is no reason for thinking that with the Republican Party in power we would go back to 1932. It should not be forgotten that our most prosperous times have been under Republican administrations. In the 71 years since the Civil War we have had only 16 years of Democratic control under three different Democratic Presidents.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1936 PROGRESSIVE AND FORWARD LOOKING

But we are not concerned with the past—only with the future. The world moves forward, not backward. The Republican Party at Cleveland adopted a sound, progressive, and forward-looking platform upon which all who are opposed to the New Deal and all who favor the preservation of the American system of government can unite. The Republican platform assures jobs to the unemployed by encouraging, rather than hampering, legitimate business. It assures nonpartisan relief for the needy. It assures protection against involuntary unemployment and dependency in old age. It assures protection to the rights of labor. It assures agriculture a policy of abundance rather than scarcity. It assures to agriculture, industry, and labor, adequate tariff protection against foreign competition in the home market. It assures the elimination of monopoly. It assures the restoration of the merit system in Government service. It

assures the balancing of the National Budget, not by increased taxes but by reduced spending. It assures a sound currency. It assures a government of laws and not of men. Finally, it gives assurance that the candidates of the party, "as a matter of private honor and public faith", will undertake to be true to the principles and program set forth.

NEW-DEAL PLATFORM INSINCERE

Contrast this platform with the generalities of the New Deal platform; with its false claims, its misleading statements, and its insincere promises. The people will not be fooled by the beautiful word picture of the New Deal which it paints, either as regards the past or the future.

The New Deal platform was drafted at the White House and ratified by the Philadelphia convention. It was almost a sacrifice for the New Deal convention to be held in the city which is "the cradle of American liberty." The aims and principles of the New Deal are as far apart from the aims and principles of those who there drafted the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as are the North and South Poles from one another. The New Deal platform plagiarizes the words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident", as contained in the Declaration of Independence but it adopted none of the substance of that great document.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN WILL BE FOUGHT OVER PRINCIPLES

The coming election campaign is not a fight between the "ins" and the "outs." It is not a fight between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, because there is no more Democratic Party as such. The election campaign is really a fight for principles. The New Deal is on one side and the Republican Party, representing all who are opposed to the New Deal, is on the other. The issue is clearly drawn. The verdict of the people is awaited.

NEW DEAL ON THE WAY OUT

Already there is evidence that the new dealers know they are on the way out. It was demonstrated in the apologetic speeches at the Philadelphia convention, and it was most strikingly shown in the insistence of New Deal leaders that the Governor of New York consent to renomination in the hope that thereby he would be able to assist the President to carry his own State.

I am confident that next November the people will decide that they have had enough of the New Deal and that they wish to restore the system of government established by the fathers under a businesslike and progressive administration. Let the slogan be: "Off the rocks with Landon and Knox!"

PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONAL UNION FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the widespread interest that exists with respect to the attitude of Members of Congress toward the 16 principles of the National Union for Social Justice impels me to make known my views, as follows:

Principle 1. I believe in liberty of conscience and liberty of education, not permitting the state to dictate either my worship to my God or my chosen avocation in life.

This principle is fundamental in our form of government. The duty to maintain and support it is an obligation of true citizenship. I am in complete accord with it and could not do otherwise than pledge to it my wholehearted allegiance.

Principle 2. I believe that every citizen willing to work and capable of working shall receive a just, living, annual wage which will enable him both to maintain and educate his family according to the standards of American decency.

This principle is right, just, and proper. To provide such a standard of wage would make a better and more contented Nation. My support has and will continue to be given to such measures as will make possible its fulfillment.

Principle 3. I believe in nationalizing those public resources which by their very nature are too important to be held in the control of private individuals.

The public interest must be considered paramount. This should at all times be the determining factor. Governmental regulation, control, or ownership should be the means to insure the safety of the public interest; and the

method to be pursued being that which is most appropriate or necessary.

Principle 4. I believe in private ownership of all other property.

This principle is sound and based upon the custom, law, and experience of the American form of government.

Principle 5. I believe in upholding the right to private property, but in controlling it for the public good.

This principle is in accord with established principles of law. In all well-organized society the right of the individual must be subservient to the public good. The power in the Government to regulate and control, upon a reasonable basis, is just as necessary as that the right to private property shall be recognized and protected by Government.

Principle 6. I believe in the abolition of the privately owned Federal Reserve Banking System and in the establishment of a Government-owned central bank.

There is nothing so vital to the welfare of our people than a banking system that insures stability and complete assurance that its tremendous powers can and will only be utilized in the public interest. Therefore, while there is much to justify the thought that at times the rights and privileges that now exist under the present system can be and have been utilized for private gain, yet there is a corresponding fear that under a Government-owned central bank system there would be a temptation for political control, resulting in political gain in place of private gain under the existing system. Thus the Government-owned central bank can only prove beneficial if a system is devised that will provide a business management in the public interest and preclude all possibility of political control. If this is not accomplished, then the result would be disastrous and our last estate worse than the first. My support of this principle, therefore, is based upon the assumption that there can and will be complete divorcement of politics from the management and control of the bank.

Principle 7. I believe in rescuing from the hands of private owners the right to coin and regulate the value of money, which right must be restored to Congress, where it belongs.

The purpose of this principle is plain. The result to be attained is worth while. I am in full accord with the objective that is sought.

Principle 8. I believe that one of the chief duties of this Government-owned central bank is to maintain the cost of living on an even keel and arrange for the repayment of dollar debts with equal-value dollars.

The fulfillment of this principle would go far to eliminate economic uncertainty and periods of depression, and in the accomplishment of this purpose my support would be given to such measures as would give reasonable assurance thereof.

Principle 9. I believe in the cost of production, plus a fair profit, for the farmer.

This principle is basic to the welfare of the farmer. Without such a return the farmer cannot attain that standard of living to which he and his family are entitled. It is just as necessary for the farmer to have an adequate return for his labor as for the worker to have a just, living, annual wage. Our national welfare is closely linked to the individual welfare of these two classes.

Principle 10. I believe not only in the right of the laboring man to organize in unions but also in the duty of the Government, which that laboring man supports, to protect these organizations against the vested interests of wealth and of intellect.

My favorable attitude toward this declaration of principle has been evidenced by my support of all measures presented to Congress for the accomplishment of this purpose. My continuing interest is assured to the end that there may be the fullest recognition of this principle.

Principle 11. I believe in the recall of all nonproductive bonds and therefore in the alleviation of taxation.

To the extent that I understand what is included in the definition "nonproductive bonds" I am in accord with the principle and the object it seeks to attain.

Principle 12. I believe in the abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

The acceptance of this principle as a Government policy, both Federal and State, would, in my opinion, materially reduce the burden of taxation upon those least able to pay and close a way of escape now available to those most able to pay.

Principle 13. I believe in broadening the base of taxation according to the principles of ownership and the capacity to pay.

The relief of the intolerable tax burden now carried by real estate is a fair example of the need for a remedy that will provide a broadening of the base of taxation into fields where the ability to pay exists. There is no equity in a system that does not base taxation upon the ability to pay.

Principle 14. I believe in the simplification of government and the further lifting of crushing taxation from the slender revenues of the laboring class.

Extravagant expenditures by local, State, and Federal Governments is immediately reflected in the tax burden. This burden in the final analysis falls most heavily upon the laboring class. Frequently those least able to pay are not aware of the extent to which the inequality exists. This result is made possible by reason of the indirect method in which the tax is levied. The extent to which there is simplification of government, producing economy and efficiency, there should be a corresponding reduction of the tax burden, and in any event there must be a recognition of the ability to pay as the only proper basis of taxation. Recognizing this principle, I have opposed the imposition of sales, processing, or any other form of tax that is laid upon the necessities of life or commodities in general use by the laboring class. With any method that will provide simplification of government and relief from crushing taxation I am in entire accord.

Principle 15. I believe that in the event of a war for the defense of our Nation and its liberties there shall be a conscription of wealth as well as conscription of men.

This principle is fundamentally right, just, and sound. There can be no honest difference of opinion with respect to it. To take our boys and exempt our wealth is based upon a false sense of values. Wealth can never be more precious than human life, and to take the latter and leave the former is unthinkable. The experience of the last war provides the reason and the necessity for the acceptance of this principle.

Principle 16. I believe in preferring the sanctity of human rights to the sanctity of property rights, for the chief concern of Government shall be for the poor, because, as it is witnessed, the rich have ample means of their own to care for themselves.

Whenever or in whatever way human rights may come into conflict with property rights there should be no doubt that human rights must prevail. To hold otherwise is to place a higher value upon material things than upon the human or life element. It must ever be the duty of government to protect the weak against the strong.

FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL

Recognizing what I believe to be a fundamental principle of representative government, namely, the right of our people to have important matters of legislation decided in the open, upon the floor of Congress, by all their duly elected Representatives, instead of by a few who hold important committee assignments, I signed the petition to discharge the committee of the House from further consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill; and, when as a result of the signing of the petition by 218 Members of the House, the motion was made that the committee be discharged, I voted in favor of said motion and thereby brought the bill to the floor of the House.

My support of the measure on final passage was contingent upon the inclusion of certain amendments, which to me seemed vital if full justice was to be done to all classes by the legislation, particularly with respect to the inclusion of city owners as well as farm owners within the benefits of the bill. To provide for one without giving any consideration to the welfare of the other produced an inequality, and was an injustice that in my opinion should have been corrected. I am inclined to believe such an amendment would have helped materially in the passage of the bill.

CONCLUSION

I have sought to give in plain and unmistakable language a frank expression of my views with respect to the important principles advocated by the National Union for Social Justice. I recognize the sincerity of purpose that actuates those who advance such principles, and with like sincerity I have sought to leave no doubt as to my favorable stand with reference thereto.

I am of the opinion that the recognition of these principles as policies of government, without regard to party lines, would tend to make a better and more secure Nation.

HON. JOHN H. HOEPEL

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks in behalf of my colleague, Congressman JOHN H. HOEPEL, who represents the Twelfth District of California.

During the 4 years that Mr. HOEPEL has been in Congress he sponsored and supported the following legislation: Adequate pensions for the aged, widows with dependent children, and all those who are physically incapacitated; increased compensation for disabled veterans; payment of the adjusted-service certificates; and every other form of legislation from which ex-service men could derive a benefit. He was also very active in behalf of the Townsend old-age pension plan.

Unfortunately Congressman HOEPEL was accused of a crime which I do not believe he committed; in fact, all of his colleagues, with whom I have discussed the matter, believe that he is innocent of the charges preferred against him. I hope for the sake of Congressman HOEPEL, his family, and his constituents that he will be exonerated.

If the citizens desire to obtain information concerning their Congressman, I suggest that they read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The RECORD will prove by Congressman HOEPEL's speeches and the bills he sponsored and supported that he was a progressive and humanitarian Representative. I am sure that if the citizens of his district will reelect him to the office he now holds he will again represent them as he has done in the 4 years while a Member of Congress.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DURING THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, so many Members have evinced an interest in postal legislation that I should like to submit a brief summary of the bills reported by our committee during the Seventy-fourth Congress. I am dividing them into groups so that it will be readily apparent just which bills became law and which measures failed of passage.

The first group consists of bills reported favorably by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, passed by the House and Senate, and signed by the President.

POST OFFICE COMMITTEE BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW

H. R. 3612 (Public Law No. 249). To provide for adjusting the compensation of post-office inspectors and inspectors in charge to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. (Provides a series of salary grades to which post-office inspectors may be allocated on the basis of the work performed.)

H. R. 5049 (Public Law No. 338). Providing punishment for forging or counterfeiting any postmarking stamp. (Safeguards postmarking stamps used by postmasters in canceling stamps on letters.)

H. R. 5159 (Public Law No. 317). To authorize the Postmaster General to contract for air-mail service in Alaska. (Extends air-mail service in Alaska.)

H. R. 5162 (Public Law No. 339). Providing for punishment for attempts to obtain mail by fraud and deception. (Extends the penal law to cover attempts to obtain mail fraudulently.)

H. R. 5218-S. 932 (Public Law No. 12). To postpone the effective date of certain restrictions respecting air-mail contracts. (Extended certain air-mail contracts for 6 months.)

H. R. 5360 (Public Law No. 340). Providing for punishment for the crime of robbing or attempting to rob custodians of Government moneys or property. (Brings within the provisions of the Penal Code the crime of robbing or attempting to rob custodians of Government moneys.)

H. R. 5540 (Public Law No. 341). Excepting the imposition of demurrage charged on collect-on-delivery parcels exchanged between the continental and island possessions. (Extends the free-storage period for collect-on-delivery mail and waives demurrage charges on parcels exchanged between the continental and island possessions.)

H. R. 6374-S. 1539 (Public Law No. 118). Providing compensation for the Post Office Department for the extra work involved in the return of valuable packages from the Dead Letter Office to the writers. (Decreases the cost to the Post Office Department of handling dead letters.)

H. R. 6511 (Public Law No. 270). To amend the air-mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service. (Provides for the extension of the domestic air-mail system and reasonable rates of compensation to the carriers.)

H. R. 6717 (Public Law No. 174). To amend section 1 of the act of July 8, 1932. (Permits prosecution of the senders of extortion letters in the jurisdiction where such mail is delivered.)

H. R. 6990 (Public Law No. 275). To fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes. (Establishes a 40-hour workweek for postal employees.)

H. R. 7688, H. R. 12608 (Public Law No. 641). To provide for the appointment of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes. (Establishes the ratio of substitutes to regular employees in post offices and in the Railway Mail Service.)

H. R. 7709 (Public Law No. 366). To provide time credits for substitute laborers in the Post Office when appointed as regular laborer. (Gives watchmen, messengers, and laborers in the Postal Service credit toward promotion for their substitute service.)

H. R. 8790 (Public Law No. 322). To amend section 6 of the act of February 28, 1925. (Reclassifies the salaries of superintendents in the motor-vehicle service.)

H. R. 9496 (Public Law No. 634). To protect the United States against loss in the delivery through the mails of checks in payment of benefits provided for by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. (Safeguards the delivery of checks issued by the Veterans' Administration and expedites the payment of the soldiers' bonus.)

H. R. 10193 (Public Law No. 575). To amend the act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees. (Restores the salaries of certain per-diem employees at the mail equipment shops.)

H. R. 10267 (Public Law No. 619). To provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents at large, assistant superintendent in charge of car construction, chief clerk, assistant chief clerks, and clerks in charge of sections in offices of division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service, to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. (Establishes a wider range of salary grades for supervisory officials in the Railway Mail Service.)

S. J. Res. 92 (Public Resolution No. 24). Making final disposition of records, files, and other property of the Federal Aviation Commission. (Provides for the transfer of the records, etc., of the Federal Aviation Commission to the Interstate Commerce Commission.)

The following Senate bill, which also passed the House, failed of passage:

S. 1439. Amending the postal laws to include as second-class matter religious periodicals publishing local information. (Vetoed, Aug. 20, 1935.)

While we were fortunate in having many of our bills enacted into law during the Congress, the closing days found some of them still pending on the calendars of the House or before the Senate Post Office Committee. I am listing them below. We reported a few resolutions adversely and the measures were tabled by the House.

Three of the bills recommended by our committee were pending on the calendars of the House of Representatives at the close of the Congress, as follows:

BILLS REPORTED AND PENDING IN HOUSE AT ADJOURNMENT

H. R. 2793. To amend the provisions of laws relating to appointment of postmasters. (Permits the Post Office Department to appoint a new postmaster whenever the incumbent's term expires.)

H. R. 6868. To provide time credits for substitutes in the motor-vehicle service. (Gives motor-vehicle employees credit, for the purposes of promotion, for fractional parts of a year's substitute service.)

H. R. 11822. To permit certain special-delivery messengers to acquire a classified status through noncompetitive examinations. (Authorizes noncompetitive examinations for special-delivery messengers who have as much as 5 years' continuous service on the date of approval of the bill, so that they may qualify for the position of substitute clerk, carrier, or laborer.)

The last group of bills consists of those measures which were approved by our committee and the House and referred to the Senate, but were not acted upon by that body prior to adjournment:

BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS AT ADJOURNMENT

H. R. 1993. Giving superintendents at classified post-office stations credit for substitutes serving under them. (Passed House June 3, 1935.) (Includes substitutes as station employees in determining salaries of superintendents.)

H. R. 4036. For the relief of Ralph C. Irwin. (Passed House May 7, 1935.) (Corrects the records with regard to the appointment of Mr. Irwin as a village letter carrier.)

H. R. 4450. To provide for the purchase of the pneumatic mail-tube systems in New York and Boston. (Passed House Aug. 7, 1935.) (Authorizes an appraisal by competent engineers of the properties comprising the pneumatic mail-tube systems in New York and Boston.)

H. R. 5596. Granting equipment allowance to third-class postmasters. (Passed House June 3, 1935.) (Allows third-class postmasters 50 percent of the box rents at offices where the postmasters furnish the equipment.)

H. R. 5723. To give certain railway postal clerks the same time credits for promotion purposes as were given others who were promoted on July 1 when automatic promotions were restored. (Passed House June 3, 1935.) (Provides for the promotion of terminal clerks whose earned advancement was denied them by the joint action of the Economy and the Terminal Reclassification Acts.)

H. R. 6014. To reclassify the rate of premium on bonds of officers and employees in the motor-vehicle service of the Post Office Department. (Passed House Feb. 17, 1936.) (Limits the premium which may be charged by sureties in bonding officers and employees in the motor-vehicle service.)

H. R. 7506. To provide for a stenographic grade in the offices of the chief clerk and superintendent in the Railway Mail Service. (Passed House July 16, 1935.) (Defines the position of stenographer and provides for the promotion of certain railway postal clerks.)

H. R. 7936. To adjust salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes. (Passed House July 15, 1935.) (Increases the pay of rural letter carriers serving short, heavy routes.)

H. R. 8002. To increase the compensation of letter carriers in the Village Delivery Service. (Passed House July 15, 1935.) (Establishes higher salaries for village letter carriers.)

H. R. 8369. Relating to laborers in the Railway Mail Service and motor-vehicle employees of the Postal Service. (Passed House Aug. 7, 1935.) Protects the rank and pay of laborers and motor-vehicle employees who are surplus and transferred temporarily to another branch of the Postal Service.)

H. R. 8541. For payment of compensation to persons serving as postmaster at third- and fourth-class post offices. (Passed House Feb. 3, 1936.) (Provides compensation for persons serving as postmasters in cases of emergency.)

H. R. 8730. To provide special rates of postage on reading matter and sound-reproduction records for the blind. (Passed House Aug. 7, 1935.) (Provides a special low rate of 1 cent a pound on publications furnished the blind at cost, and continues the free mailing privilege on publications furnished without charge.)

H. R. 8869. To amend sections 181 and 186 of the Criminal Code. (Passed House Aug. 7, 1935.) (Amends the private express statute with regard to the conveyance of letters outside of the mails.)

H. R. 10850. To extend the provisions of the 40-hour law for postal employees to watchmen and messengers in the Postal Service. (Passed House Feb. 17, 1936.) (Establishes a 40-hour workweek for post-office watchmen and messengers.)

H. R. 10930. To credit laborers in the Postal Service with any fractional part of a year's substitute service toward promotion. (Passed House Apr. 6, 1936.) (Gives post-office laborers, watchmen, and messengers credit for any fractional part of a year's substitute service in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position.)

H. R. 11954. To amend the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1053), relative to postal rates on third-class mail matter. (Passed House June 1, 1936.) (Classifies bills and statements of account produced by any photographic or mechanical process as first-class mail matter.)

The committee will continue to function throughout the year as, in accordance with House Resolution 551, we will cooperate with the Post Office Department in conducting two surveys: (1) With respect to the equitable compensation of star-route carriers; and (2) with respect to the equitable compensation of fourth-class postmasters.

MY RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, when the present session of the Seventy-fourth Congress adjourns, I will have concluded 4 years of service in Congress as the Representative from the Thirty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

I now present to my constituents an excerpt of my record in Congress. They can check it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of which is kept in the Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh.

WEEKLY RADIO REPORTS

First, I should like to mention that I was the first and still am the only Member of Congress to make weekly radio reports to his constituents. For 3 years I have come to Pittsburgh every week end at my own expenses to deliver, over station WJAS in Pittsburgh, a report of the activities of the Congress. I invited criticism and comment. I was anxious to know what the people were thinking. I am proud of the great success of these talks. They have been widely commented upon, hailed as a forward step in public enlighten-

ment on issues of the day. They carry out in true democratic spirit the idea that the people should know what their public servants do.

THREE IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

I was first elected to Congress in a period of darkness and despair. They were days when hunger and desolation stalked the streets and homes of our country.

In facing the job which was before me, I saw that three immediate problems cried for solution. They were:

First. Immediate relief for the unemployed.

Second. Saving of the homes and farms of the Nation from foreclosure.

Third. A permanent national program of social security.

The first of these problems—relief for the unemployed—loomed like a dark shadow over the land at the time of my first election in November 1932. The situation had been aggravated because the Hoover administration had definitely and finally refused to extend substantial aid to the unemployed.

I advocated that the Federal Government should make substantial contributions toward unemployment relief. This was done. At the time I was elected local and State governments were forced to carry this entire burden. It was a staggering load, under which many local governments were already crumbling.

FAVORED FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

That burden was being carried almost entirely by the home owner and farm owner because practically all revenue of local or municipal government is obtained by taxes upon real estate. Therefore, the greater the contribution by local government for relief, the larger the increase of taxation on homes and farms. I was utterly opposed to this system; I fought it as early as 1932.

I advocated the principle of contribution toward unemployment relief from the Federal Government whose chief source of revenue is from graduated income taxes—from sources that are taxed according to their ability to pay. I believed that this was sound policy in the emergency.

I believe in giving employment by public works in preference to the cash dole. Such public works should be useful and of a lasting character.

I voted accordingly.

SPONSORED BILL FOR CENSUS OF JOBLESS

I maintain that in order to deal intelligently with the problem of unemployment we should know the number of unemployed in this country and their occupations and skill. That is necessary to solve the problem of relief and jobs. Therefore, I introduced a bill for an unemployment census. The bill for a national unemployment census passed the House of Representatives on June 7, 1934. Unfortunately, this was in the closing days of the session, and the bill was blocked in the Senate by a Republican filibuster.

I CARRIED OUT MY PLEDGE

I pledged myself to secure Federal contributions toward unemployment relief during the national emergency. I submit that I have faithfully and successfully carried out that pledge.

RELIEF FOR HOME OWNERS

Secondly, I have done much to provide relief for the mortgage-burdened home owners and farmers and to save their homes and farms from foreclosure. The home owner is the backbone of this country and we help to preserve this Nation when we assist him. Thousands of home owners can bear witness of my unceasing efforts in their behalf.

Let me give here a national résumé of my efforts in behalf of the distressed home owner.

It should be remembered that the original bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were not guaranteed as to principal. This fact made mortgagees reluctant to accept them, and consequently relief for the home owner was impossible in many cases. Therefore, on January 3 and 8, 1934, I introduced three bills—H. R. 6141, H. R. 6147, and H. R. 6564—to increase the amount of H. O. L. C. bonds to be issued, to guarantee the principal as well as the interest of

the bonds, and to use H. O. L. C. funds for new-home construction. On April 13, 1934, I introduced H. R. 8118, to increase by \$1,000,000,000 the authorized issuance of H. O. L. C. bonds. On January 3, 1935, I introduced House Resolution 46, which directed the H. O. L. C. to resume consideration of applications for home owners which had been suspended on November 16, 1934. On March 9, 1935, I introduced House Resolution 157, directing the H. O. L. C. to permit the filing of new home-loan applications. On January 9, 1936, I introduced H. R. 9994, to stop the H. O. L. C. from foreclosing on needy home owners who could not meet their payments.

MY POLICIES BECAME LAW

I am glad to say that most of the policies which I advocated became law. Next year, I am confident, I will secure the adoption of the remaining ones.

AID TO THE SMALL-BUSINESS MEN

During the debate on the bill amending the H. O. L. C. on March 8, 1935, I proposed an amendment making homes with one store eligible for home loans. The H. O. L. C. before this had ruled such properties ineligible, so that a small-business man, grocer, tailor, barber, and the like, who conducted his business in the property in which he lived could obtain no relief. My amendment became law, and this injustice to the small-business man was remedied.

TO REDUCE MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

My bill—H. R. 3974, now known as H. R. 10638—proposes that the interest on H. O. L. C. loans to home owners be reduced to 3½ percent and the period of payment be increased to 25 years. At the present time the interest rate is 5 percent and the period of payment 15 years. Formerly the Home Owners' Loan Corporation paid 4 percent interest on its bonds; now it pays only 2¾ percent. Why not pass this saving on to the home owner?

My bill would reduce the monthly payments from \$8 per thousand-dollar-mortgage debt to \$5. For instance, on a \$3,000 H. O. L. C. mortgage monthly payments would be reduced from \$24 to \$15 per month. It is a sound bill. It is a fair bill. Its passage is necessary to prevent a repetition of wholesale foreclosures. I hope to secure passage of this bill in the next Congress.

PERSONAL AID TO HOME OWNERS

Let me add, too, that, in addition to this work in the Halls of Congress, I have personally given advice and guidance to several thousand home owners in their dealings with the H. O. L. C. I have made their problems my problems. I have fought against inefficiency and red tape in the H. O. L. C. I have protested when Pennsylvania was behind other States in granting H. O. L. C. loans.

MY PLEDGE TO HOME OWNERS CARRIED OUT

I submit that my pledge for aid to the home owners has been carried out, year after year, untiringly, loyally, successfully.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Third. I pledged myself to work for the enactment of a program of social security. I did my best to bring this about.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Let me begin by stating that on February 14, 1934, the House of Representatives, by unanimous vote, passed my resolution, House Resolution 249, directing Congress to make a study of a national contributory system of old-age pensions. I am proud of that resolution, because it represents the first official action ever undertaken by Congress toward setting up a national system of old-age-pension payments. It was the first step toward the social-security bill, passed a year later.

SIGNED BY ROOSEVELT

In my office hang copies of two bills, H. R. 5711 and H. R. 7167. Under each of these bills is the pen which President Roosevelt used to sign them, and make them the law of the land. The one bill, H. R. 5711, provides for pensions for the needy blind of the District of Columbia. The other, H. R. 7167, is the Ellenbogen Unemployment Insurance Act for the

District. My unemployment compensation act has been recognized as one of the most carefully drawn bills on the subject of social security ever enacted. It has been referred to as a model bill—one which is serving as a guide to many States.

Of course, I voted for the Social Security Act. But I did much more than merely vote for this measure. I urged that it be liberalized.

WE NEED CHANGES IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Many provisions of the Social Security Act should be changed. I am especially in favor of making more liberal the provisions for old-age pensions. A maximum pension of \$30 a month, such as we now have in Pennsylvania, is entirely too low. I have said time and again that the aged people of this country are entitled to a real old-age pension—one sufficient to remove from them forever the dread specter of the almshouse and the poorhouse. I want the aged people of this country to spend the twilight of their lives in peace and tranquillity, secure in the knowledge that their remaining years will be undisturbed and happy.

AGE LIMIT FOR OLD-AGE PENSIONS SHOULD BE REDUCED

Furthermore, I believe that these pensions should begin at 60 years of age and not at 70 and 65, as now provided. Sixty-five years is far too old in these days when the terrific pace of modern industry burns able-bodied men out at 45 and 50 and then tosses them aside like worn-out machinery.

TRUE SOCIAL SECURITY

In the true social security of the future, the ideal will be security of the individual from birth onward. Maternity and infant care will look after him when he is born. Social security would make every possible effort to protect the child from sickness and want. It would provide hospitalization for crippled children, curing those who can be cured, and leading those who are physically handicapped into avenues of usefulness. Vocational training—the use of arts and crafts—these would be available. And, finally, there would be true protection against the hazards of unemployment, and against the misery and uncertainty of insecure old age.

We do not have this yet; but we now have the foundation; we can improve and enlarge from time to time the building which we construct upon that foundation. Let me put it another way: This act is a way station, a part-way stop toward the end of the journey. The end is true social security for all, as I have outlined it, and for which I shall work.

I pledged that I would work and vote for social security.

I submit that I have carried out that pledge.

But I have not stopped here. To me, social legislation also means decent living and working conditions, decent housing, fair wages, maximum-hour standards, abolition of child labor, and everything else which is necessary for the betterment of the conditions of life.

ABOLISH CHILD LABOR

Because of this concept, I have introduced, and worked for, a number of bills touching on these conditions. My bills H. R. 7017 and H. R. 7738 aim to abolish child labor.

THE TEXTILE BILL

Another bill, and one which is in the forefront of public attention at the present time, is my bill H. R. 12285, for the regulation of the textile industry. It outlaws child labor; it sets up minimum wages and maximum hours; it bans cut-throat competition and sweatshop conditions. It has the full support of the American Federation of Labor, of the United Textile Workers of America, and of a large number of manufacturers and dealers. The House Committee on Labor has concluded exhaustive hearings on this bill and reported it out to Congress, recommending its passage.

My textile bill has been acclaimed throughout the United States as the solution for the chaotic conditions in the textile industry. It is expected to pass the Congress and become law next year.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

In any program of social legislation, I include decent, sanitary housing, and particularly housing for those with limited incomes.

For the last 4 years I have worked for the passage of housing legislation. Recently, Senator WAGNER, of New York, and I have jointly introduced in Congress the Wagner-Ellebenbogen housing bill, which we believe provides a solution for the housing problem—a problem which everyone recognizes as one of the most important the country faces today.

THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN HOUSING BILL

Our bill sets up a permanent agency within the Government to promote and foster low-cost housing. It will provide homes for those families whose incomes are so low that they cannot afford to live decently. The bill will not permit competition with private home construction. On the contrary, it will stimulate business revival in the construction industries, give employment to hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers in the building trades, and provide the impetus for a great and permanent revival in the heavy goods industries.

Few measures which have been proposed in Congress have aroused such Nation-wide and well-nigh universal support as the Wagner-Ellebenbogen housing bill.

BUSINESS AND LABOR SUPPORT THE BILL

Outstanding national organizations of business, chambers of commerce, large business and banking institutions are strongly supporting our bill. Labor has hailed the bill as the most important measure necessary for the welfare of the country. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers; the United Textile Workers of America; the American Federation of Hosiery Workers; the International Garment Workers of America; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America are just a few of the endorsements among labor. I do not know of any labor union which is not openly and enthusiastically for this bill.

THE NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN BILL

The newspapers of the country have hailed the Wagner-Ellebenbogen housing bill as a sound, forward-looking, and as an absolutely necessary piece of legislation. I shall only mention a few of the many newspapers who favor the bill: The Pittsburgh Press, the New York World-Telegram, and the other newspapers belonging to the Scripps-Howard chain; the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the New York Evening Post, the Baltimore Sun, the Philadelphia Record, the Buffalo (N. Y.) Times, and many others all over the United States.

Mr. John H. Fahey, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; Mr. Stewart McDonald, Federal Housing Administrator; the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and P. W. A. Administrator; and Miss Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, have all warmly endorsed the principles of the bill.

OTHER ENDORSEMENTS

The Pennsylvania House of Representatives and other State legislatures, a large number of city councils, the United Conference of Mayors, a large number of mayors from large and small cities and towns, urban and rural communities have all endorsed this bill. I could go on indefinitely, but I just wanted to add a few more endorsements of outstanding importance: The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Unitarian Ministerial Union, the National Council of Catholic Charities, the Social Justice Commission of Special Conference of American Rabbis, National Association of Housing Officials, National Public Housing Conference, National Urban League, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Association of Letter Carriers, and the National Board of Young Women's Christian Association.

AN IMPORTANT RECOVERY MEASURE

There is no more important social measure before this session of Congress than the Wagner-Ellebenbogen housing bill. It provides, at last, decent living quarters for our low-income groups; it is a blow at the insanitary and crime-breeding slums; it meets the demand, now insistent in this country, for new home construction, of which millions of units are badly needed.

There can be no lasting recovery unless the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill is passed. Its passage will give to the children of America the opportunity to grow up to a better life in sanitary and healthy homes, full of light and sunshine; it will permit the parents of America to live in decency and comfort, befitting the American standard of living. The Congress will pass this bill next year.

FLOOD RELIEF

I did not wait for the flood of March 1936 to arouse my interest and convince me of the need for flood-control measures for Pittsburgh and the surrounding territory. Shortly after I assumed my office in the spring of 1933 I appeared before various Federal agencies urging flood relief for the Pittsburgh district. I aided greatly in the passage by the House of Representatives of the omnibus flood-control bill in 1935—a year before the recent flood—a bill which has just become a law and which contains authorization for the construction of the dams and reservoirs to protect Pittsburgh.

March 17, 1936, is a date which will never be forgotten by Pittsburghers. Because of the havoc and desolation which the floodwaters wreaked on Pittsburgh that day, I introduced in the House 2 days later H. R. 11919, appropriating \$50,000,000 for the relief of flood victims, and pleaded with my colleagues on the floor of the House for consideration of Pittsburgh's plight. I also asked the heads of W. P. A. in Washington to send W. P. A. workers into the flooded areas at once to facilitate the work of rescue and salvage. Realizing the great damage which had been done to the supplies of merchants during the flood, I introduced a bill to permit \$250,000,000 in loans to flood-stricken businessmen.

THE FLAG BILL

I should like to call attention to my bill H. R. 6193, which has been widely endorsed. It prohibits the importation of United States flags made in foreign countries, so that we may no longer have the spectacle of sitting down to the President's birthday banquet and finding on the table American flags labeled "Made in Japan."

TO COLLECT WAR DEBTS

H. R. 10310. To create a debt commission for the purpose of negotiating the payment of war debts with foreign powers. My purpose in introducing this bill was to revive this issue. It is a sorry spectacle indeed that these foreign nations present—a barefaced and shameless repudiation of debts honorably incurred for the carrying on of a war which involved their very existence.

We wanted nothing from that war—no spoils; no territory; no new countries. But we have a right to demand an honest effort to repay the money we so lavishly dealt out. While nations arm to the teeth and spend billions in armament races, they have no right to repudiate the honorable debts of past wars. Of the billions owed us, as much as possible should—indeed, must—be collected, and I am convinced a determined effort on our part will be productive of results.

VETERAN AND BONUS LEGISLATION

I introduced and voted for payments and free hospitalization to disabled veterans and for aid to dependents of veterans who died from service-connected injuries. I voted for the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates, commonly misnamed "bonus." I voted to override the President's veto and for every measure which aimed to secure justice for the veterans. I have personally aided thousands of veterans in every matter for which they called on me. The veterans know me as a true friend.

INSURANCE OF BANK DEPOSITS

I voted for the bill to protect the currency system of the United States and to insure bank deposits. Losses of billions of dollars suffered by innocent depositors through bank failures under the former Republican administrations can no longer occur.

I VOTED TO PROTECT INVESTORS AND CONSUMERS

I am proud of my vote in favor of the bill to eliminate the evils of the utility holding company. Despite the existence of a million-dollar lobby, the use of fake telegrams, and false and malicious propaganda, I voted with our great President

for what was falsely called the "death sentence" of unnecessary utility holding companies. This bill was desperately needed to protect the investors in the stocks and bonds of utility operating companies against the schemes which robbed them of the profits justly due them and destroyed their investments.

A \$16,000,000,000 SWINDLE

During 1929 corporate insiders sold \$19,000,000,000 of utility holding company stock to the investing public despite the fact that they only owned actual assets of about \$3,000,000,000. When the inflated utility-stock balloon collapsed, investors lost \$16,000,000,000 as a result of this criminal oversale of worthless and fraudulent stock.

The utility holding companies were guilty of write-ups and fictitious loans and transfers from operating companies that were added to the rate base to enable them to extort excessive and illegal rates from the public. They siphoned the profits to corporate insiders and denied the widows and orphans, for whom they shed crocodile tears, their just share of the profits.

I voted for the Wheeler-Rayburn bill to eliminate the evils and abuses of unscrupulous utility holding companies. I voted to protect the interests of the consumers, the rate payers, and of the investors.

UTILITY BARONS ARE OPPOSED TO ME

And, because of my votes in the interest of the people and against evils practiced by utilities, I am being opposed by a man who spent most of his professional life fighting for the utilities, by a man who mouths reforms, but who, in every critical hour and in every important battle, has been found in the camp of the special interests and of reaction. Every utility baron and every reactionary enthusiastically supports my opponent. They have confidence in him. They also know that I have proven myself a friend of the people, a friend of the investor, and a friend of honest business.

NO RUBBER STAMP

As a Member of Congress I have supported the policies of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I voted with the administration on every measure in which I believed, but I voted against the administration whenever my best judgment dictated such a course.

I VOTED AGAINST GAG RULE

Despite strong pressure I voted against the iniquitous gag rule that would have prevented the consideration of independent measures. These gag rules are a violation of the democratic principles of representative government, and I therefore have consistently opposed them. I was not a "rubber stamp" Congressman. I voted independently, according to the dictates of my conscience and according to my best judgment.

I have used every possible device to ascertain the views of my constituents on pending legislation and have been guided accordingly in my votes.

I DEFEATED THE ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH A SYSTEM OF TOLL BRIDGES AND TOLL HIGHWAYS IN ALLEGHENY COUNTY

I believe it would be disastrous for Allegheny County to return to a system of toll bridges and toll highways. It would substantially depreciate the value of real estate, would undermine business, and would forever destroy the industrial supremacy of Allegheny County. The imposition of tolls would have meant the end of further industrial and financial progress for Allegheny County and would have throttled and choked the business life of the county.

I knew it was a question of life and death for Allegheny County. Therefore I was determined to prevent the imposition of tolls as far as it was within my power to do so.

When the law for the creation of the Allegheny County Authority with its program of tolls was introduced in the State Legislature in Harrisburg, I hurried to Harrisburg, although I was a Member of the National Legislature and not the State legislature, and spent weeks in arguing and fighting against the passage of that law. The Republican-controlled legislature passed the law and created the Allegheny County Authority. I then carried on a consistent and

determined fight against the endless delay and red tape employed by the Allegheny County Authority. I submitted a substitute program which would eliminate tolls and construct all the useful, needed projects. Finally after struggling for several years the substitute program which I had advocated was adopted by a new board of county commissioners. The proposal to impose tolls was scrapped and the Allegheny County Authority is headed for dissolution.

I am very proud of the fact that I was privileged to take a leading part in preventing the imposition of tolls in Allegheny County and thus save every property owner in Allegheny County from depreciation of the value of his property and every businessman from loss of a large part of his business. I am proud that I was able to help to kill the tolls and thus permit the future growth of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes a partial report of my work in Congress.

I HAVE KEPT MY PLEDGES

I have shown that my campaign pledges and my congressional accomplishments square with each other. I have tried to do my job to the best of my ability and in the best interests of those whom I was chosen to serve.

HELPED CONSTITUENTS

I have tried to be helpful to my constituents in the many and various ways which are at the disposal of a congressional office. Although my mail averages 200 letters a day, each one receives a personal answer, and wherever help, assistance, or guidance is requested it is given to the full measure possible.

BROUGHT GOVERNMENT PROBLEMS TO PEOPLE

I have tried, through my radio talks, to bring to the people of my district an appreciation and understanding of the problems of government, and of how the Nation's affairs are handled. I am hopeful that in this process I have been able to contribute, in however slight a degree, to a knowledge of our work as Members of Congress—for only through an enlightened electorate can democracy flourish.

CONFIDENT OF REELECTION

The measure of a man's future accomplishment is his achievement in the past. The past is the yardstick of the future. By this yardstick, I ask that my constituents measure me, and, if they find me worthy, enable me to continue the work I have begun.

LET US HAVE REAL PATRIOTISM RATHER THAN BLIND, SELFISH, AND MACHINE-CONTROLLED PARTISANSHIP IN THE ELECTION OF OUR NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, there are two kinds of Congressmen. One is the say-nothing, do-nothing kind who are dictated to by the leaders of their political party. This type can be seen daily, listlessly and unattentive, in the rear of the floor reading newspapers or in the cloakrooms chatting over old times like inmates of the Old Soldiers' Home. When a roll-call vote is to be taken they run into the House Chamber and ask the leaders, "How shall I vote?"; and then like slaves vote as they are instructed without knowing anything as to the merits of the legislation being voted on. It would be just as satisfactory to the people they represent to replace this type of Congressman with a machine which could utter "yea" and "nay", inasmuch as many of these machine Congressmen have served for years and have yet to make a speech on the floor of the House. Nor would they dare stand up and swerve one-thousandth of an inch from the line marked out by their political bosses.

Then there is the other type of Congressman, who does not hesitate to cast his vote in the interest of the people regardless of party criticism. It is this type of Congressman that I hope will be returned to serve the people. Strange as it may seem, nevertheless my observations disclose that the more independent and fearless a Congressman is in the interest of the people the more difficult it is for him to obtain reelection because the machines at home, whose interests he would not serve, organize and use every means possible to defeat him.

The facts are that we will never have national recovery until we have an independent and aggressive Congress. The

late beloved Speaker of the House, Mr. Rainey, advised me that I was the most independent Democrat in the Seventy-third Congress; and my record proves that I would not be coerced but voted consistently in the interest of the people. Naturally, with this attitude, I was always quite anxious to observe and advise new Members of Congress to prevent them becoming vassals of the party leaders—thereby submerging their own individuality and losing their effectiveness as Congressmen. It was a pleasure to find that the Seventy-fourth Congress contained more independent-thinking Congressmen than the Seventy-third Congress. Limited time prevents my going into detail on the record of these various Representatives; however, I do wish to make a reference to one of them, a Congressman from Pennsylvania, who has proven himself to be courageous, independent, and sincerely interested in the people he represents. I refer with pleasure to the Honorable THEODORE L. MORITZ, of the Thirty-second Congressional District, who is indeed not a servant of any selfish political or other minority groups.

Congressman MORITZ's first vote upon taking over his duties as a Congressman was a vote against the "gag rule", which he had the courage to oppose against the orders of his political party.

All of Congressman MORITZ's votes, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose, were motivated by how they would benefit the people and not how they would please the political bosses. Time and time again he voted against foolish and excessive appropriations, such as retiring able-bodied Army officers at the age of 37 at \$150 and more per month, and such as retiring our Supreme Court judges at \$15,000 per year. With his single vote he blocked the creation of additional judgeships because he felt in these critical times that it would be best to legislate in the interest of the people rather than create additional jobs for the political bosses. He helped to defeat the huge appropriation to complete the Mount Rushmore statues because he felt the time was not opportune to spend money for art when the people were hungry.

On the other hand, Congressman MORITZ voted for all measures which he thought would help the rank and file—such as regulation of utility companies, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Guffey Coal Act, the Old-Age Security Act, the Wagner labor relations bill, and the Frazier-Lemke Farm Act. He not only voted for these measures but spoke in support of them, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a number of his speeches on these subjects which are masterpieces.

If our country is to prosper and if our country is to get out of the old-time rut of special privilege, it can only be done by sending independent thinkers like THEODORE L. MORITZ to the National Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I am chairman of the Committee on War Claims, one of the few committees in the House with the power to appropriate money, of which Congressman MORITZ is a member. I can truthfully say that no member of my committee has shown the deep interest in and given as much study to legislation before the committee as Congressman MORITZ. We need men of Congressman MORITZ's caliber in the House—men who take an interest in committee work and men who take an interest and make a study of legislation which reaches the floor for consideration.

In Congressman MORITZ's home town he has been buffeted by his own party because he was outspoken and independent minded, but the people are fully aware of his good work. And when the people are for you it makes little matter who is against you. I have watched his work and activities since he became a Member of the House and sincerely hope that the people of his district will arise en masse, throw the gauntlet to the self-seeking bosses, and send Congressman THEODORE L. MORITZ back to Washington, so that he may continue to fight for the people of whom he considers himself a delegate.

The people of the Thirty-second District of Pennsylvania are entitled to know the caliber and stamina which Congressman MORITZ has typified as their Representative, as no doubt the political machines will use hammer and tong in

an effort to defeat him. If the people of his district could only appreciate his independent qualities and fair attitude on legislation in their interest, they would give him an overwhelming vote of confidence and return him to Congress, first, as a reward for his courageous attitude, and, second, as a rebuke to the crooked and too often controlled political machines.

As I am the editor of a national periodical devoted to the interest of all war veterans, and as a past commander of the American Legion, United Spanish War Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, I have a sympathetic insight and understanding of the problems of our veterans. In this capacity I have always taken a determined attitude on the problems pertaining to our disabled veterans and their dependents. Congressman MORITZ is not a veteran, but he assisted me in every effort and supported me at all times in advancing the interest of the veterans of our wars. World War and Spanish War veterans owe an obligation to Congressman MORITZ and should support him for reelection. The unemployed and so-called underdog owe it to themselves to support a man who has stepped out boldly in advancing their cause.

Unless men of Congressman MORITZ's type are reelected, and their number is increased, we may as well disband the Congress and accept a dictatorship which is so prevalent in many of the European countries where the law-making bodies have been abolished, where freedom of the press is unknown, where religious worship is jeopardized, and the voice of the people is no more than a rubber stamp in the hands of the dictator. Patriotism, rather than politics, should actuate the votes of the people of the Thirty-second District of Pennsylvania and in all other sections of our beloved country. Rubber stampism is alien to American principles. It is destructive to government, and if we are to maintain our high ideals of Americanism it must be done through men of Congressman MORITZ's caliber and not by Congressman hand-picked by political machines—dominated and controlled as they are by the hand of Farley.

RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION OF U. S. FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION", U. S. S. "CONSTELLATION", U. S. S. "HARTFORD", U. S. S. "OLYMPIA", AND U. S. YACHT "AMERICA"

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill, which will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, which provides for the preservation as historical naval relics of the U. S. frigate *Constitution*, the U. S. S. *Constellation*, the U. S. S. *Hartford*, the U. S. S. *Olympia*, and the yacht *America*.

For many years I have been endeavoring to bring to the waters adjacent to the city of Washington the U. S. S. *Olympia*, desiring it to be preserved as a memorial to the men and women who served in the War with Spain. As you know, this vessel was the flagship of Admiral George Dewey in the Battle of Manila Bay. My bill has not only been reported favorably by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House on several occasions, but it passed the House and was sent to the Senate in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress. Unable to secure favorable action in the Senate, due to the fact that I could not secure the approval of the Director of the Budget, I took the matter up with the President and wrote him at length on May 21, 1936.

I am happy to say that I have received from the President the following letter, which indicates he is not only in favor of bringing the U. S. S. *Olympia* to Washington but also the other vessels:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 1, 1936.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: I have your letter of May 21, 1936, regarding bill H. R. 7220, to provide for establishing in the District of Columbia the old cruiser *Olympia* as a memorial to the men and women who served in the War with Spain.

The *Olympia* is only one of four or five old naval vessels having historical and patriotic tradition, which should be preserved and made available to the public as national shrines.

Several bills have been introduced which propose the restoration and preservation of these old naval vessels at different localities. I have given this matter considerable thought and have come to

the conclusion that the *Constitution*, the *Constellation*, the *Hartford*, the *Olympia*, and the *America* should be restored, insofar as practicable, to their original condition and berthed together in the District of Columbia, along the Potomac River, on land belonging to the United States, and maintained as historical naval relics for the inspection and inspiration of all the people of the United States who wish to visit such vessels.

It is now contemplated that preliminary surveys may soon be made and that a comprehensive plan may be developed for the consideration of Congress looking to the gradual and orderly restoration and establishment of these vessels here in Washington, such work and expense to be spread over a period of 4 years. It is difficult to select any one of these vessels as having a better claim for preferential treatment than the others. It is my view that action on bills providing for the restoration and establishment at particular locations of any or all of the old vessels in reference should now be deferred pending the conclusion of the survey and study now contemplated.

I have the assurance of the Navy Department that the *Olympia* is not required to be scrapped by any provisions of existing naval treaties.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The fact that people who come to Washington from the Middle West, especially my constituents from St. Louis, have always expressed disappointment over not being able to see a naval vessel while here was one reason that caused me to conceive the idea of bringing the *Olympia* to Washington. The more outstanding reason, however, was that I did not desire to see this historic vessel destroyed, as was recommended by the Navy Board about 8 years ago.

The first report made by the House Committee on Naval Affairs on the bill I introduced to preserve the *Olympia* contained the following:

The preservation of historic treasures has received little attention at the hands of the American people. The historic relics which are preserved in the large cities of Europe are what make these cities so interesting to American visitors.

A wave of resentment, especially among the veterans of the Spanish War, followed in the wake of the decision of naval officers to junk the *Olympia*.

I have received the assurance of Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, that reports on my bill to preserve these historic vessels will be secured during the vacation period, so that the matter can be taken up by the committee when the Seventy-fifth Congress assembles.

I am submitting a brief history of the vessels mentioned in my bill which the President says should be restored and berthed in Washington:

THE UNITED STATES FRIGATE "CONSTITUTION"

After the close of the Revolutionary War the United States disposed of all her ships until she had no Navy left in 1785. In consequence of this defenseless condition the Barbary powers preyed upon her commerce until it was no longer safe for her merchant ships to display the American flag in the Mediterranean or the waters off Gibraltar.

To meet this state of affairs the construction of six frigates was authorized by act of Congress March 27, 1794. One of these frigates was the *Constitution*, recently restored and now making a tour of the ports of the country.

This famous ship was constructed at Boston, Mass. Her keel was laid in November 1794; she was launched October 21, 1797, and went to sea in August 1798. She was built as a 44-gun ship and carried from 400 to 435 men. She was able to carry stores sufficient for a 6 months' cruise. Much of the timber used in her construction was live oak brought from the State of Georgia in the southern part of the United States. She cost when finished \$302,718.84.

Her first service was in the West Indies, 1798-1801, against the French who were committing depredations upon our commerce. She made several captures during this period, including the *Niger*, a privateer of 24 guns and 70 men, which she sent into Norfolk, Va.; the *Spencer*, a British ship, which was a prize of the French frigate *Insurgente*; and the *Sandwich*, which she cut out in the harbor of Port Platte, San Domingo.

At the close of the French (quasi) War the *Constitution* was thoroughly overhauled and fitted out for service in the Mediterranean as the flagship of Commodore Edward Preble.

She left the United States in August 1803, and during the next 4 years she was constantly in service, participating in five attacks on the harbor of Tripoli and capturing three of the enemy's ships. Not only was she employed against the enemy herself, but it was on board her that operations were planned and orders originated for the rest of the squadron. In her cabin the Treaty of Peace with Tripoli was signed June 3, 1805, which ended the paying of tribute to that country. The table on which this treaty was signed can now be seen in the captain's cabin, where it stood during that important event.

It was during our second war with Great Britain, the War of 1812, that the *Constitution* distinguished herself so conspicuously. She was in the Washington Navy Yard when war was declared June 18, 1812. The declaration was read on her deck on the 20th, and she sailed next day to join the American squadron under Commodore John Rodgers at New York. During this cruise her troubles began when she found herself in the midst of a British squadron of five ships just off New York. She finally escaped after a chase of nearly 3 days, by good management and superior seamanship. The story of the escape is one of the most interesting chapters in her history.

During the War of 1812 she ran in and out of Boston seven times, in spite of the fact that it was closely blockaded by a British fleet; she made five cruises, ranging from Halifax, Nova Scotia, on the north to Guiana on the south, and as far east as the coast of Portugal; she captured and burned, or sent in as prizes, nine merchant ships and five British ships of war; and she was shut in Boston Harbor nearly 9 months. The ships of war captured were the *Guerriere*, of 49 guns and 280 men, August 19, 1812; the *Java*, of 49 guns and 422 men, December 29, 1812; the *Pictou*, of 14 guns and 60 men, February 15, 1814; and the *Cyane* and *Levant*, captured in one engagement February 20, 1815. The *Cyane* carried 34 guns and 175 men and the *Levant* 21 guns and 138 men. This last engagement occurred 3 days after the termination of the war.

It was after the engagement with the *Guerriere* that she received the name *Old Ironsides*, because, as her seamen said, the shots of the enemy bounced off her sides as though they were made of iron.

In addition to her participation in the wars mentioned above, the *Constitution* was a very busy peacetime vessel.

She was flagship of the Mediterranean for the protection of our commerce 1821-24, 1824-28, 1835-38, and 1848-50.

She was flagship of the Pacific Squadron, operating on the west coast of South America, 1839-41.

She was employed, 1842-43, for the suppression of piracy in the West Indies.

She circumnavigated the globe, 1844-46. She left New York May 30, 1844, and visited the following places: Madeira and Rio de Janeiro; sailed around the Cape of Good Hope to Madagascar, Mozambique, Sumatra, Singapore, Borneo, China, Manila, Hawaii, San Francisco, Monterey, and Valparaiso; passed around Cape Horn and again visited Rio de Janeiro. From there she set her course for Boston, where she arrived in October 1846, having sailed 52,249 miles. During this cruise she once more found herself suddenly in the midst of a British squadron, but this time they were friends in the need of stores instead of an enemy to be outwitted.

She served as flagship of the African Squadron, 1853-55, sent out to suppress the slave trade. During her stay on the African coast she captured the American schooner *H. N. Gambrell*, suspected of being a slaver, and sent it home to New York. Commodore Isaac Mayo, the flag officer, was instrumental in bringing about peace between various warring tribes of natives along the coast.

During the Civil War, 1861-65, the *Constitution* was used as a training ship for midshipmen in connection with the Naval Academy, which was temporarily at Newport, R. I., and after the war, when the academy was removed to Annapolis, Md., she continued to serve in that capacity until 1871, when she was taken to Philadelphia, Pa., and used as a training ship for naval apprentices.

Her last cruise to a foreign shore was made in 1878, when she carried the American exhibit to France for the Universal Exposition at Paris. When she returned home she was placed out of commission, but was used for awhile as a training ship and later as a receiving ship.

In 1897 she was towed to Boston to help celebrate her one hundredth anniversary, after which she was moored to a wharf in the Boston Navy Yard and used as a naval museum until 1925, when the work of restoring her was commenced.

The *Constitution* has been rebuilt several times, and twice she has been condemned to destruction. The first time was in 1830, when she was saved by the poem *Old Ironsides*, by the American poet, Oliver Wendell Holmes. The second time she was marked for destruction was in 1900, when it was proposed to tow her to sea and use her for a target. This time she was saved largely through the efforts of a patriotic organization called the Daughters of the War of 1812.

In 1925 the Congress of the United States authorized her complete restoration, but appropriated no funds for it. Instead it was planned to raise the money by private contributions. The sum needed was about \$725,000 and it has been raised largely by the sale of pictures of her and small amounts given by American school children. It is estimated that approximately 4,500,000 children contributed.

The list of officers who served on the *Constitution* carries many names famous in American naval history, such as Silas Talbot, Edward Preble, John Rodgers, Stephen Decatur, Isaac Hull, William Bainbridge, Charles Stewart, Jacob Jones, and George Dewey.

U. S. S. "CONSTELLATION"

One of the six frigates authorized by act of Congress of March 27, 1794. Designed by Naval Constructor Joshua Humphreys. Built at the shipyard of Samuel and Joseph Sterrett, Baltimore, Md., under the immediate supervision of Capt. Thomas Truxtun, United States Navy, and Naval Constructor David Stoddard. Materials used in her construction, live oak, cedar, and pine. Keel laid, 1795. Launched, September 7, 1797; the second vessel launched under the reorganization of the United States Navy.

Length, 164 feet; beam, 41 feet; tonnage, 1,278; battery, 36 guns. Complement, 340 men. Cost, \$314,212. Sailing qualities so fine that the French called her the "Yankee race horse."

June 1798 sailed from Baltimore on her first cruise under command of Commodore Thomas Truxtun, to protect American commerce in the West Indies in the naval war with France. Made flagship of Commodore Truxtun's squadron.

February 9, 1799, near St. Kitts, West Indies, after a spirited engagement of more than an hour, received the surrender of the French frigate *L'Insurgente*. Later in the same month captured two smaller vessels from the French.

February 2, 1800, received the surrender of the French frigate *La Vengeance* after a running fight of 5 hours. This prize, though badly damaged, managed to escape in the darkness and reached Curaçao in a sinking condition.

1802-05, cruised in the Mediterranean during war with the Barbary powers.

1806-11, laid up at the Washington Navy Yard.

1812, rebuilt; 14 inches added to her beam.

1813-14, blockaded at Norfolk by the British fleet, but her boats took an active part in operations at Craney Island. Assisted in sinking 3 boats, taking 43 prisoners, and killing and wounding 90 of the enemy.

1815-22, cruised in Mediterranean, Brazil, and Pacific Squadrons.

1823-24, out of commission.

1825-44, cruised in the Mediterranean, West Indies, and the coast of Brazil.

1845-53, laid up.

1854, rebuilt at the Norfolk Navy Yard; her battery changed to 22 guns.

1855-58, Mediterranean Squadron.

1859-61, African Squadron.

1862-64, cruising in search of Confederate vessels in European waters.

1865-68, receiving ship, Norfolk and Philadelphia.

1869-71, undergoing repairs at Norfolk, Va.

1872, gunnery ship, Washington Navy Yard.

1873-92, practice ship, Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

1893-1933, attached to the training station, Newport, R. I. The *Constellation* is now used as station ship at Newport, where she is visited by many people every year.

U. S. S. "HARTFORD"

The U. S. S. *Hartford* was a steam sloop of war, launched at the Boston Navy Yard November 22, 1858. Steam sloop, first class; length, 225 feet; beam, 44 feet; depth, 18½ feet; maximum speed, 13½ knots; ordinary speed, 8 to 12 knots. Built of wood; displacement, 2,900 tons; 18 guns. Tonnage and battery were changed when alterations were made in her, and she is entered in the Navy Registers from 1862 to 1865 as of 1,990 tons, and her battery variously given as 22 guns and 26 guns. The latter number of guns she carried in 1862-63.

The first cruise of the *Hartford*, 1859-61, was to the East Indies as flagship of Commodore C. K. Stribling. She returned to the United States at the beginning of the Civil War and was refitted and put in commission January 19, 1862, commanded by Commander Richard Wainwright, and became flagship of Admiral D. G. Farragut in the West Gulf Blockading Squadron. She reached the mouth of the Mississippi River February 20, 1862; March 11 she anchored off Southwest Pass; April 7 to 16 was preparing for the passage of Forts St. Philip and Jackson, below New Orleans. Their bombardment commenced April 18 and lasted until April 24, when the *Hartford* and Farragut's fleet passed the forts; engaged Chalmette batteries on April 25. At 1 p. m. of the same day the *Hartford* anchored before New Orleans; Farragut demanded the surrender of the city through Capt. Theodor Bailey, second in command, and the next morning the American flag was hoisted on the city hall. From this period until the surrender of Vicksburg July 4, 1863, and Port Hudson July 9, 1863, the *Hartford* was conspicuously engaged, having taken part in the bombardments of those strongholds, the unsuccessful attack on the C. S. ram *Arkansas* July 22, 1862, and at one time blockaded the mouth of Red River.

After the opening of the Mississippi River to Vicksburg was accomplished and the flag hoisted over Port Hudson rest was needed. The *Hartford* returned to New Orleans, and on August 1 sailed for New York, arriving there August 10. She sailed from New York January 3, 1864, under command of Capt. Percival Drayton, with Admiral Farragut on board, reaching Southwest Pass January 21, 1864, where she resumed her duties as the flagship of the West Gulf Squadron.

August 5, 1864, the memorable engagement of Mobile Bay took place, Farragut leading his squadron in his now famous ship, the *Hartford*, part of the time standing in the rigging to obtain a better view of the action, which ended in the surrender of the squadron of Admiral Buchanan and the forts of Mobile Bay. After the active work of the squadron was finished the *Hartford* returned to New York in December, where she was put out of commission long enough to prepare for a cruise in the East Indies which lasted from July 17, 1865, to sometime in 1868.

After this she was repaired and again sent as flagship of the same station, Rear Admiral Jenkins, from 1872 to 1875.

From 1876 to 1877 she was flagship of the North Atlantic Squadron, and under Capt. S. B. Luce began her career as a training ship. From 1877 to 1879 she was on the south Atlantic station.

During 1882 she carried the solar eclipse party around Cape Horn to the Pacific. In 1886 she was in the Pacific and was laid up for repairs at the Mare Island Navy Yard until 1899. October of that year she was recommissioned and sent on special service, and then became a training ship for landsmen, and as such cruised in all parts of the world until 1906, during part of which year and in 1907-11 she was used as practice ship for the midshipmen at the Naval Academy. In 1912-26 she was station ship at Charleston, S. C. November

19, 1904, she took part in the ceremonies at the unveiling of the statue of Frederick the Great at Washington, D. C. Her battery in 1922 was of light rapid-fire guns.

She is still at Charleston, S. C., out of commission.

U. S. S. "OLYMPIA"

A protected cruiser, built at the Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Calif. Authorized September 7, 1888; keel laid in 1890; launched November 25, 1892, and named for the capital city of the State of Washington. Commissioned February 5, 1895.

Length overall, 344 feet 1 inch; breadth on waterline, 53 feet ½ inch; mean draft, 21 feet 6 inches; normal displacement, 5,865 tons; speed, 21.69 knots; armament, ten 5-inch R. F. guns, four 8-inch B. L. R.; complement, 34 officers, 346 men.

After service as the flagship of Rear Admiral F. V. McNair, from 1895 to 1898, cruising in waters of Japan, China, and the Sandwich Islands, the *Olympia* became the flagship of Admiral George Dewey, in command of the Asiatic Squadron, on January 3, 1898, Capt. G. V. Gridley commanding.

On May 1, 1898, at the Battle of Manila Bay, the *Olympia* led the attack on the ships of the Spanish Squadron. Admiral Dewey in his autobiography states:

At 5.40, when we were within a distance of 5,000 yards, I turned to Captain Gridley, and said, "You may fire when you are ready, Gridley." While I remained on the bridge with Lamberton, Brumby, and Stickney, Gridley took his station in the conning tower and gave the order to the battery. The very first gun to speak was an 8-inch from the forward turret of the *Olympia*, and this was the signal for all the other ships to join in the action.

The action lasted from 5.41 a. m.—with an interruption of 3 hours—until 12.30 p. m., and ended in the destruction of the enemy's vessels.

On account of the ill health of Captain Gridley, Commander B. P. Lamberton was ordered to take command of the *Olympia* in June 1898. The vessel continued with the Asiatic Squadron until she went out of commission November 8, 1898, at the navy yard, Boston, Mass.

In January 1902 the *Olympia* was recommissioned under command of Capt. H. W. Lyon and joined the North Atlantic Squadron as flagship in April 1902.

From December 1903 to April 1904 the *Olympia* was protecting American interests and lives in Panama, going on the same service in June to Smyrna and Turkey. In May 1905 and from July to December 1905 she was on a similar mission in Dominican waters.

This vessel was placed out of commission on April 2, 1906, at the Norfolk Navy Yard, but was recommissioned on May 15, 1907, and cruised with the midshipmen from the Naval Academy. Placed in reserve at Annapolis. In 1912 taken to Charleston, S. C., where she remained in ordinary until 1916.

When the United States entered the World War the *Olympia* was en route from St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, to the Norfolk Navy Yard. A week later she was designated flagship of the United States patrol force, Commander of the Patrol Force Rear Admiral Henry B. Wilson and Capt. Waldo Evans in command of the *Olympia*.

She was employed in patrol duty off the coast of Nova Scotia and as ocean escort for British merchantmen en route to and from New York and the war zone. On April 28, 1918, she sailed from Charleston for Europe, arriving on May 20 at Scapa Flow, Scotland, and arrived at Murmansk, Russia, May 24. She transported Lieutenant General Poole, of the British Army, and a small detachment of troops. They drove off an attack at Pechenga.

On June 8, 1918, the *Olympia* sent a detachment 150 strong to Kandalaska to assist in guarding that point. When the Murmansk government broke with the Bolsheviki allied troops landed in Murmansk. In August a detachment from the *Olympia* under Captain Bierer took part in the successful expedition against Archangel. This same detachment under Lieutenant Hicks bore their share in the pursuit of the retreating Bolshevists to the interior, having some hard fighting.

In December 1918 the *Olympia* became the flagship of the commander, United States naval forces, eastern Mediterranean, visited ports along the Adriatic, and made a cruise of the Black Sea.

In September 1919 was underway for Trau, Dalmatia, having been informed by the Italian senior naval officer present of the occupation of Trau by renegade Italian troops from the Italian occupied zone, which he urged the United States naval authorities to induce to return to the Italian zone prior to an inevitable clash of arms with the Serbian military authorities. Arriving at Trau, disembarked a landing force of 101 men and officers. The mission having been accomplished, the landing force returned to the ship, which returned to Spalato the same evening.

November 7, 1920, assisted in the delivery to the Italian Government of the ex-Austrian battleship *Radetzky* and ex-Austrian battleship *Zrinyi*. These two vessels held in trust by the United States after the armistice were towed out to sea and delivered to the Italian authorities as per agreement.

At Ragusa, Dalmatia, assisted in caring for refugees who were landed there and were in desperate circumstances due to hunger, lack of shelter, and the outbreak of typhus and smallpox. The ship distributed fuel, soap, clothing, and food and the medical officer cared for the sick.

The *Olympia* remained in European waters until May 4, 1921, when she left for the Philadelphia Navy Yard. She participated in the bombing exercises of the ex-German ships *Frankfort* and *Osterfriesland*.

In September 1921 she was assigned the duty of bringing home for burial in Arlington Cemetery the Unknown Soldier, representative of the heroes of the American forces of the World War. She left the Philadelphia Navy Yard on this mission on October 3, 1921, reaching Plymouth October 16. She arrived at the Washington Navy Yard on November 9, 1921, with the Unknown Soldier, where she was met by representatives of the Army and Navy and the other services.

The *Olympia* was placed out of commission at Philadelphia December 9, 1922. During the Sesquicentennial Exposition at Philadelphia visitors to the exposition were admitted on board as part of the Navy's exhibit at the celebration. She is still at Philadelphia, out of commission—1936.

UNITED STATES YACHT "AMERICA"

The United States yacht *America* was originally the famous American racing vessel that won the trophy known as the *America's* cup from the Royal Yacht Squadron at Cowes, England, August 22, 1851. She was a sailing schooner, built by George Steers, of New York, in 1851. Her dimensions, and so forth, were as follows: Length over all, 111 feet; beam, 25 feet; deck to keelson, 11 feet. Draft: Aft, 12 feet; forward, 7 feet 6 inches. Rate: Fourth. Tonnage, 100.

For the early history of the *America* see the Lawson History of the *America's* Cup, from which the following résumé of events following her victory and prior to her acquisition by the United States Navy is culled:

After sailing a match with the *Titania* off the Isle of Wight, August 28, 1851, the *America* was sold by the American syndicate that owned her to Lohn John de Blanquiers for \$25,000. Her masts were shortened and her rigging changed, and in 1852 she was raced in England with moderate success. She cruised in the Mediterranean during the same year, and in 1853 was sold to Lord Templeton, who used her for about a year and then laid her up at Cowes. In 1859 she was sold to the owner of the Northfleet Yard—England—who rebuilt her, making her as good as new. In 1860 she was purchased by H. E. Decie—Lord Decie—who changed her name to *Camilla*, cruised in the West Indies, and upon his return to England raced her with indifferent success. She is next heard from on this side of the water, having been bought from her English owner by some person—name not recorded—in Savannah, Ga., where she arrived in April 1861. At Savannah a gun was mounted on her and she was fitted out as a blockade runner and dispatch boat for the Confederacy under the name of *Memphis*. No connected history of her adventures in this picturesque period of her career has been preserved.

The *Memphis* was finally chased into the St. Johns River, Fla., by a United States blockading vessel and was sunk there by the Confederates. She was discovered in Dunns Lake by a boat expedition commanded by Commander Thomas H. Stevens, United States Navy, in March 1862, was raised by him, and, after being repaired, was taken into the United States Navy under her original name. She was appraised at \$6,000 by Rear Admiral S. F. du Pont November 1, 1862, and was purchased from the New York prize court by the Navy Department May 19, 1863, for \$700. She served on the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron off Charleston, S. C., until May 1863.

Commander Stevens' version of the *America's* connection with the Confederacy, given in his report of April 23, 1862, to Flag Officer S. F. du Pont, commanding the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron, is as follows:

The *America* was brought to Jacksonville by a Lord Dacy, and, I am well informed, was sold to the Confederate Government some 4 months ago (at which time she ran the blockade) for the sum of \$60,000. It is asserted and generally believed she was bought by the rebels for the purpose of carrying Slidell and Mason to England.

The officers who found and raised the *America* waived all claim to prize money, requesting that she be sent North and used as a practice ship for midshipmen at the Naval Academy. She was ordered to this duty in May 1863, and was the pride of the midshipmen until 1873. She was sold at auction to Gen. Benjamin F. Butler and Col. Jonas H. French, of Boston, June 20, 1873, and used for racing and cruising. She was rebuilt in 1885, and sailed her last race in that year unsuccessfully. In 1917 she passed into the hands of the Eastern Yacht Club of Marblehead, Mass., and was by them and others presented to the Navy in 1921, as follows: She was turned over to the Government at the Naval Academy at Annapolis on October 1, 1921, at 10:30 a. m. for the sum of \$1, the presentation being made by Mr. Charles Francis Adams on behalf of the American Restoration Fund and other organizations, and so forth, and taken over by the Navy Department as a relic.

U. S. S. "AMERICA"

Line of battleship; 182½ feet length; 50 feet beam; 1,982 tons; full complement, 626 officers and men. First ship of her class built in America.

Built by order of Congress at Portsmouth, N. H., under the direction of Col. James Hackett. From May 10, 1777, to May 12, 1781, Capt. Tobias Lear superintended the building, and she was completed under the supervision of Capt. John Paul Jones. Commenced in 1777, launched November 5, 1782.

Capt. John Paul Jones was unanimously selected by Congress to command the *America*, but it was decided to present her to France to replace the *Magnifique*, wrecked in Boston Harbor. She was accordingly when launched delivered to the Chevalier de Martigne, late commander of the *Magnifique*. The French Minister at Philadelphia, Chevalier de Luzerne, was directed to receive her for the service of the King of France. Jones was ordered to superintend her fitting out.

She sailed for France and was in active service during 1782 and 1783, then laid up at Brest. In 1786 a commission ordered by the King to examine the *America* found her too much decayed to be repaired; she was ordered to be broken up and a new vessel built to bear the name *America*.

The figurehead of the *America* was designed by John Paul Jones. It was the figure of the Goddess of Liberty crowned with laurel; the right hand raised, forefinger pointing to heaven, on the left arm a shield of blue with 13 silver stars in it.

ROOSEVELT OR LANDON?—BUILDERS VERSUS WRECKERS!

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the battle lines are drawn. The war is on. It is Roosevelt and Garner versus Landon and Knox. Progressives, liberals, humanitarians versus old guards, reactionaries, monopolies, Liberty Leaguers.

The one pronounced progressive candidate, Senator BORAH, was so disgusted with the standpat atmosphere of the Republican Cleveland convention that he did not even attend the convention, nor has he endorsed the candidate since.

The outstanding liberal and progressive Republican, Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, has openly and publicly endorsed President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

THREE LONG YEARS?

They have stressed the 3 long years of Roosevelt. They have said nothing of the 3 long and terrible years under Hoover.

This is not only a mighty interesting comparison but it tells the very heart of the political question confronting every voter when he goes into his voting booth on November 3.

In the first place, think of the Hoover 3 long years from what you yourself saw and experienced—suffering mothers, sweatshops, ragged children, hungry and starving toilers, ground down by the greedy oppressors' heels, 14,000,000 or 15,000,000 unemployed, banks failing everywhere—causing universal ruin and suicides, homes and farms foreclosed by the hundreds of thousands, millions of boys tramping the roads and railroads, drifting hither and yon and headed straight for the devil, businesses going to pot on every hand in every community, farm prices so low that they would not bring enough even to pay interest and taxes, with almost everybody you saw without hope and surrounded in gloom and despair. As you think back, is not this the actual, the unvarnished, picture of the Hoover 3 long years?

And then compare these with the 3 long years under Roosevelt; the hungry fed; sweatshops abolished; many millions given employment; the farm income raised toward a prosperous condition; workers given more decent working and living conditions; bank failures almost entirely stopped; business prosperous everywhere; millions of boys taken from the streets and railroads into the C. C. C. camps and employment; mortgage foreclosures on homes and farms reduced almost to a minimum; stock-market graft wiped out; millions of needy old people, blind, and dependent children helped; spirits revived; and gloom and distress turned into hope and assurance.

We should pick up their slogan and song of 3 long years and bring it, as it actually is, and burn it into the minds of every possible voter in the country. This is the real question between the two parties, Do you want to go back to the Hoover 3 long years or do you want to continue the Roosevelt 3 long years?

The Republican convention's great demonstration, you know, was for Mr. Hoover, and Mr. Hoover heartily approves Governor Landon; therefore, it would seem that Governor Landon typifies the Hoover 3 long years, especially as the Governor so heartily condemns the Roosevelt 3 long years.

ROOSEVELT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

He has turned despair into hope and prosperity for nearly all of the people.

He has provided jobs for many, many millions.

He has fed hungry mouths and has kept great groups of our people from starving and from anarchy.

He has practically doubled the farm income.

During the Hoover administration more than 6,000 banks were closed, with the consequence of disaster and loss almost beyond telling and beyond measuring, while the President has so rearranged the situation that a bank failure is now almost unknown.

He has guaranteed the bank deposits for more than 50,000,000 of American citizens.

He has shifted the money center of America from Wall Street to Washington.

He has saved a million homes from foreclosures through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Farm evictions prior to his administration were at a rate of more than 200,000 a year. He has loaned about \$4,000,000,000 and has saved hundreds and hundreds of thousands of farms and farm homes from the continued foreclosures.

He has saved and helped tens of thousands of banks, insurance companies, railroads, and other business institutions through the R. F. C.

He has taken a million and a quarter boys from begging rides from automobiles on the highways and from stealing

rides on railroad trains, drifting back and forth aimlessly and heading straight into crime, and has put them into the health-giving, the hope-giving, and the prosperity-giving C. C. C. camps.

He has outlawed the sweatshop and abolished child labor.

He has provided for old-age insurance through cooperation with the States, and has given help to dependent children and the physically incapacitated.

He has given us the Securities Commission, which protects innocent investors from the lying and thieving devices of the unscrupulous confidence men and their worthless stocks.

He has given us the Tennessee Valley electrical yardstick and is bringing electricity into hundreds of thousands of farm homes through the R. E. A., and its efficient chairman, Morris L. Cooke.

He has taken 600,000 farm families—about 3,000,000 people—from relief rolls and put them into self-respecting and self-supporting conditions on farms through the Resettlement Administration.

He has kept tens of thousands of young people in schools and colleges.

Through the Federal Housing Administration he has helped hundreds of thousands of people to build and buy their own homes.

In 1932, 900 corporations made a net profit of \$142,000,000. Last year these same corporations made more than 10 times that much profit—\$1,568,000,000. On every hand business is better and in some instances is booming.

He has increased our foreign trade with many countries, in some as much as 30 percent.

And there are a lot of other great benefits which his administration has accomplished.

The 3 years under Roosevelt was a people's Government. The 3 years under Hoover was an Andy Mellon-Wall Street Government.

I could go on all day making similar comparisons, but these I have given tell the whole story. There is no question in my mind as to which 3 long years the people will choose.

The Wall Street-Old Guard crowd are about as honest with the people as the hubby was with his wife. He telephoned to her from a night club, "I'm working late at the office, dear." Replied the wife, "Well, you must be made of asbestos. Your office burned down shortly after 5."

DEPRIVED OF LIBERTIES?

Another fearful convention howl was that President Roosevelt is depriving us of many of our liberties. Yes; this is true. He is. There are two kinds of liberties—the kind of liberties we want, and the kind of liberties we do not want.

The kind of liberties that we do not want are those which gave to certain powerful financial interests special privileges to loot and rob the American public at will. Those interests and special privileges regarded these rights which they possessed under the previous Republican administration as their liberties. It was those liberties which wrecked and ruined our Nation. The rules of the game that were established by Andy Mellon and his crowd have been scrapped and discarded and in doing so, the real liberties of the people, as originally contemplated by the fathers of our country and guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, will again be triumphant in this great land of ours.

LABOR FOR ROOSEVELT

The American Labor movement has abandoned its non-partisan policy and has taken a definite stand favoring Roosevelt Democratic liberalism. John L. Lewis, head of the Mine Workers' Union, and Maj. George L. Berry, of the Pressman's Union, have pledged to deliver 500,000 members of these organizations to President Roosevelt. The members of the labor organizations are active in their support of the President.

President William Green of the American Federation of Labor, in a speech in Washington last spring heartily endorsed the President and his policies.

WHO IS DISSATISFIED WITH ROOSEVELT?

The Republican newspapers would lead their readers to believe that the people are dissatisfied with President Roosevelt.

Let us tear down their vicious cartoons and libelous articles. Let us analyze those subsidized remarks that appear in the Republican press.

Now who is it, then, that is dissatisfied with the work of the Roosevelt administration? Not those who have been aided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Not those whose farms have been saved by the Farm Credit Administration. Not those who have been able to refinance their mortgages at a lessened rate of interest through the activities of the Federal Housing Administration. Not those whose homes have been saved by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Not the stockholders or creditors of banks, insurance companies, and railroads that have been rescued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Surely not those who have received aid or found work through the Public Works Administration or the Works Progress Administration. Not the 1,250,000 boys who were taken from idleness and the streets and given opportunity and training in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Not the 52,000,000 American citizens whose deposits in the banks of the country have been made secure by the act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Not the laboring groups in whose interest the National Recovery Administration established collective bargaining, improved working conditions, outlawed the sweatshop, abolished child labor, and gave to industry an opportunity for constructive leadership.

Not those whose humanitarian instincts approve the Social Security Act and its provisions for old-age insurance and grants to States for widows' pensions, child welfare, and public-health service. Let me say to you at this time that the inadequate old-age pensions now being paid by the State of Michigan is not the Federal Government's fault, but this lies at the door of our Republican Governor who apparently does not believe in fair treatment for the aged of our State and for the widows and for child welfare.

Not those who recognized the need of abolishing holding companies, formerly connected with the banks of our country, which made it possible for reckless or corrupt financiers to speculate with the savings of depositors or waste the funds entrusted to their care. Not those who favor stock-market regulations to protect the public in connection with securities offered for general sale. Not those whose utility rates have been reduced through the activities and influence of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Not those who wanted to see the price level lifted and the debt burden of the country made bearable. Not those who have followed international developments and have noted the fruitful efforts to expand our markets and to revive foreign trade. In Detroit alone the reciprocal tariff agreements made by our President and our Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, has increased industrial production and has aided the export trade of automobiles over 100 percent. This in turn aids in increasing employment in our factories and places at work many a person, who prior to these trade agreements was unemployed.

Not those who realize that the American dollar is the soundest money on earth; and that there is a larger metallic reserve behind every Government issue than at any previous time in our history.

Surely not the great masses of the people who see evidence of increasing prosperity upon every hand.

Who, then, I repeat, are dissatisfied? No doubt thwarted political ambitions, unrelenting partisanship, and ultra-conservatism account for the major portion of the forces arrayed against us. These things we understand and accept. There are those who complain that the Budget has not been balanced. If the President had balanced the Budget at the time his critics insisted that he should do so, how many of our citizens would have been forced to go without food? Which was the more important thing to do, balance the Government's Budget or balance the people's budget?

The people of this great country are proud that they had a President and a Congress that thought of them first. Men with a heart, who, seeing and knowing the condition of the people of our country, thought in terms of them. It was impossible to balance the Budget and feed the people at the same time. If it be treason to the doctrines of sound finance to feed and clothe the hungry and naked, then let the critics of the administration make the most of it.

Of course, recovery has cost a great deal of money, but far less than unfriendly critics assume. Nor do the critics allow any credit for the public buildings that have been erected, the great bridges that are being flung across our rivers, the thousands of miles of good roads that are being laid, the dams that are being built, and the innumerable other projects that add to the wealth and well-being of our country. This outpouring of public credit had for its primary object the rescue of millions of Americans from the impossible position in which the economic collapse had placed them. The purpose was to preserve to them their private ownership of property; their right to conduct their enterprises as independent and useful factors in American life and to avoid the processes of liquidation by which the great bulk of our fellow citizens were rapidly being forced into the growing army of the unemployed.

There are still many grave problems yet to be worked out, which must be approached not only with all the intelligence the Nation can summon, but with a devotion amounting to consecration.

Do you suppose for a moment that the Republican Party, as now constituted, or as it is likely to be constituted, would be able to grasp the social consequences involved in these great economic problems or be willing to adopt the measures of relief that existing conditions demand? It would be a vain and futile hope.

The dawning future is aglow with promise and when the history of this era is written, President Roosevelt will be more and more clearly revealed not only as a friend of human justice and social progress, but as the protector and defender of our accredited form of government, which by his genius he has vindicated.

BUILDERS VERSUS WRECKERS

The issue is clear—shall we continue the New Deal which has rescued our country from disaster and despair; or shall the Government be turned back to the old dealers who wrecked and ruined it?

The consequences of the coming election are vital to the future of our Nation. We must do our utmost toward swelling the majority that will testify to the national desire that the processes of recovery, initiated and caused by President Roosevelt, shall not be interrupted.

The verdict must be so overwhelming, so conclusive, so compelling, that nobody can doubt that the country is united in its determination and there shall be no backward step in our progress.

HON. TILMAN BACON PARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I should not wish for this session to come to a close without expressing to the House my keen regret over the fact that our beloved colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable TILMAN BACON PARKS, is voluntarily retiring from membership in this body. Despite the importunities of his many friends in and out of Congress our friend has concluded to terminate his enviable congressional career.

Mr. PARKS took his seat in this House on March 4, 1921, and has served continuously with distinction ever since. But relatively few of the present membership have had longer service. My service antedates Mr. PARKS by 8 years. Therefore, it has been my privilege to know and serve with him throughout his membership. Our association naturally became closer when he became a member of the Committee on Appropriations on December 9, 1931, immediately becoming a member of the important War Department subcommittee, in which he succeeded to the chairmanship at the commencement of the Seventy-fourth Congress. No word of praise from me is necessary of the splendid record he made

in that important post. Every Member here who gives close attention to the national defense will bear witness to the signal contribution he has made in providing us with a better, more effective, and more efficient Military Establishment.

Mr. PARKS' withdrawal can only mean a decided loss to the House, to his great State, and to the Nation; and I am sure there is no man in this body, on either side of the aisle, who does not join me in the earnest wish that his future may be blessed with good health, happiness, and prosperity in abundant measure.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I shall include an editorial from the Boston Evening American entitled "A Real Representative." It is a well-deserved tribute to our departing friend:

[From the Boston American]

A REAL REPRESENTATIVE

The retirement from Congress at the expiration of his present term of Representative TILMAN B. PARKS marks the passing from public life, for the present at least, of a statesman who will leave behind him in Washington an enviable record of devoted service to the national defense of his country.

While faithfully representing his own constituents of the Seventh District of Arkansas for the past 15 years, he has been broad enough in his stalwart Americanism to visualize the Nation and its needs as a whole. This is an attribute so rare today as to be deserving of the highest praise.

As chairman of the military subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in his closing term, Mr. PARKS was largely instrumental in bringing before the House, with the full support of his committee, an appropriation bill which for the first time in many years recognized the deplorable state of weakness into which the United States Army had been permitted to sink, and presented an intelligent program for its improvement.

For the first time also in many years, under the leadership of Mr. PARKS, the attention of Congress was directed to the Pacific.

Accompanied by Representative JOHN F. DOCKWEILER, of California, who gave him constant encouragement and support, and by other members of his subcommittee, Mr. PARKS a year ago made a personal examination of the defenses of the west coast from Seattle to San Diego, of the Panama Canal, and of the Hawaiian Islands.

The committee was impressed with the strategic importance of the Pacific, gathered valuable data at first hand, and incorporated the ideas obtained in the Army bill of this year which gives the country its first adequate defense program since the close of the World War.

It is, unhappily, unusual to find a public servant who maintains his enthusiasm to the very close of his appointed term of office. It is a weakness of human nature to lose interest in a duty which is soon to be relinquished.

Mr. PARKS has known for a long time that he would not be a candidate to succeed himself in Congress with the expiration of his present term.

The indefatigability of his zeal for the national defense thus grew from no selfish motive, but from the highest instincts of disinterested love of country.

With his retirement the Army will lose a valued supporter, Arkansas a faithful servant, and the Nation a patriotic and most efficient legislator.

SALARIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave to extend, I am submitting a statement of salaries paid officials and directors of certain companies and corporations. This list was furnished by the Securities and Exchange Commission on June 15, 1936, and reads as follows:

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
Allied Stores Corporation:		
B. Earl Puckett.....	President and director.....	\$73,147
Richard Mitton.....	Chairman and director of registrant; officer of 1 subsidiary.....	50,235
American Express Co., P. F. Small.....	President and director.....	68,665
American Rolling Mill Co.:		
George M. Verity.....	Chairman and director.....	63,000
Charles R. Hook.....	President, general manager, and director.....	54,000
American Smelting & Refining Co.:		
Francis H. Brownell.....	Chairman and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.....	100,000
H. G. Guess.....	Vice president and director.....	70,000
Simon Guggenheim.....	President and director.....	50,000
American Sugar Refining Co., Earl D. Babst.....	Chairman and director.....	77,160

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.:		
W. S. Gifford.....	President and director.....	\$205,250
C. P. Cooper.....	Vice president and director.....	74,250
C. M. Bracelen.....	Vice president and general counsel.....	61,875
B. Gheradi.....	Vice president and chief engineer.....	61,875
H. D. Pillsbury.....	President and director of 1 subsidiary.....	55,008
Leonard H. Kinnard.....	Chairman and director of 1 subsidiary.....	55,000
American Tobacco Co.:		
George W. Hill.....	President and director.....	137,043
James E. Lipscomb, Jr.....	Director and president of 1 subsidiary.....	100,000
Vincent Riggio.....	Vice president and director.....	60,000
Charles F. Neiley.....	do.....	60,000
Thomas R. Taylor.....	do.....	50,000
Paul M. Hahn.....	do.....	50,000
American Water Works & Electric Co., Inc., H. Hobart Porter.....	President and director.....	80,625
American Woolen Co.:		
Lionel J. Noah.....	do.....	85,300
Moses Pendleton.....	Vice president and director.....	50,300
Anaconda Copper Mining Co.:		
Cornelius F. Kelley.....	President and director of registrant; president of 8 subsidiaries.....	174,504
James R. Hobbins.....	Vice president and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.....	60,574
Associated Gas & Electric Co., J. I. Mange.....	President and director.....	55,572
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., S. T. Bladsoe.....	do.....	55,500
Atlantic Refining Co.:		
J. W. Van Dyke.....	Chairman and director.....	100,000
W. M. Irish.....	President and director.....	75,000
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Daniel Willard.....	President.....	60,000
Beneficial Industrial Loan Corporation, Charles H. Watts.....	President and director of registrant; officer and director of 5 subsidiaries; director of 45 subsidiaries.....	68,585
Bethlehem Steel Corporation:		
Charles M. Schwab.....	Chairman and director of registrant; officer or director of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	230,000
Eugene G. Grace.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	180,000
Quincy Bent.....	Director of registrant; officer, director, or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	90,000
C. Austin Buck.....	do.....	90,000
Paul Mackall.....	do.....	75,000
R. E. McMath.....	Vice president, secretary, and director of registrant; officer or director of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	58,500
Borden Co., Arthur W. Milburn.....	President and director.....	95,000
Boston & Maine R. R., E. S. French.....	President and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.....	59,000
Brooklyn-Manhattan Transit Corporation, William S. Menden.....	President and director.....	62,189
Brooklyn Union Gas Co., James H. Jourdan.....	do.....	81,092
California Packing Corporation, L. E. Wood.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.....	50,240
Chicago & North Western Ry. Co., Fred W. Sargent.....	President and director.....	50,000
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., Ralph Budd.....	do.....	50,000
Coca-Cola Co., R. W. Woodruff.....	President and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary.....	100,500
Columbia Gas & Electric Corporation:		
Philip G. Gosler.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.....	91,300
Thomas B. Gregory.....	Senior vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.....	51,050
Commercial Credit Co.:		
A. E. Duncan.....	Chairman and director.....	55,000
J. P. Maguire.....	President of subsidiary.....	55,000
Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, Wendell L. Willkie.....	President and director.....	65,971
Consolidated Gas Co. of New York: George B. Cortelyou.....	President, trustee, and member executive committee of registrant; officer or director of 22 subsidiaries.....	108,506
Frank W. Smith.....	Trustee and member executive committee of registrant; officer or director of 9 subsidiaries.....	78,188
Floyd L. Carlisle.....	Chairman, trustee, and member executive committee of registrant; officer or director of 9 subsidiaries.....	57,930
Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore, Herbert A. Wagner.....	President, member executive committee, and director.....	66,640
Continental Oil Co., Dan Moran.....	President and director.....	100,000
Corn Products Refining Co.:		
George M. Moffett.....	do.....	144,750
Frederick T. Fisher.....	Vice president, secretary and treasurer, and director.....	121,500
George S. Mahana.....	Vice president and director.....	121,500

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
Crown Zellerbach Corporation, Louis Bloch	Chairman and director	\$67,760
Curtis Publishing Co.: G. H. Lorimer	Chairman, president, and director	100,000
P. S. Collins	Vice president and director	60,751
F. A. Healy	do	54,000
Delaware & Hudson Railroad Corporation, L. F. Loree	President and director	50,000
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R., J. M. Davis	do	60,000
Detroit Edison Co., Alex Dow	do	75,715
Eastman Kodak Co.: Frank W. Lovejoy	do	90,904
William G. Stuber	Chairman and director	61,230
Electric Power & Light Corporation, H. C. Couch	Director of registrant; officer or director of 8 subsidiaries	71,335
Erie Railroad Co., C. E. Denney	President and director	53,750
Federal Water Service Corporation, C. T. Chenery	President and director of registrant; chairman and director of 14 subsidiaries	56,700
Federated Department Stores, Inc.: Simon Lazarus	Vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries	100,440
Fred Lazarus, Jr.	Director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries	100,320
Louis E. Kirstein	do	80,400
Edward J. Frost	Secretary, treasurer, and director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries	80,320
Lincoln Filene	Chairman and director of registrant; chairman and treasurer of subsidiary	80,140
Samuel J. Bloomingtondale	Director of registrant; chairman of 1 subsidiary	76,201
Edward C. Blum	Assistant secretary and assistant treasurer of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary	57,720
Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Co.: Ernest Sturm	Chairman and director of registrant; chairman of 5 associated companies and director of 8 associated companies	96,597
Bernard M. Culver	President and director of registrant; president of 5 associated companies and director of 8 associated companies	56,201
General American Transportation Corporation, Max Epstein	Chairman and director	60,000
General Electric Co.: Gerard Swope	President and director	87,260
Owen D. Young	Chairman and director	87,260
General Motors Corporation: William S. Knudsen	Executive vice president and director	211,129
Alfred P. Sloan, Jr.	President and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary	201,744
Charles F. Kettering	Vice president and director	140,695
Donaldson Brown	Vice president and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary	134,688
John L. Pratt	Vice president and director	134,528
Lawrence P. Fisher	do	125,219
John Thomas Smith	do	125,213
Richard H. Grant	Vice president	118,802
James D. Mooney	Vice president and director	118,129
William A. Fisher	Vice president	110,569
Albert Bradley	Vice president and director	98,253
Charles E. Wilson	do	98,018
Ormond E. Hunt	Vice President	98,003
Charles T. Fisher	Vice president and director	78,840
John T. Schumann, Jr.	Director of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary	71,631
Gimbel Bros., Kenneth Collins	Vice president and director	50,000
B. F. Goodrich Co., J. D. Tew	President, member executive committee, and director	60,143
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., P. W. Litchfield	Chairman, president, and director	81,000
Great Northern R. R. Co., Wm. P. Kenney	President and director	60,000
Great Western Sugar Co.: W. L. Petrikin	Chairman of board and director	55,000
W. D. Lippitt	President and director	53,363
Houston Oil Co. of Texas, Geo. A. Hill, Jr.	do	51,480
Illinois Central R. R. Co., L. A. Downs	do	60,000
International Business Machines Corporation: Thomas J. Watson	do	365,339
Otto E. Braitmayer	Vice president and director	60,330
International Harvester Co., Addis E. McKinstry	President and director	60,757
International Paper & Power Co.: Archibald R. Graustein	President and director of registrant; president of 2 subsidiaries	95,696
Frank D. Comerford	Vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of 3 subsidiaries	73,100
International Paper Co., R. J. Cullen	Vice president of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries	62,880
International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, Sosthenes Behn	President and director of registrant; director of 10 subsidiaries; director of foreign subsidiaries not named	51,648

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
International Utilities Corporation, P. M. Chandler	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 7 subsidiaries	\$57,110
Kennecott Copper Corporation: D. C. Jackling	Chairman operating committee of registrant; officer or director of 6 subsidiaries	101,410
E. T. Stannard	President and director	75,820
Stephen Birch	Chairman and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary	75,700
Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., Albert H. Morrill	President and director	77,756
Lehigh Valley R. R. Co., E. E. Loomis	do	60,000
Lehman Corporation, A. H. Bunker	Vice president and director	50,000
P. Lorillard, Benjamin L. Belt	President and director	51,667
R. H. Macy Co.: Percy S. Straus	President and director of registrant; vice president of 1 subsidiary	112,217
Edwin I. Marks	Vice president and director of registrant; vice president of 1 subsidiary	101,610
William J. Wells	Director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary	75,300
Delos Walker	Vice president and director	70,135
Jesse Isador Straus	Vice president and director of registrant; vice president of 1 subsidiary	61,465
Marshall Field & Co., John McKinley	President and director	60,000
May Department Stores Co., Morton J. May	do	100,000
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corporation, Jacob France	do	81,000
Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., S. L. Avery	do	100,180
National Dairy Products Corporation: Thos. H. McInnerney	President and director	108,700
L. A. Van Bomel	Vice president and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary	60,800
J. L. Kraft	Director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary	56,390
National Distillers Products Corporation, Seton Porter	President and director	75,400
National Lead Co., William H. Croft	Director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary	88,014
National Steel Corporation: Ernest T. Weir	Chairman and director	53,672
John C. Williams	Vice president and director of registrant; president and director of 3 subsidiaries	53,671
George R. Fink	President and director of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary	53,643
New York Central R. R. Co., F. E. Williamson	President and director of registrant; officer and director of 4 subsidiaries	60,000
Norfolk & Western Ry. Co., A. C. Needles	Chairman, president, and director	60,000
North American Co.: Louis H. Egan	Director of registrant; officer or director of 30 subsidiaries	56,350
James F. Fogarty	President, member executive committee, and director of registrant; director of 16 subsidiaries	52,108
Harrison Williams	Chairman executive committee and director	50,260
Owens Illinois Glass Co., Wm. E. Levis	President, general manager, and director	100,000
Pacific Gas & Electric Co., A. F. Hockenbeamer	President and director	70,133
Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co.: Louis Blaustein	President and director	65,250
Jacob Blaustein	Executive vice president and director	55,250
Pennsylvania R. R. Co., W. W. Atterbury	President and director	60,000
Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Louis S. Cates	do	76,440
Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Corporation, Andrew J. Maloney	President and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary	60,717
Philadelphia Electric Co., W. H. Taylor	President, member executive committee, and director; officer or director of 8 subsidiaries	61,531
Pittsburgh Coal Co., J. D. A. Morrow	President and director	74,440
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.: H. A. Galt	Vice president and director of registrant; president of subsidiary	72,000
H. S. Wherrett	President and director	63,000
Procter & Gamble Co.: Richard K. Deupree	President and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries	100,000
Renton K. Brodie	Vice president and director of registrant; officer of various subsidiaries	60,000
Herbert G. French	Vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries	60,000
Floyd M. Barnes	Vice president and director of registrant; officer of various subsidiaries	55,000

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
Public Service Corporation of New Jersey:		
Thomas N. McCarter.....	President and director of registrant; president and director of 5 subsidiaries.	\$150,000
Edmund W. Wakelee.....	Vice president and director of registrant; vice president and director of 5 subsidiaries.	90,000
Percy S. Young.....	do.	90,000
Pullman, Inc., David A. Crawford.	President and director.....	66,444
Pure Oil Co., Henry M. Dawes.....	do.	55,250
Radio Corporation of America:		
David Sarnoff.....	President and director of registrant; director of 4 subsidiaries.	52,330
James G. Harbord.....	Chairman and director of registrant; director of 4 subsidiaries.	50,160
Reading Co., C. H. Ewing.....	President and director of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary.	60,000
Republic Steel Corporation:		
T. M. Girdler.....	Chairman, president, and director.....	129,372
B. F. Fairless.....	Vice president and director.....	64,692
R. J. Wysor.....	do.	64,692
Myron A. Wick.....	do.	51,744
Reynolds (R. J.) Tobacco Co.:		
S. C. Williams.....	Vice chairman and director.....	60,000
Jas. A. Gray.....	President and director.....	50,000
Sears, Roebuck & Co.:		
Lessing J. Rosenwald.....	Chairman and director.....	85,140
Robert E. Wood.....	President and director.....	81,818
Shell Union Oil Corporation,		
J. C. Van Eck.....	Vice chairman and director.....	60,000
Southern Pacific Co.:		
Hale Holden.....	Chairman and director.....	60,000
A. D. MacDonald.....	President and director.....	50,000
Paul Shoup.....	Vice chairman and director.....	50,000
Southern Ry. Co., Fairfax Harrison.	President and director.....	50,000
Standard Brands, Inc.:		
Joseph Wilshire.....	President and director of registrant; president of 4 subsidiaries.	152,560
Paul W. Fleischmann.....	Vice president of registrant; vice president of 2 subsidiaries.	60,050
Hugo A. Oswald.....	Secretary and treasurer of registrant; secretary and treasurer of 1 subsidiary.	55,660
Standard Oil Co. of California:		
K. R. Kingsbury.....	President and director.....	136,418
Oscar Sutro.....	Vice president and director.....	90,987
W. H. Berg.....	do.	54,596
H. D. Collier.....	do.	54,546
R. W. Hanna.....	do.	54,546
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana:		
E. G. Seubert.....	President and director.....	117,900
Allan Jackson.....	Vice president and director.....	64,800
E. J. Bullock.....	do.	60,300
R. H. McElroy.....	do.	54,900
O. J. Barkdull.....	Executive vice president, treasurer, and director.	51,400
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey:		
W. C. Teagle.....	President and director.....	125,000
W. S. Parish.....	Chairman and director.....	112,500
Christy Payne.....	Vice president, treasurer, and director.	85,000
E. J. Sadler.....	Vice president and director.....	85,000
C. O. Swain.....	General counsel and director.....	85,000
R. G. Stewart.....	Director.....	83,500
G. H. Smith.....	do.	70,000
O. Harden.....	do.	60,000
F. H. Bedford.....	do.	50,000
R. W. Gallagher.....	do.	50,000
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), W. T. Holliday.	President and director.....	81,000
Swift & Co.:		
G. F. Swift.....	do.	60,000
William B. Traynor.....	Vice-president, treasurer, and director.	50,000
Texas Corporation:		
C. B. Ames.....	Chairman and director.....	75,000
W. S. S. Rodgers.....	President and director.....	50,000
Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Walter H. Aldridge.	do.	50,750
Third Avenue Ry. Co., S. W. Huff.	do.	60,000
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.:		
W. F. Humphrey.....	President and director of registrant; president and chairman of 2 subsidiaries.	63,555
E. L. Shea.....	Vice president and director of registrant; president of subsidiary.	53,278
Union Pacific R. R. Co.:		
F. W. Charske.....	Chairman executive committee and director.	60,000
C. R. Gray.....	President and director.....	60,000
United Corporation, George H. Howard.	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.	75,320
United Drug, Inc., Louis K. Liggett.	Director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.	62,255
United Fruit Co., Francis R. Hart.	President and director.....	58,450
United Gas Improvement Co., John E. Zimmerman.	Chairman, president, and director..	100,000
United Light & Power Co.:		
William Chamberlain.....	Chairman and director of registrant; officer or director of 6 subsidiaries.	63,710
Charles S. McCain.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 5 subsidiaries.	57,000

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
United States Rubber Co.:		
Francis B. Davis, Jr.....	Chairman and president.....	\$125,220
William de Krafft.....	Vice president and director.....	50,700
United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., C. A. Hight.	President and director.....	55,210
United States Steel Corporation:		
Myron C. Taylor.....	Chairman and director.....	161,672
William A. Irvin.....	President and director of registrant; director of 20 subsidiaries.	102,162
William J. Filbert.....	Chairman finance committee and director of registrant; director of 19 subsidiaries.	87,942
Utilities Power & Light Corporation, H. L. Clarke.	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 5 subsidiaries.	50,880
Wesson Oil & Snowdrift Co., Inc., A. D. Geoghagen.	President and director.....	80,116
Western Union Telegraph Co.:		
Newcomb Carleton.....	Chairman and director.....	60,000
R. B. White.....	President and director.....	60,000
Westinghouse Air Brake Co., A. L. Humphrey.	Chairman and director of registrant; chairman and director of 1 subsidiary.	50,400
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.:		
A. W. Robertson.....	Chairman and director.....	78,805
F. A. Merrick.....	President and director.....	58,764
Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co., J. Allen Ross.	Vice president and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.	60,000

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, following the custom adopted at the time I was first elected to Congress, I desire to place in the RECORD a statement concerning my service during the Seventy-fourth Congress, the second session of which has just ended.

When one seeks to again place his candidacy before his constituents it is only proper that he give an accounting of his services in the past.

In the campaigns of 1932 and 1934 Democrats pledged themselves to support Mr. Roosevelt in the event of his election. At that time, due to the failure of the Missouri State Legislature to redistrict the congressional districts of Missouri, I was a candidate at large and was elected by a majority of nearly 500,000 votes, leading the 13 congressional candidates.

We all know the situation that confronted the country and President Roosevelt when he took office on March 4, 1933. Who can help but recall his appeal to the people of the country immediately following his inauguration, when he issued the order that resulted in the so-called bank holiday? The American people, Republicans as well as Democrats, approved the President's course, or at least offered absolutely no objection, because they were aware that our financial system would be destroyed if he had not taken the action.

During the 4 years of the Hoover administration which had just ended, 1,035 national banks had closed their doors. During the administrations of President Coolidge, which just preceded that of Mr. Hoover, covering 4½ years, 533 national banks failed.

During 1933, 3 months of which were under President Hoover, 435 national-bank suspensions occurred prior to or during the bank holiday, while only 3 national banks closed their doors during the remainder of that year. The activities of 250 national banks were suspended during the banking holiday, requiring the appointment of receivers to complete liquidation. These receivers either reorganized the banks or made partial payments to depositors.

The President proceeded with two objects in view—first, to conquer the depression, and second, to prevent a recurrence.

One of the outstanding achievements of the Roosevelt administration was the passage of the so-called Bank Deposit Guaranty Act, which guarantees all deposit accounts up to \$5,000. Accounts are now insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, created during the Roosevelt administration.

During 1934 and 1935 only five national banks in this country suspended operations, and every depositor whose account was \$5,000 or less received his or her money in full. This covered the deposits of over 90 percent of the depositors

in the closed banks. How happy hundreds of thousands of our citizens would be if we had had such a law in force during the Coolidge and Hoover administrations. In 1934 and 1935 five national banks closed their doors, while up to this date in 1936 not one national bank has suspended operations.

SUPPORTED PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Any number of outstanding laws were passed during the Seventy-third Congress, which was the first Congress of the Roosevelt administration. I referred to my service in that Congress in a previous report, and I will not go into detail in reference to the meritorious legislation that was passed other than to say that I kept the pledge I made to the people of the State of Missouri during the campaign of 1932 and supported every recommendation the President made to the Congress.

In times of war it has always been the policy of the Congress to delegate unusual powers to the Chief Executive. When the Democratic Party assumed control in March 1933 we were at war—war with the depression or panic, or whatever you might desire to call it—millions of our citizens were without food, clothing, and shelter. Something had to be done immediately, because not only the millions of citizens out of employment were demanding action by the Congress but the businessmen of the country were likewise demanding action. In order to meet this unprecedented situation, Congress did on numerous occasions delegate certain extraordinary powers to the President, and at the time there was no complaint either from the press, the masses of the people, or from the business group. On the contrary, Congress was complimented for expediting relief measures.

Slowly but surely conditions started to improve, and as business became better there was a change of attitude among the leaders of industry, who had previously been appealing for help.

Congress had passed numerous laws extending relief to the unemployed, help to the farmers, and billions of dollars in loans to business. Through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation gigantic corporations, some of our largest banks, and especially the railroads, were saved from bankruptcy. There was no complaint then when business was in distress.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ACT

One of the laws that Congress passed was the National Industrial Recovery Act, the purpose of which was to assist the recovery of business. Under that act business was permitted to organize in groups, adopt codes, and in many instances the antitrust laws of the country were practically suspended.

I do not know where the thought for the enactment of this legislation originally came from, nor do I know who prepared the bill, but I do know that the president of the National Association of Manufacturers who happened at that time to be a resident of the city, a part of which I represent in Congress, St. Louis, came to me and pleaded with me to speak in favor of and vote for that legislation when the President submitted the bill. He pictured the ultimate destruction of business if the Congress did not respond to the appeal of the President for the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act. I supported that bill and it proved to be beneficial to hundreds of thousands of businessmen throughout the country, the great majority of which were shocked and disappointed when the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional.

Business men in groups adopted codes under the N. R. A. and among the agreements was the shortening of the hours of labor. This required additional help. Another agreement was in regard to salaries, the employees benefiting by receiving increases in wages. Shortly after the Court declared Congress had gone beyond its powers under the Constitution, complaints reached the Department of Labor that employers were lengthening working hours and reducing salaries. A survey was made and the result has just been announced. It is estimated that nearly 1,000,000 employees lost their jobs in the 6 months following the decision of the Supreme Court, while the reduction in salaries was great but unestimated. The benefits that accrued by reason of the passage of the act were lost to many of the employees.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ACT WAS BENEFICIAL

After the passage of that law business recovered steadily and then developed the change of attitude, especially among those who had been appealing to the President and the Congress for help, until today we find the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States probably the most outstanding critic of the Roosevelt administration. Among the acts they criticize is the National Industrial Recovery Act which their president urged me to support. They not only abandoned their own child but criticized Congress for enacting the law they urged Congress to pass.

Other critics of the administration are the Liberty League, the Economy League, and other leagues and associations, the wealth of whose members run up into the billions of dollars.

In the final analysis the ultimate conclusion that one must reach is, that they are displeased because the Roosevelt administration has taken from them the special privileges which they so long enjoyed. They know that they will never regain those special privileges while the Democratic Party is in power. While their vile tongues and pens pour forth vituperation, commendation comes from those who seek no special favors and who are grateful for the help that has been extended by the President, a Democratic House and Senate.

As an indication of improvement the report of increases in salaries that have been granted to the executives of the large corporations of the country in the last 2 years is ample proof of the recovery of big business. While they have increased the salaries of their executives, they complain whenever Congress attempts to legislate in a way that will bring about an increase in the salaries of the employees or pass legislation that will put the unemployed to work. The objective of the Roosevelt administration has been to more equally distribute the profits of industry among the workers who are responsible for those profits and not confine the profits and increases to the officials of the corporations.

Under the terms of the National Security Act the Commission has the power to make public the salaries and bonuses of officials of corporations. Just a few days ago one of the many lists was released by the Commission. At the head of that list was the name of a director and member of the executive committee of a large 5- and 10-cent store. His salary and bonus for the year 1935 amounted to \$309,880. Eighteen officials of that corporation received in bonus, which was in addition to their salaries, \$1,186,053. Would it not make for a better condition if some of that money had been used in increasing the salaries of the underpaid clerks? I doubt if the Governors of the 48 States in the Union receive altogether \$300,000 a year.

The answer of big business to criticism of increases in salary and bonus to executives is that the amount paid officials is small in comparison to that paid to employees. Probably if the same percentage of increases were granted employees as was given to executives then there would not be so much discontent among the workers.

It is true that a number of the laws that Congress enacted have been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, but I can say now that is not going to prevent the Congress in the future from trying to write legislation that will be beneficial to the farmers of the country as well as to the laboring man if a way can be found to do so under the Constitution.

WILL REPUBLICANS REPEAL NEW LAWS?

Can anyone conceive that the Republican Party is willing to go on record now as being in favor of the repeal of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act, the Farm Credit Administration Act, the National Securities Exchange Act, the Federal Bank Deposit Act, the Social Security Act, the Veterans' Act, the National Housing Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Federal Alcohol Act, the various laws improving the National Banking Act, the Bankruptcy Act, the Prohibition Act, the restrictive Immigration Act, the act to prevent profiteering in time of war, the Revenue Acts of 1934 and 1935, the act providing for the control of public-utility companies, the Kidnaping Act, the Extortion Act, the Fugitives from Justice Act, and the various acts appropriating money

for relief, as well as dozens more of other outstanding laws passed by the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses? They are going to criticize these laws, but ask them to go on record as favoring their repeal.

It might be proper to mention at this point that while the Republicans are now assailing this legislation, which I willingly admit that I supported, the record will show that on an average over one-half of the Republicans of the House voted with the Democrats for the passage of every bill mentioned, and in some instances over 90 of the 120 Republicans and Progressives in the House supported the very laws which they are now criticizing.

I repeat that those who were appealing with tears in their eyes back in 1933 for help now condemn the legislation that was enacted that has brought them back to the point where some of them are now making more money than they ever did in history, but who are now the outstanding critics of the legislation which has proved so beneficial to them.

MILLIONS OF FARMS AND HOMES SAVED

The Roosevelt administration has not only saved millions of farms but 1,019,919 people of the country availed themselves of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act, borrowing \$3,097,667,903 from that Corporation, thus preventing foreclosure.

We have given temporary employment to millions of our unfortunate citizens, providing them with funds to feed and clothe their families.

While no one could be more anxious to see the unemployed of the country secure work with private industry, nevertheless it may just as well be understood now as later that the unemployment situation is a national problem and must be handled by the National Government so long as it exists. Cooperation between industry and the Government is the road that leads toward recovery, and business will eventually see the wisdom of cooperating with the Government.

I do not propose to enumerate individually the many bills I have supported, but want to make it perfectly plain, and I have no apologies to offer for supporting all legislation I felt would be beneficial and would ultimately lead to recovery. I promised my constituents in the campaign of 1934 that I would follow this procedure and have carried out that promise to the letter.

Just as soon as conditions will permit, if reelected to Congress, I will be strongly in favor of repealing laws that granted extraordinary powers to the executive officials. Had it not been for the great emergency that confronted us, I never would have voted for such legislation. The Constitution places upon Members of Congress certain duties that they and not the Executive should perform, and I will favor restoring to the Congress those powers at the earliest date practicable.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

A great deal has been said in reference to an increase in the national debt. No one realizes more than I do the necessity of the Government balancing its normal Budget, and I will join with others to bring this about if returned to Congress. In regard to the national debt, however, let me say that there is no reason why anyone in the country should be greatly alarmed. While it is true the national debt has been increased, a great deal of this money will be recovered because it is in the form of loans secured by proper collateral. Several billion dollars will not be recovered, as that has been expended for relief purposes.

President Roosevelt has been charged with placing upon the backs of the citizens of this country a national debt of \$35,000,000,000. Now, what are the facts? The Treasury statements show the net increase in the national debt since 1933, when President Roosevelt assumed command, is \$10,800,000,000. Everyone knows how this came about. The money was used to assist the unemployed, to feed, clothe, and provide shelter for unfortunate citizens who could not secure work. Now, how about the other \$25,000,000,000 they have charged to Roosevelt. Every dollar of it was owed by the Government on March 4, 1933, inherited, so to speak, from

the previous administrations. President Hoover increased the national debt during his administration by billions of dollars and did not provide for a dollar of assistance to the unemployed. That money went to meet the normal expenses of the Government, because business was so bad the Government did not collect taxes sufficient to meet expenditures, and every year during the Hoover administration there was a deficit, which increased the national debt, because the Government borrowed money to meet its obligations in excess of receipts.

Our bonds have been refinanced by the present administration, saving several hundred million dollars in interest annually.

HELP TO UNEMPLOYED

When it was necessary to create the Civil Works Administration, it was likewise necessary to immediately adopt a program to put the unemployed to work or it would have been necessary to have made weekly payments to those who needed relief. It is likewise true that the projects carried on by the Civil Works Administration were not what might be classed as permanent improvements, but that cannot be said of the Public Works Administration nor the Works Progress Administration, the latter having supplemented the Civil Works Administration. Practically every dollar spent by the Public Works Administration has been for permanent improvements on such projects as new sewers, water systems, utility plants, public buildings, bridges, grade crossings, and so forth. These improvements are permanent and the money has been well spent. It provided work for the unemployed and helped business generally. We have likewise spent a great deal of money improving public highways, rivers and harbors, and erecting Government buildings, not only in Washington but throughout the United States. The money spent for this purpose is classed as liabilities and charged against the public debt.

Whenever a great corporation or a financial institution issues a financial statement you will always find among the assets the real-estate holdings as well as the equipment to offset the liabilities in part. Is there any reason why, in considering the financial statement of the Government, there should not be added to the assets of the Government the permanent improvements that have been brought about by the expenditures of public money? The construction of public buildings reduces the annual rental of the Government for housing Government activities, and while I do not have the exact figures before me, it is reasonable to say that the amount spent for permanent and lasting improvements is several billion dollars. The amount saved in rents runs into the millions annually. Many of these projects are self-liquidating—that is, the amount spent will be saved in rentals over a period of years.

SERVICE TO DISTRICT AND CONSTITUENTS

While the enactment of all laws indirectly affects a Congressman's constituents, naturally there are activities in which he can participate that are beneficial solely to the community he represents. In St. Louis a new Federal building has been constructed; a new post office is under construction; a new Public Health Service hospital and a new post-office garage have been authorized, the money appropriated, the plans are now being drawn, and bids will soon be asked for construction. While it is true these buildings are not in the district I represent, they serve the people of my district and mechanics who do reside in my district have benefited by these projects. The total amount involved in this construction work is over \$10,000,000, and I feel I can say without fear of contradiction that I took the lead in advocating the authorization for the construction of these buildings, appearing before committees of Congress, securing the necessary legislation.

Every movement that I felt would be beneficial to those that I represent and to my city has received my support. All mail that has come to me has been promptly answered, and no proper appeal has reached me that I have not at least tried to comply with.

RELIEF JOBS

In regard to the Works Progress Administration, under which relief labor is employed, I have no time since its inception attempted to bring influence to bear in behalf of anyone who has appealed to me. Every letter that has left my office in reply to a request for assistance to secure employment with the Works Progress Administration has contained a paragraph that a letter from a Congressman is not and should not be sufficient to secure work where the money is paid from a relief appropriation. I have given many letters to constituents who have appealed to me to the officials, but have made it plain to those officials in numerous communications I was not endeavoring to influence them in any way and did not want politics to enter relief work. All I requested was that the applicant be considered and, if found to be entitled to recognition under the policy of the Administration, they be given work if it was available. I have never felt that it would be of benefit now or any time to the administration or to the country to permit the use of Federal relief money to further the political interests of any individual or party, and it is my purpose to adhere strictly to that policy in the future as I have in the past.

KIDNAPING AND EXTORTION ACTS

As many of my constituents are aware, I am coauthor of the Federal Kidnaping Act, introduced in the Senate by Senator Patterson and in the House by myself. I am author of the Extortion Act, which makes it a felony to use the mails to extort money under threat of violence. I am proud of the results that have been attained by the enactment of this legislation. While the Kidnaping Act is commonly referred to as the Lindbergh Act, it was introduced long before the Lindbergh baby was kidnaped, because of the numerous kidnapings that had occurred in my own community where the victim had been taken to Illinois and the local police had no power to follow. Up to the time of the passage of the Extortion Act it was not a crime to send a letter through the mail where one threatened to kidnap a child or destroy personal property unless paid certain sums of money. These laws have resulted in the confinement in the Federal penitentiary of gangsters and have practically eliminated organized crime in the Nation.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES

I am the only member of the Missouri delegation who is chairman of a committee in the Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I preside over a committee of 21 members. It is the duty of this committee to see that the money appropriated by the Congress is spent by the executive branch of the Government for the purpose for which it was appropriated.

During the Seventy-fourth Congress I have taken the lead under instructions from the committee in stopping scores of bills and have saved the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. The outstanding service of the committee was in connection with the Indian claims.

Just before the convening of the present Congress, information reached me regarding Indian claims pending before the Court of Claims. These suits had resulted from Congress passing 114 resolutions setting aside the statute of limitations and permitting Indians or their representatives to sue the Government on claims growing out of treaties, acts of Congress, and Executive orders. There was no limitation, and some of these claims grow out of treaties that were ratified as far back as 1779. After making a thorough investigation of the situation I called a meeting of the committee and had the Assistant Attorney General, Hon. Harry W. Blair, who represents the Government in the Court of Claims in these suits, as well as two assistants and representatives from the Comptroller General present. The Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Blair, stated before the committee that while all the petitions in those suits had not been filed up to that date, the suits filed amounted in claims of over three and one-quarter billion dollars. In some of the resolutions the Government was permitted to offset the claim by showing gratuities and advances that had been made to the various tribes,

but in the great majority of the cases this right was not extended to the Government. The Government apparently was helpless.

CHECKED INDIAN TREASURY RAIDS

Our committee was told frankly if Congress did not act it would be impossible to estimate the amount that the Court of Claims would be required to allow the Indians as a result of these suits. The committee came to the conclusion that the only way the Treasury and the taxpayers could be protected was to have a law passed that would be retroactive and would extend to the Government the right to charge off gratuities and advances made to the tribes in all suits pending and in future suits unless the Congress specifically provided that such offsets should not be allowed. Acting under directions of the committee, I placed the matter before the Committee on Appropriations, and Chairman JAMES P. BUCHANAN, of Texas, of that committee, as well as many of his colleagues, both on the Democratic and Republican side, were not only amazed but alarmed over the situation. The suggestion of our committee was when the next deficiency bill was considered the Committee on Appropriations call the judges of the Court of Claims, the Attorney General, and the Comptroller General before them, who would confirm our statement, and then add an amendment to the deficiency bill giving the Government the right to set off the claims of the Indians by showing gratuities and advances that had been made to the tribes. The Appropriations Committee followed this procedure, and as a result we now have the law on the statute books, and while, no doubt, the Indians will recover some money from the Government, the amount will be very small in comparison with the amount of the claims.

Since that amendment was adopted several of the cases have been tried and the court allowed gratuities and advances as a set-off and rendered judgments in favor of the Government. This has resulted in individual resolutions and bills being introduced amending the original jurisdictional act which would deny the Government the right to charge off the gratuities and advances. Many of those resolutions and bills passed the Senate without debate and were favorably reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House. Acting under the instructions of the committee, I have stopped the passage of the bills with the assistance of many members of my committee.

As an example, here is what happened in the last 2 days of the Congress:

The California Indian claims bill was passed, but before it was passed I insisted upon two amendments. One sentence which struck out only four lines in the bill which appeared to be perfectly harmless would have cost the Government, according to the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States, \$15,000,000. This was stricken out, together with an entire section which would also have cost the Government many millions of dollars, if the bill was allowed to pass in the form it passed the Senate.

A second bill called up Saturday was defeated by my objections, and that bill would have extended to the Cherokee Indians certain privileges that would have cost the Government untold millions of dollars if it had been allowed to pass.

In both cases the Court of Claims has already acted upon the matter, as well as has the Supreme Court, and they have ruled against the Indians; but if the jurisdictional acts were changed as the bills provided, a new suit would have been instituted and there would have been nothing that the judges could have done but render an opinion in favor of the Indians and against the Government.

Our committee's contention is when these suits have once been tried and acted upon by the Court of Claims and the Supreme Court they should not be allowed to be returned to the courts.

RUSSIAN SHOE CLAIM

Special attention has been given by our committee to the Private and Consent Calendars.

Throughout the last session, a day or two before omnibus claims bills were passed, I briefed for the membership of the House the important measures to be voted upon. Many bills

listed as unfair to the taxpayers were defeated and every bill the President vetoed, claims bills, had been opposed by me.

Take the so-called Russian shoe claim for \$960,000 as an example. When the Congress sent that bill to the White House over my objection I sent a long letter to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget, calling their attention to the bill and proved beyond question by the reports of the State Department and the Comptroller General there was no moral or legal obligation to require the taxpayers to reimburse the claimant. Further I was the one who advanced the argument that the same principle was involved as was involved in the suits against the Government growing out of the revaluation of the gold dollar.

I called at the Treasury and insisted an opinion be secured from the Attorney General. This was done and was included in the report when it was submitted to the President. The President vetoed the bill for that very reason and when the House sustained that veto only four Members voted to override the veto.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury thanking me for calling his attention to this claim, and I have letters from the President and other Cabinet officers expressing their appreciation for information I had advanced to them where savings to the taxpayers could be accomplished.

RECEIVE 5,000 LETTERS A MONTH

I receive 5,000 letters a month. These letters contain requests of every character. No one who has ever written me can say I have ever made inquiry concerning their politics. I have tried to serve all, regardless of creed, color, or politics, feeling that when a Representative in Congress is elected it is his duty to serve all of his constituents. I have never asked for any reward other than the indorsement of those that I represent, and that is all I ask now. Naturally if my record meets with the approval of the people of the Thirteenth District I would appreciate their indorsement of my service.

Several days before the death of our beloved Speaker, Hon. Joseph W. Byrns, I was appointed by him a member of the select committee of the House, consisting of five members—Hon. JAMES P. BUCHANAN, of Texas, who was elected chairman; Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN, of Michigan; Hon. J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr., of New York; and Hon. FRED R. LEHLBACH, of New Jersey—to make an investigation with a view to bringing about a reduction in governmental expenditures by the coordination and consolidation of Government agencies where there is now overlapping and duplication of work. Mr. BUCHANAN was required to return to his home, and I have been appointed acting chairman of that committee. This will prevent my return home for several weeks, as there are several conferences to be held and agreements to be reached in reference to investigations that must be made. This House committee will cooperate with a similar Senate committee and a committee appointed to represent the President.

The importance of this work cannot be underestimated. We are in hopes that it will result in large savings to the taxpayers of the country. Just as soon as possible I shall return to St. Louis, to remain until after the November election.

FORWARD WITH ROOSEVELT

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the Democratic and Republican Parties have now met in conventions and adopted their respective platforms, it is well to give some time and study to their declarations.

The Democratic Party has always followed the sound principle that government has a dual function. It must not only furnish a sound and efficient administration and vigorously safeguard the material interests of our country but it must primarily protect and advance the social needs of our people. The Democratic Party has at all times consistently and militantly held to the ideal that the people have the right to live under honest and progressive government and to demand the safeguarding of human rights and values as well as those of property. These principles of government have been firmly embraced and closely adhered to by President Roosevelt.

These principles are likewise stoutly proclaimed in the Democratic platform of 1936 as the policy of the next Democratic administration. The Democratic Party under President Roosevelt has definitely and positively established the principle that it is the function of the Federal Government to assume responsibility for national legislation in the field of unemployment insurance and old-age pensions. We have recognized that this type of social legislation should accrue for the benefit of the people uniformly throughout the Nation.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM WOULD DESTROY FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND FEDERAL OLD-AGE PENSIONS

The Republican platform adopted in Cleveland contains this deeply significant statement:

We propose to encourage adoption by the States and Territories of honest and practical measures for meeting the problems of unemployment insurance. The unemployment insurance and old-age annuity sections of the present Social Security Act are unworkable.

These words serve notice to the people of the Nation that if the Republican Party gains control of our Government next November, the Nation-wide establishment of unemployment insurance will be completely destroyed. The Federal act, of course, will be repealed and there will be no chance whatsoever of any substantial number of States adopting unemployment insurance.

The political leaders of the Republican Party, when they wrote those words, knew, as do all of us, that an effective system of unemployment insurance cannot possibly be enacted save on the basis of minimum standards set by the Federal Government for the Nation as a whole.

The very men who now say, "We will encourage the adoption of unemployment insurance by the States and Territories" will be the first to oppose the adoption of unemployment insurance by any single State unless all the other States in the same industrial competitive class have the same statute.

In our own State of Michigan we have seen our Republican leaders practically sabotage Federal and State social and labor legislation. Yet these same men dare to claim that they are concerned with the welfare of the people!

This plank in the Republican platform is full of trickery, particularly so in view of the fact that the New York minimum wage act, adopted under the administration of that great Democratic Governor, Herbert H. Lehman, was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. In view of this decision how can we hope to establish a broad program of social security by purely State or Territorial acts?

The problem of social security is the problem of the Federal Government.

1936 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

At this time let me bring to your attention the planks adopted by the Democratic convention at Philadelphia in June 1936.

We hold this truth to be self-evident—that the test of a representative government is its ability to promote the safety and happiness of the people.

We hold this truth to be self-evident—that 12 years of Republican leadership left our Nation sorely stricken in body, mind, and spirit; and that 3 years of Democratic leadership have put it back on the road to restored health and prosperity.

We hold this truth to be self-evident—that 12 years of Republican surrender to the dictatorship of a privilege supplanted by a Democratic leadership which has returned the people themselves to the places of authority, and has revived in them new faith and restored the hope which they had almost lost.

RECOVERY

We hold this truth to be self-evident—that this 3-year recovery in all the basic values of life and the reestablishment of the American way of living has been brought about by humanizing the policies of the Federal Government as they affect the personal, financial, industrial, and agricultural well-being of the American people.

We hold this truth to be self-evident—that government in a modern civilization has certain inescapable obligations to its citizens, among which are:

First. Protection of the family and the home.

Second. Establishment of a democracy of opportunity for all the people.

Third. Aid to those overtaken by disaster.

These obligations, neglected through 12 years of the old leadership, have once more been recognized by American government. Under the new leadership they will never be neglected.

PROTECTION OF HOME AND FAMILY

First. We have begun and shall continue the successful drive to rid our land of kidnapers and bandits. We shall continue to use the powers of government to end the activities of the malefactors of great wealth who defraud and exploit the people.

SAVINGS, INVESTMENTS

Second. We have safeguarded the thrift of our citizens by restraining those who would gamble with other people's savings, requiring truth in the sale of securities; by putting the brakes upon the use of credit for speculation; by outlawing the manipulation of prices in stock and commodity markets; by curbing the overweening power and unholy practices of utility-holding companies; by insuring 50,000,000 bank accounts.

OLD AGE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Third. We have built foundations for the security of those who are faced with the hazards of unemployment and old age; for the orphaned, the crippled, and the blind. On the foundation of the Social Security Act we are determined to erect a structure of economic security for all our people, making sure that this benefit shall keep step with the ever-increasing capacity of America to provide a high standard of living for all of its citizens.

CONSUMER

Fourth. We will act to secure to the consumer fair value, honest sale, and a decreased spread between the price he pays and the price the producer receives.

RURAL POWER

Fifth. This administration has fostered power-rate yardsticks in the Tennessee Valley and in several other parts of the Nation. As a result electricity has been available to the people at a lower rate. We will continue to promote plans for rural electrification and for cheap power by means of the yardstick.

HOUSING

Sixth. We maintain that our people are entitled to decent, adequate housing at a price which they can afford. In the last 3 years the Federal Government, having saved more than 2,000,000 homes from foreclosure, has taken the first steps in our history to provide decent housing for people of meager incomes. We believe every encouragement should be given to the building of new homes by private enterprise, and that the Government should steadily extend its housing program toward the goal of adequate housing for those forced through economic necessities to live in unhealthy and slum conditions.

VETERANS

Seventh. We shall continue just treatment of our war veterans and their dependents.

AGRICULTURE

We have taken the farms off the road to ruin.

We have kept our pledge to agriculture to use all available means to raise farm incomes toward its pre-war purchasing power. The farmer is no longer suffering from 15-cent corn, 3-cent hogs, 2½-cent beef at the farm, 5-cent wool, 30-cent wheat, 5-cent cotton, and 3-cent sugar.

By Federal legislation we have reduced the farmer's indebtedness and doubled his net income. In cooperation with the States and through the farmer's own committees we are restoring the fertility of his land and checking the erosion of his soil. We are bringing electricity and good roads to his home.

We will continue to improve the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program with payments to farmers.

We will continue a fair-minded administration of agricultural laws, quick to recognize and meet new problems and conditions. We recognize the gravity of the evils of farm tenancy, and we pledge the full cooperation of the Government in the refinancing of farm indebtedness at the lowest possible rates of interest and over a long term of years.

We favor the production of all the market will absorb, both at home and abroad, plus a reserve supply sufficient to insure fair prices to consumers; we favor judicious commodity loans on seasonal surpluses, and we favor assistance within Federal authority to enable farmers to adjust and balance production with demand at a fair profit to the farmers.

We favor encouragement of sound, practical farm cooperatives.

By the purchase and retirement of 10,000,000 acres of sub-marginal land and assistance to those attempting to eke out an existence upon it we have made a good beginning toward proper land use and rural inhabitation.

The farmer has been returned to the road to freedom and prosperity. We will keep him on that road.

LABOR

We have given the army of America's industrial workers something more substantial than the Republican's dinner pail full of promises. We have increased the worker's pay and shortened his hours; we have undertaken to put an end to the sweated labor of his wife and children; we have written into the law of the land his right to collective bargaining and self-organization, free from the interference of employers; we have provided Federal machinery for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes.

We will continue to protect the worker and we will guard his rights, both as wage earner and consumer, in the production and consumption of all commodities, including coal and water power and other natural resource products.

The worker has been returned to the road of freedom and prosperity. We will keep him on that road.

BUSINESS

We have taken the American businessman out of the red. We have saved his bank and given it a sounder foundation; we have extended credit; we have lowered interest rates; we have undertaken to free him from the ravages of cutthroat competition.

The American businessman has been returned to the road to freedom and prosperity. We will keep him on that road.

YOUTH

We have aided youth to stay in school; given them constructive occupation; opened the door to opportunity which 12 years of Republican neglect had closed.

Our youth have been returned to the road of freedom and prosperity. We will keep them on that road.

MONOPOLY AND ECONOMIC POWER

Monopolies and their concentration of economic power, the creation of Republican rule and privilege, continue to be the master of the producer, the exploiter of the consumer, and the enemy of the independent operator.

This is a problem challenging the unceasing effort of untrammelled public officials in every branch of the Government. We pledge vigorously and fearlessly to enforce the criminal and civil provisions of the existing antitrust laws, and to the extent that their effectiveness has been weakened by the new corporate devices or judicial construction, we propose by law to restore their efficacy in stamping out monopolistic practices and the concentration of economic power.

AID TO VICTIMS OF DISASTER

We have aided and will continue to aid those who have been visited by widespread drought and floods, and have adopted a Nation-wide flood-control policy.

UNEMPLOYMENT

We believe that unemployment is a national problem and that it is an inescapable obligation of our Government to meet it in a national way. Due to our stimulation of private business, more than 5,000,000 people have been reemployed; and we shall continue to maintain that the first objective of a program of economic security is maximum employment in private industry at adequate wages. Where business fails to

supply such employment, we believe that work at prevailing wages should be provided in cooperation with State and local governments on useful public projects, to the extent that the national wealth may be increased, the skill and energy of the worker may be utilized, his morale maintained, and the unemployed assured the opportunities to earn the necessities of life.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Republican platform proposes to meet many pressing national problems solely by action of the separate States. We know that drought, dust storms, floods, minimum wages, maximum hours, child labor and working conditions in industry, monopolistic and unfair business practices cannot be adequately handled exclusively by 48 separate State legislatures, 48 separate State administrations, and 48 separate State courts. Transactions and activities which inevitably overflow State boundaries call for both State and Federal treatment.

We have sought and will continue to seek to meet these problems through legislation within the Constitution.

If these problems cannot be effectively solved by legislation within the Constitution, we shall seek such clarifying amendment as will assure to the legislatures of the several States and to the Congress of the United States, each within its proper jurisdiction, the power to enact those laws which the State and Federal legislatures, within their respective spheres, shall find necessary, in order adequately to regulate commerce, protect public health and safety, and safeguard economic security. Thus, we propose to maintain the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

MERIT SYSTEM IN GOVERNMENT

For the protection of Government itself and promotion of its efficiency we pledge immediate extension of the merit system through the classified civil service—which was first established and fostered under Democratic auspices—to all non-policy-making positions in the Federal service.

We shall subject to the civil-service law all continuing positions which, because of the emergency, have been exempt from its operation.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

We shall continue to guard freedom of speech, press, radio, religion, and assembly which our Constitution guarantees; with equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

The administration has stopped deflation, restored values, and enabled business to go ahead with confidence.

When national income shrinks, Government income is imperiled. In reviving national income, we have fortified Government finance. We have raised the public credit to a position of unsurpassed security. The interest rates on Government bonds has been reduced to the lowest point in 28 years. The same Government bonds which in 1932 sold under 83 are now selling over 104.

We approve the objective of a permanently sound currency so stabilized as to prevent the former wide fluctuations in value which injured in turn producers, debtors, and property owners on the one hand and the wage earners and creditors on the other, a currency which will permit full utilization of the country's resources. We assert that today we have the soundest currency in the world.

We are determined to reduce the expenses of government. We are being aided therein by the recession in unemployment. As the requirements of relief decline and national income advances, an increasing percentage of Federal expenditures can and will be met from current revenues, secured from taxes levied in accordance with ability to pay. Our retrenchment, tax, and recovery programs thus reflect our firm determination to achieve a balanced Budget and reduction of the national debt at the earliest possible moment.

FOREIGN POLICY

In our relationship with other nations, this Government will continue to extend the policy of good neighbor. We reaffirm our opposition to war as an instrument of national policy, and declare that disputes between nations should be settled

by peaceful means. We shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the disputes of others; to be prepared resolutely to resist aggression against ourselves; to work for peace and to take the profits out of war; to guard against being drawn by political commitments, international banking, or private trading into any war which may develop anywhere.

We shall continue to foster the increase in our foreign trade which has been achieved by this administration; to seek by mutual agreement lowering of those tariff barriers, quotas, and embargoes which have been raised against our exports of agricultural and industrial products; but continue as in the past to give adequate protection to our farmers and manufacturers against unfair competition or the dumping on our shores of commodities and goods produced abroad by cheap labor or subsidized by foreign governments.

EQUAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The issue in this election is plain. The American people are called upon to choose between a Republican administration that has and would again regiment them in the service of privileged groups and a Democratic administration dedicated to the establishment of equal economic opportunity for all our people.

We have faith in the destiny of our Nation. We are sufficiently endowed with natural resources and with productive capacity to provide for all a quality of life that meets the standard of real Americanism.

Dedicated to a government of liberal American principles, we are determined to oppose equally the despotism of communism and the menace of concealed fascism.

We hold this final truth to be self-evident—that the interests, the security, and the happiness of the people of the United States of America can be perpetuated only under Democratic government as conceived by the founders of our Nation.

This platform will provide for the President a vehicle on which he may travel without fear or hesitation and with the assurance that the American people are steadfastly bound unto his strong and courageous leadership—leadership that would again bring confidence to the hearts and minds of the people and instill in them renewed courage.

This platform definitely points the way for a more prosperous, more secure, more equitable, and more satisfying and hopeful life for the generations to come.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

On June 27, 1936, President Roosevelt, in his acceptance speech, said as follows:

Senator ROBINSON, members of the Democratic convention, my friends, we meet at a time of great moment to the future of the Nation. It is an occasion to be dedicated to the simple and sincere expression of an attitude toward problems, the determination of which will profoundly affect America.

I come not only as the leader of a party—not only as a candidate for high office, but as one upon whom many critical hours have imposed and still impose a grave responsibility.

For the sympathy, help, and confidence with which Americans have sustained me in my task I am grateful. For their loyalty I salute the members of our great party, in and out of official life in every part of the Union. I salute those of other parties, especially those in the Congress, who on so many occasions put partisanship aside. I thank the Governors of the several States, their legislatures, their State and local officials who participated unselfishly and regardless of party in our efforts to achieve recovery and destroy abuses. Above all, I thank the millions of Americans who have borne disaster bravely and have dared to smile through the storm.

CALLS RESCUE CONCERN OF ALL

America will not forget these recent years—will not forget that the rescue was not a mere party task—it was the concern of all of us. In our strength we rose together, rallied our energies together, applied the old rules of common sense, and together survived.

In those days we feared fear. That was why we fought fear. And today, my friends, we have won against the most dangerous of our foes—we have conquered fear.

But I cannot, with candor, tell you that all is well with the world. Clouds of suspicion, tides of ill will and intolerance gather darkly in many places. In our own land we enjoy indeed a fullness of life greater than that of most nations. But the rush of modern civilization itself has raised for us new difficulties, new problems which must be solved if we are to preserve to the United States the political and economic freedom for which Washington and Jefferson planned and fought.

Philadelphia is a good city in which to write American history. This is fitting ground on which to reaffirm the faith of our fathers; to pledge ourselves to restore to the people a wider freedom—to give to 1936 as the founders gave to 1776—an American way of life.

The very word freedom in itself and of necessity suggests freedom from some restraining power. In 1776 we sought freedom from the tyranny of a political autocracy—from the eighteenth century royalists who held special privileges from the crown. It was to perpetuate their privilege that they governed without the consent of the governed; that they denied the right of free assembly and free speech; that they restricted the worship of God; that they put the average man's property and the average man's life in pawn to the mercenaries of dynastic power—that they regimented the people.

And so it was to win freedom from the tyranny of political autocracy that the American Revolution was fought. That victory gave the business of governing into the hands of the average man, who won the right with his neighbors to make and order his own destiny through his own government. Political tyranny was wiped out at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

PEOPLES' LIVES REORDERED

Since that struggle, however, man's inventive genius released new forces in our land which reordered the lives of our people. The age of machinery, of railroads, of steam, and electricity; the telegraph and the radio, mass production, mass distribution—all of these combined to bring forward a new civilization and with it a new problem for those who would remain free.

For out of this modern civilization economic royalists carved new dynasties. New kingdoms were built upon concentration of control over material things. Through new uses of corporations, bank and securities, new machinery of industry and agriculture, of labor and capital—all undreamed of by the fathers—the whole structure of modern life was impressed into this royal service.

There was no place among this royalty for our many thousands of small-business men and merchants who sought to make a worthy use of the American system of initiative and profit. They were no more free than the worker or the farmer. Even honest and progressive-minded men of wealth, aware of their obligation to their generation, could never know just where they fitted into this dynastic scheme of things.

It was natural and perhaps human that the privileged princes of these new economic dynasties, thirsting for power, reached out for control over government itself. They created a new despotism and wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction. In its service new mercenaries sought to regiment the people, their labor, and their properties. And as a result the average man once more confronts the problem that faced the minuteman.

REMOTE CONTROL OVER FARMERS

The hours men and women worked, the wages they received, the conditions of their labor—these had passed beyond the control of the people, and were imposed by this new industrial dictatorship. The savings of the average family, the capital of the small-business man, the investments set aside for old age—other people's money—these were tools which the new economic royalty used to dig itself in.

Those who tilled the soil no longer reaped the rewards which were their right. The small measure of their gains was decreed by men in distant cities.

Throughout the Nation opportunity was limited by monopoly. Individual initiative was crushed in the cogs of a great machine. The field open for free business was more and more restricted. Private enterprise became too private. It became privileged enterprise, not free enterprise.

An old English judge once said: "Necessitous men are not free men. Liberty requires opportunity to make a living—a living decent according to the standard of the time, a living which gives man not only enough to live by but something to live for."

For too many of us the political equality we once had won was meaningless in the face of economic inequality. A small group had concentrated into their own hands an almost complete control over other people's property, other people's money, other people's labor, other people's lives. For too many of us life was no longer free; liberty no longer real; men could no longer follow the pursuit of happiness.

Against economic tyranny such as this, the citizen could only appeal to the organized power of government. The collapse of 1929 showed up the despotism for what it was. The election of 1932 was the people's mandate to end it. Under that mandate it is being ended.

ONE HUNDRED-PERCENT LIBERTY FOR THE PEOPLE

The royalists of the economic order have conceded that political freedom was the business of the Government, but they have maintained that economic slavery was nobody's business. They granted that the Government could protect the citizen in his right to vote, but they denied that the Government could do anything to protect the citizen in his right to work and live.

Today we stand committed to the proposition that freedom is no half-and-half affair. If the average citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity in the polling place, he must have equal opportunity in the market place.

The economic royalists complain that we seek to overthrow the institutions of America. What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance to American insti-

tutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power. In vain they seek to hide behind the flag and the Constitution. In their blindness they forget what the flag and the Constitution stand for. Now, as always, the flag and the Constitution stand for democracy, not tyranny; for freedom, not subjection; and against a dictatorship by mob rule and the overprivileged alike.

The brave and clear platform adopted by this convention, to which I heartily subscribe, sets forth that Government in a modern civilization has certain inescapable obligations to its citizens, among which are protection of the family and the home, the establishment of a democracy of opportunity, and aid to those overtaken by disaster.

But the resolute enemy within our gates is ever ready to beat down our words unless in greater courage we will fight for them.

PLEDGES FIGHT WILL CONTINUE

For more than 3 years we have fought for them. This convention in every word and deed has pledged that that fight will go on.

The defeats and victories of these years have given to us as a people a new understanding of our Government and of ourselves. Never since the early days of the New England town meeting have the affairs of government been so widely discussed and so clearly appreciated. It has been brought home to us that the only effective guide for the safety of this most worldly of worlds is moral principle.

We do not see faith, hope, and charity as unattainable ideals, but we use them as stout supports of a nation fighting the fight for freedom in a modern civilization.

Faith—in the soundness of democracy in the midst of dictatorships.

Hope—renewed because we know so well the progress we have made.

Charity—in the true spirit of that grand old word. For charity, literally translated from the original, means love, the love that understands, that does not merely share the wealth of the giver, but in true sympathy and wisdom helps men to help themselves.

We seek not merely to make government a mechanical implement, but to give it the vibrant personal character that is the embodiment of human charity.

We are poor indeed if this Nation cannot afford to lift from every recess of American life the dread fear of the unemployed that they are not needed in the world. We cannot afford to accumulate a deficit in the books of human fortitude.

In the place of the palace of privilege we seek to build a temple out of faith and hope and charity.

It is a sobering thing to be a servant of this great cause. We try in our daily work to remember that the cause belongs not to us but to the people. The standard is not in the hands of you and me alone. It is carried by America. We seek daily to profit from experience, to learn to do better as our task proceeds.

TELLS CONTRAST OF GOVERNMENTS

Governments can err, presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales.

Better the occasional faults of a government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of others much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

In this world of ours in other lands, there are some people, who, in times past, have lived and fought for freedom, and seem to have grown too weary to carry on the fight. They have sold their heritage of freedom for the illusion of a living. They have yielded their democracy.

I believe in my heart that only our success can stir their ancient hope. They begin to know that here in America we are waging a great war. It is not alone a war against want and destitution and economic demoralization. It is a war for the survival of democracy. We are fighting to save a great and precious form of government for ourselves and for the world.

I accept the commission you have tendered me. I join with you. I am enlisted for the duration of the war.

The President's humanity has enriched the rights of the common man. His progressive and liberal policies have brought fresh hope and determination to our young men and women, to our boys and girls.

SOCIAL UNREST MEANS GROWTH

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, the rising tide of intolerance in the United States is giving serious-minded Americans great concern.

The tragedy of it is that this spirit is being manifested among all classes of men and women and in every department of our national life.

It is revealed not only in the war between the classes, although there are still many who would try to have you believe there are no classes in our country. But that we do have classes is evident in the relations between men and women even of the same class group.

THE COMMON MAN COMING INTO HIS OWN

In spite of intolerance, the spirit of democracy is steadily growing. The development of this spirit is to be commended, but it carries with it certain elements which create social unrest.

This is the era of the common man.

Slowly but surely the masses are coming into their own.

No human power can stop their onward march and no divine power will.

First came the struggle for educational democracy. At one time only the leisured classes were considered worth educating.

Today it is true that not only may every boy and girl have an education, but we insist by law that they must have an education.

VICTORY FOR WOMEN

In former days the vote was limited to those who were property owners. Today, for the most part, the ballot which determines our political destiny is in the hands of every adult.

Closely related to this manifestation of political democracy is the newly acquired right of women to vote—to stand side by side with the men of the Nation in selecting our officials and in making our laws. The restlessness and discontent of women dissatisfied with things as they are is significant and encouraging.

Some men say they gave the women the right to vote; but this is not true. Women, discontented with their economic status, would have taken the right anyway, because they were entitled to it.

Wholesome social unrest is being produced by public libraries, by education, by newspapers, magazines, and publications of all kinds that bring ideas, facts, and truth to eager-minded students of our times.

If you were to visit the readers' room of our American libraries, you would discover that the young men and women who are seated at the tables are engaged in reading books on history, economics, sociology, and other serious subjects.

The readers of these books are discovering that the world is a bigger, more wonderful place than they ever dreamed it to be, and it makes them eager to know more, have more, and be more.

DESIRE FOR CULTURE

Our public schools and colleges are responsible for wholesome social unrest in that they bring knowledge, ideas, and better understanding of what life is all about, thus making people dissatisfied with their own inefficiency and out-of-dateness.

Classes and curriculum, dealing with economic subjects, are the most popular in our institutions of learning.

The graduates of these institutions are better informed as to what is going on in the world and they are learning how they may be better fitted into the world so far as their skill and knowledge are concerned.

Art galleries are also responsible for social unrest.

When men and women with imagination spend a few hours viewing the wonderful works which are displayed in our great museums and art galleries, does anyone suppose that they are the same persons when they pass out of the main entrances of these institutions? One result which follows the study of literature, music, art, and beauty, in whatever form, is to make those people fortunate enough to have these cultural experiences, dissatisfied with crude, ugly, vulgar things that make life sordid and wretched and creates in them a desire to introduce into their lives more of beauty, culture, and refinement.

All this eventually may mean shorter hours so that people may enjoy more leisure, more wages, and have more happiness in their lives.

DISCONTENT A BUSINESS ASSET

Big business, through its great advertising campaigns, is causing social unrest.

By every device of typography and art work and through the skill of the highest-priced writers in the world, business

attracts attention, creates new desire, and tries to lead to action the readers of their costly magazine and newspaper advertising pages so that they may purchase the goods or the services which big business has to sell.

Business aims to make the average person forever dissatisfied with the old radio or old automobile, or his present grade of tobacco or chewing gum, ice-cream freezer, or watch, or any possession with which he has thus far been quite contented.

WE ADVANCE TOWARD IDEALISM

Strange as it may seem, the church is responsible for wholesome social unrest which, after all, means social and spiritual advancement. The church sends the finest flower of its colleges and seminaries out into mission fields at home and abroad, holding up standards of life, physical, mental, and moral, as well as spiritual, toward which the church rightly urges the masses of the people to aspire.

The church points out the low condition under which many people are compelled to live, declaring that only through the application of the Gospel, which it teaches, will they ever reach the summit of the higher and nobler life.

For creating this kind of discontent the church is greatly to be commended.

It will be seen, therefore, that through literature and education, art, and the presentation of modern, mechanized equipment, and religion, desirable social unrest is being created—the logical result of the finest idealism that the world has ever known.

Such desirable social unrest cannot and should not be retarded. It would be useless to try to do so. It involves the growth and the progress of the human race.

GOOD NEIGHBOR IDEA THE HOPE OF HUMANITY

But all this relates largely to the development of the individual.

It makes the individual richer, better, and more appreciative of the finer things of life. It creates new inspirations that lead to new aspirations and to new achievements.

But unfortunately it frequently fails to give to the individual a sense of responsibility to and for others.

The church more nearly fulfills its responsibility in this direction, but even so what religionist would insist that the social responsibility of his church is being fully or even approximately met. The great peril in America today is the lack of the neighborly spirit, as the President has repeatedly stated.

What our country needs—what every country needs—is the development of the "good neighbor" idea to which I referred in a recent speech I delivered in the House when considering legislation authorizing Federal cooperation with the States for the purpose of protecting people from the life-destroying menace of stream pollution.

In that speech I endeavored to present convincing facts in proof of the proposition that what our country needs and what every country needs is the development of the "good neighbor" idea as an antidote to selfishness, class hatred, and the destructive menace of intolerance.

Of all the great messages broadcast to the world by President Roosevelt, none outrivaled in importance that great speech President Roosevelt delivered in his home community at Hyde Park, expressing the philosophy of "the good neighbor idea."

INTOLERANCE INSPIRED BY FEAR

The rising tide of intolerance in this country, in politics, in business, in industry, and even in religion itself, is due largely to the fact that while we have grown marvelously in many other directions, we have failed dismally in developing that spirit of neighborliness to which the President refers.

When men hate each other, it is usually because they do not know each other. The French have a saying that "To know all is to forgive all." It is this ignorance of our fellowmen which causes our fear of them and it creates in our hearts a suspicion that is not justified. Fear is at the bottom of much of the intolerance that plagues the world, causes rebellion among classes and wars between nations.

THE PRICE WE PAY FOR IGNORANCE

The ignorance of labor, regarding the problems of capital and the ignorance of capital in regard to the needs of labor are types of ignorance which produce a goodly share of the present industrial situation.

The ignorance of the whole history and the great accomplishments of many religious groups is responsible for much of the misunderstanding between these groups.

The ignorance of governmental functions, motives, accomplishments, and personnel, creates unjustifiable bitterness in political life on the part of many Americans.

The ignorance of the conditions from which many of the masses are suffering and for the alleviation and cure of which conditions sincere-minded men and women are earnestly struggling, causes hatred of them by smugly comfortable and complacent people who can see in these efforts merely a gross and often a crass revolutionary movement.

LET US GET ACQUAINTED WITH ONE ANOTHER

To relieve this situation will require better acquaintance with our neighbors and the enlargement of the number of these neighbors—locally, nationally, and internationally.

This widening knowledge and acquaintance will help settle the labor problems, the racial problems, the religious problems, and the political problems which face America today.

To this end we should encourage freedom of speech instead of its limitation, so that we may know what is on the minds of the people. We should support the open forum where "men may shake out their hearts."

But most of all, we should know men and women in a more personal way, so that we may become acquainted with their characters, their aspirations, their purposes, their plans, and their problems.

AMERICA CAN LEAD THE WAY

It was the Great Teacher Himself who once told an earnest inquirer who sought to know the "good way" that he must "love his neighbor as he loves himself." And what the inquirer asked Him: "Who then, is my neighbor?" The Teacher told him the classical story of "the Good Samaritan." To be a "good neighbor" in the sense proclaimed by President Roosevelt in his Hyde Park speech, is to be a "Good Samaritan" in every relationship with humanity, everywhere.

We have a right to be proud of our culture, our knowledge, and our accomplishments in these United States. In spite of all that the world has passed through in recent years, we are still the undisputed leader among the nations, both from the standpoint of our natural resources and from the standpoint of the perpetuation of the spirit of democracy.

No longer can we afford to misunderstand and fight one another. From now on we are compelled to know one another, understand one another, and cooperate with one another in self-defense. Our survival depends upon our capacity for mutual aid.

LIBERTY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. ECKERT. Mr. Speaker, "Hold fast that which is good" is a bit of Biblical counsel that might well be heeded by the common people of the Nation during the pending campaign. The enemies of the present administration are seeking to discredit the New Deal and all its works. To this end, all manner of extravagant and baseless statements find their way into the press, on the air, and wherever the Roosevelt administration happens to be the topic of conversation.

The object, of course, is quite plain. If the New Deal can be discredited in the eyes of the voters, the chances of defeating President Roosevelt at the November election will be enhanced, and inasmuch as privilege is on the defensive, and making a last stand for its life, the mere misstatement of facts concerning the New Deal will not disturb the conscience or the slumbers of the antinew dealers.

But while this reckless disregard of truth is being exhibited, let those who toil and labor for a livelihood pause and reflect on the advice of Saint Paul.

The New Deal came into being in response to the call of the people for action and change in politics and government.

It symbolizes the urge of the people for freer and better economic opportunities. It is the sign of the liberal and progressive movement in America.

The New Deal is in the making. It is not a fixed and static thing. It is a living and changing thing, unfolding and developing with the demands of the times. The legislation that was first enacted in the name of the New Deal was intended to meet a grave crisis. After the ravages of the depression were arrested, legislation of a permanent nature followed, and as the needs of the future demand additional legislation that also will be enacted in due course. The progress of the New Deal will advance or retard in exact proportion to the loyalty or disloyalty of the people. If the enemies of the New Deal succeed in disintegrating the forces back of President Roosevelt, its success will be jeopardized, the advances already made dissipated, and the cause of liberalism irreparably damaged. If, however, the masses will stand shoulder to shoulder and rally to the call of their Commander in Chief, its success is assured, and a better and brighter day for American toilers and American business will come to pass. Therefore, friends of the New Deal must hold fast to what has already been accomplished and in solid phalanx struggle on for greater achievements.

A brief survey of what has been done in the name of the New Deal discloses the great strides made by the Roosevelt administration. It will be recalled that among the first acts of Franklin D. Roosevelt after assuming the office as Chief Executive was to call the Seventy-third Congress into extraordinary session, and for a period of 100 days the Congress passed an array of emergency legislation that not only surprised but revived and stimulated the spirit of a discouraged people and restored their faith and confidence in the Government. Only brief reference can be made to the various acts passed by the Congress. The following is a list of the most important legislation:

Act of March 9, 1933: Emergency Banking Act, to provide relief in the existing national emergency in banking.

Act of March 20, 1933: Economy Act, to maintain the credit of the United States Government.

Act of March 24, 1933: Emergency Banking Act of March 9, 1933, above, amended to authorize direct loans by Federal Reserve banks to State banks and trust companies.

Act of March 31, 1933: Reforestation Act.

Act of May 12, 1933: Farm Relief Inflation Act. Title I provides for the acquisition of cotton by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Title II, entitled the "Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933", provides for the issuance of bonds by Federal land banks, and so forth.

Title III authorizes the President to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase and hold Treasury bills or other obligations of the United States Government from the Federal Reserve banks up to \$3,000,000,000; to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue United States notes up to \$3,000,000,000 to meet maturing Federal obligations, and so forth; by proclamation to fix the weight of the gold and silver dollar; to accept silver in payment of debts due from foreign governments.

Act of May 12, 1933: Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, authorizing a grant of \$500,000,000 from funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Act of May 18, 1933: Tennessee Valley Authority—Muscle Shoals—Act of 1933.

Act of May 27, 1933: Securities Act of 1933, prohibiting the sale or offering for sale in interstate commerce of any securities not registered with the Federal Trade Commission.

Joint resolution of June 5, 1933: Gold clause repeal.

Act of June 6, 1933: National Employment System Act.

Act of June 13, 1933: Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, authorizing and directing the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to create a Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which is authorized to issue bonds up to \$2,000,000,000.

Act of June 16, 1933: Glass-Steagall Banking Act of 1933. This act requires a limited insurance of deposits from a fund to which all member banks of the Federal Reserve System must contribute.

Act of June 16, 1933: National Industrial Recovery Act.

Act of June 16, 1933: Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, 1933, creating office of Federal Coordinator of Transportation.

Act of June 16, 1933: Farm Credit Act of 1933. This act directs the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to organize 12 production credit associations from which farmers may borrow money; also 12 banks for cooperatives which are to make loans to cooperative associations for any of the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations set forth in the Agricultural Marketing Act.

Act of January 30, 1934: Gold Reserve Act of 1934. All property rights in gold to be transferred from Federal Reserve banks, etc., to the United States; no gold to be coined, and no redemptions of currency to be made into gold.

Two billion dollars is appropriated for dealing in gold, foreign exchange, etc., by the President to stabilize the exchange value of the dollar.

Act of January 31, 1934: Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation created with a capital of \$200,000,000, to issue bonds, purchase farm-loan bonds, make loans to Federal land banks, and invest its funds in mortgage loans made under section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933.

Act of February 15, 1934: This act appropriates \$950,000,000 additional for carrying out the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 and for continuing the civil-works program.

Act of February 23, 1934: Authorizes the Farm Credit Administration to make loans to farmers during 1934 for crop production, planting, fallowing, and cultivation, and, up to \$1,000,000, for feed for livestock in drought- and storm-stricken areas.

Act of March 24, 1934: Philippine Independence Act.

Act of March 28, 1934: Independent Offices Appropriation Act. Title II amends the Economy Act of March 20, 1933.

Act of April 7, 1934: Agricultural Adjustment Act amended so as to include cattle as a basic agricultural commodity.

Act of April 13, 1934: Johnson Act, prohibiting financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States.

Act of April 21, 1934: Cotton Control Act.

Act of April 27, 1934: Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 amended by guaranteeing fully and unconditionally principal as well as interest of bonds of the Corporation.

Act of May 10, 1934: Revenue Act of 1934. Under this act the normal income tax is 4 percent; the maximum surtax is 59 percent on net incomes in excess of \$1,000,000; the maximum estate tax is 60 percent on net estates in excess of \$10,000,000.

Act of May 21, 1934: Subsidizing of vocational education in the States and Territories by \$3,000,000 for each of the next 3 fiscal years authorized.

Act of June 6, 1934: Securities Exchange Act of 1934, requiring licensing of stock exchange and registration of listed securities with a Securities and Exchange Commission.

Act of June 12, 1934: Air Mail Act, revising air-mail legislation.

Act of June 12, 1934: Reciprocal Tariff Act.

Act of June 18, 1934: To increase employment by authorizing certain appropriations.

Act of June 19, 1934: Emergency Appropriation Act, authorizing appropriation for relief.

Act of June 19, 1934: Communications Act, creating Federal Communications Commission to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in communication by wire and radio.

Act of June 19, 1934: Loans to Industries Act, authorizing Federal Reserve banks to make loans, and so forth.

Act of June 19, 1934: Silver Purchase Act, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver on certain conditions.

Joint resolution of June 19, 1934: Authorizing the President to establish boards to investigate practices of employers and employees in controversies arising under section 7a of the National Industrial Recovery Act or which are burdening the free flow of interstate commerce, and so forth.

Act of June 21, 1934: Railway Labor Disputes Act (amending the Railway Labor Act of 1926), establishing a National Railroad Adjustment Board and a National Mediation Board to aid in the prompt settlement of disputes between railroads and their employees.

Act of June 26, 1934: Federal Credit Union Act, providing for the incorporation of Federal credit unions.

Act of June 27, 1934: National Housing Act, authorizing the President to create a Federal Housing Administration.

Act of June 27, 1934: Railroad Employees' Retirement Act, providing for the compulsory retirement of railway employees at the age of 65.

Act of June 28, 1934 (Frazier-Lemke): Farm Moratorium Act.

Act of January 31, 1935: Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized to continue its functions until February 1, 1937.

Joint resolution of February 13, 1935: Additional appropriations. Section 2 restores full pay to Federal employees, effective April 1, 1935.

Act of February 20, 1935: Loans up to a total of \$60,000,000 to farmers for crop production, and so forth.

Joint resolution of March 15, 1935: Investigation of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and so forth, by Federal Communications Commission.

Joint resolution of April 8, 1935: Relief appropriations of \$4,880,000,000 for public works, and so forth.

Act of April 27, 1935: Provisions for protection against soil erosion.

Act of June 14, 1935: Provision for distribution of sound-reproduction records for the blind.

Act of June 29, 1935: Provision for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture; additional support of agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

Act of July 5, 1935: National Labor Relations Act, for settlement of labor disputes.

Act of August 9, 1935: Motor Carrier Act, placing interstate and foreign motor carriers under regulatory power of Interstate Commerce Commission.

Act of August 14, 1935: Social Security Act, providing for old-age assistance, unemployment compensation, aid to dependent children, maternal and child welfare, public-health work, aid to the blind, and taxes on employers and wage earners to finance unemployment compensation.

Act of August 23, 1935: Banking Act of 1935, making numerous amendments to the Federal Reserve Act and other banking laws.

Act of August 23, 1935: Establishment of tobacco classification standards, with provision for inspection service, etc.

Act of August 26, 1935: Regulation of public-utility holding companies, including modified "death sentence" provision, which requires simplification of holding company systems by January 1, 1938.

Act of August 29, 1935: Provisions for retirement of railway employees.

Act of August 30, 1935: Guffey Act, for stabilization of bituminous coal industry.

Act of August 30, 1935: Revenue Act of 1935.

Act of August 31, 1935: Amendments to Tennessee Valley Act, giving the Tennessee Valley Authority additional power to sell electricity, etc.

Joint Resolution of August 31, 1935: Neutrality provisions, including embargo on exportation of arms, etc.

Act of January 27, 1936: Payment of adjusted-service certificates.

Act of February 11, 1936: Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1936, carrying funds for Social Security Act, and for payment on contracts under A. A. A.

Joint resolution of February 29, 1936: Extends until May 1, 1937, the embargo provisions of the neutrality resolution of 1935.

Act of February 29, 1936: Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make benefit payments totaling \$500,000,000 to farmers who take land out of production for soil-conservation purposes.

After 1938 the conservation program shall be administered by the States, aided by Federal grants.

Act of March 31, 1936: Continues the Electric Home and Farm Authority until February 1, 1937.

Act of April 3, 1936: Extends for another year the authority of the National Housing Administration to insure private financial institutions against losses on loans made for improvement of realty, etc.

Act of April 10, 1936: Authorizes increase of \$97,000,000 in capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Joint resolution of April 21, 1936: Extends for a period of 2 years, i. e., until July 1, 1938, the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C. Supp. 12: 264 (n) (4)) authorizing the Corporation to make loans to or purchase assets of open or closed insured banks in order to reduce or avert threatened losses to the Corporation, or to facilitate merger of insured banks or sale of assets and liabilities to other insured banks.

Act of April 25, 1936: Authorizes negotiation of interstate compacts for controlling production of and commerce in flue-cured burley, fire-cured and cigar-filler binder and wrapper tobaccos.

Act of May 1, 1936: Whaling Treaty Act for effectuating the Whaling Convention of 1931.

Act of May 20, 1936: Enacts in substance the terms of Executive Order No. 7037 of May 11, 1935, under which the Rural Electrification Administration was established. Authorizes loans up to \$50,000,000 a year by Reconstruction Finance Corporation to Rural Electrification Administration for 1937 and 1938 and direct appropriations of \$40,000,000 for 1939-46.

Act of June 8, 1936: Additional appropriations for allotment among States in furtherance of vocational education; \$12,000,000 for teachers of agricultural, home economics, and industrial subjects; \$1,200,000 for distributive occupational subjects—to be matched by the States progressively, reaching 100 percent in 1947—and \$1,000,000 for teacher training.

Act of June 15, 1936: Broadens the Grain Futures Act into a Commodity Exchange Act by including within its scope cotton, rice, millfeed, butter and eggs, potatoes, as well as grains. The Government is authorized to control speculation, manipulation, unreasonable price fluctuations, and cornering, by setting quantity limits on futures trading, and so forth.

Act of June 15, 1936: Authorizes \$272,000,000 for carrying out modified Mississippi flood-control project.

Act of June 16, 1936: Penalizes—maximum fine \$5,000—any person—including shippers, brokers, or their employees, and so forth—who (a) by false billing, and so forth, knowingly and willfully, directly or indirectly, and whether with or without the consent or connivance of the carrier or its agents, obtains transportation for property by a common carrier subject to the shipping act at less than regular rates; or (b) by false representations, and so forth, similarly obtains any refund or other payment whereby the compensation of the carrier is made less than or different from the regular rates or charges.

Act of June 16, 1936: Additional annual authorizations for roads, fiscal years 1938 and 1939, as follows: \$125,000,000 for interstate highways; \$14,000,000 for forest roads; \$2,500,000 for roads through public lands, and so forth; \$7,500,000 for roads in national parks and \$10,000,000 for approach roads; \$4,000,000 for roads in Indian reservations; \$25,000,000 for feeder roads; \$50,000,000 for elimination of grade crossings.

Act of June 19, 1936: Amends the Clayton Antitrust Act by prohibiting price discrimination tending to lessen competition or to create monopolies, allowing differential on account of differences in cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. Prohibits discriminatory rebates or discounts for purpose of eliminating competitors.

Act of June 22, 1936: Flood Control Act—adopting and authorizing prosecution of approximately 223 enumerated projects of river and harbor improvement for flood-control

and erosion-prevention purposes, with provision for future hydroelectric development. In general, the States or local agencies are to provide necessary land, pay any damages, and maintain the completed works. Cost is set at \$310,000,000 for construction and \$10,000,000 for examinations and surveys—not more than \$50,000 to be expended in 1937.

Act of June 22, 1936: First Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 1936—carrying in title II, \$1,425,000,000 for relief and work relief, as follows: Roads, \$413,250,000; public buildings, \$156,750,000; parks, and so forth, \$156,750,000; public utilities, \$171,000,000; flood control, and so forth, \$128,250,000; "white-collar relief", \$85,500,000; women's projects, \$85,500,000; miscellaneous, \$71,250,000; National Youth Administration, \$71,250,000, rural rehabilitation, \$85,500,000.

Act of June 22, 1936: Revenue Act of 1936 (a) increases surtaxes on individual net incomes from present maximum—\$533,000 on \$1,000,000 income, plus 59 percent of excess over \$1,000,000—up to a new maximum of \$3,591,440 on \$5,000,000, plus 75 percent of excess; (b) splits up the tax on corporate incomes—8 percent on first \$2,000, 11 percent on next \$13,000, 13 percent on next \$25,000, and 15 percent on excess over \$40,000—instead of former flat 13¼ percent; (c) surtax on undistributed profits of corporations, 7 percent on first 10 percent of retained income, 12 percent on next 10 percent, 17 percent on next 20 percent, 22 percent on next 20 percent, and 27 percent of amount over 60 percent.

This brief survey of the New Deal tells the story of the achievements—though very inadequately—of the Roosevelt administration. Through it all there runs but one single purpose. The entire program is intended to arrest the devastating forces of the depression, restore faith and confidence in the Government, and pave the way for the establishment of an era of social justice. There is no trace of evil design or selfishness in the long list of legislative enactments. Which of the legislative enactments ought not to have been enacted or which ought to be repealed? Which of the list has not met some present need or aided in restoring confidence and faith in the Government?

The New Deal is glorified with true patriotism and nobility of purpose and the results are reassuring. Hope, faith, confidence have supplanted despair, fear, uncertainty. The people and the Nation, under the salutary influence of the New Deal are rapidly emerging from the slough of despond in which the American people found themselves on that eventful 4th day of March 1933. In the light of the progress of the past, the future is full of promise that the American people will steadfastly continue in the path typified by the New Deal and amplify, develop, and perfect it as the exigencies of the future demand.

A partial analysis of the New Deal enactments reveals the magnitude and comprehensive character of the program. Banking, transportation, labor, agriculture, industry, social security, housing, rural electrification, slum clearance, relief, unemployment, public utilities, power, farm credit, home owners' credit, and other items of public concern are embraced in the New Deal program. The legislation enumerated indicates the wide sweep of the program. It anticipates the objective of the New Deal which President Roosevelt has declared again and again to be that which any honest government of any country would do—try to increase the security and the happiness of the people in all occupations of life and in all parts of the country; to give them more of the good things of life; to give them a greater distribution, not only of wealth in the narrow terms but of wealth in the wider terms; to give them places to go in the summertime—recreation; to give them assurance that they are not going to starve in their old age; to give honest business a chance to go ahead and to make a reasonable profit and to give everyone a chance to make a living. This in the President's own words is the task ahead. The achievement of this objective in its fullness, means a long and weary struggle, a struggle that cannot stop short of the abolition of legal privilege. Privilege is an attribute of aristocracy and has no place in a democracy, which Lincoln defined as "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Woodrow Wilson said:

The reason that America was set up so that she might be different from all the nations of the world is this: That the strong could not put the weak to the wall; that the strong could not prevent the weak from entering the race. America stands for opportunity. America stands for a free field and no favors.

This implies an America free from privilege. The true purpose of the founders of the American Republic has never been achieved, for at no time in the history of our country have the people enjoyed "a free field and no favors." There have always been the few who enjoyed favors at the expense of the many. These favors are legal privileges and constitute the instruments by which the possessors thereof exploit the masses.

Until the New Deal is amplified, developed, and perfected so that the America of Woodrow Wilson, wherein private privilege in all its ramifications is destroyed, the mission of the New Deal will not be fulfilled. For the ultimate objective is to bring into force and effect the doctrine of "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

The word is being sedulously spread abroad that the New Deal is an invasion of liberty. This propaganda emanates mainly from the privileged few. That of itself is ominous, yet it ought to put the people on inquiry, for liberty is a coveted right. It has been the quest of man from time immemorial and man is still in pursuit. The goal has not yet been attained, notwithstanding the fact that those who assail the New Deal as an encroachment of liberty, assume that America is a land of full and complete liberty. Be not deceived! Neither in America nor any other land has there been that recognition of human rights upon which liberty in its true sense is predicated. We in America, in the early days of the Republic, enjoyed a larger degree of liberty than any other people of modern times, but with the monopolization of the natural resources that came with the settlement and development of the Republic, the open door of equal economic opportunity gradually closed and the liberty that was once enjoyed vanished.

Then again, there are those who, though most bitter in their denunciations, sound the praises of liberty, but the liberty which they invoke is the liberty to exploit the producers of wealth. "O Liberty! Liberty! How many crimes are committed in thy name?" They would have us believe that if the New Deal were discarded, liberty's beneficent rays would shine upon us in all its glory. Dismiss the thought. The New Deal is not invading the substantial liberty of the American people. The liberty that was America's declined with the close of our public domain. As long as land was to be had for the mere asking America enjoyed a high degree of freedom. The moment, however, that the last acre of free land passed out of the picture, the glory of America's freedom began to fade, until today the economic freedom enjoyed by the great mass of our people is to beg, beseech, and implore the lords of privilege for a chance to earn a living. This is not the liberty in which the Nation was conceived, nor the freedom for which the fathers fought, but the liberty in which it was conceived and for which the fathers fought must be restored if popular government is to endure.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To assure these rights to the people of America is in its deeper aspect the meaning and mission of the New Deal.

Hold fast that which is good.

THE BONUS—TAXATION—AND THE TARIFF

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, in addition to attending the sessions of the House, attending to departmental matters for constituents, and answering a large volume of correspondence, a Congressman's time is to a very great extent taken up by his committee work.

For the past 19 years I have been a member of the important Ways and Means Committee, which considers all tax and tariff legislation, in addition to many other matters

which incidentally affect the revenue. During the session just closed, the committee has been occupied with the consideration of several major bills and a great number of minor bills.

PAYMENT OF THE BONUS

The first major bill considered by the committee was that providing for the immediate payment of the soldiers' bonus. It will be recalled that last year Congress passed a bill providing for payment of the bonus which was vetoed by the President. While the House voted to override the veto, it was sustained in the Senate, and the bill failed of enactment.

This year another bonus bill was passed providing for a different method of payment. It was also vetoed by the President, but this time both the Senate and House overrode the veto, and the bill became a law. I voted in favor of the legislation when it was before the House and also voted to override the veto.

REVENUE ACT OF 1936

Another major piece of legislation considered during the past session was the so-called Revenue Act of 1936, which was passed by the subservient New Deal Congress in response to the President's request. Along with my Republican colleagues in the House, I opposed this measure.

As originally proposed by the President, the new law would have repealed all existing taxes on corporations and substituted a graduated penalty tax based solely on the earnings not distributed to stockholders. While the House passed a bill in substantial conformity with the President's plan the Senate refused to accept it, and as a final compromise it was agreed to retain the present corporate taxes at slightly lower rates and superimpose a modified penalty tax on amounts not distributed to stockholders.

While ostensibly for revenue-raising purposes the new tax law is actually aimed at forcing the distribution of corporate earnings without respect to the financial needs of the corporation. It therefore constitutes a direct and unwarranted interference with business by substituting Government dictation for sound discretion in the management of the fiscal affairs of a corporation. At the same time, by penalizing and discouraging the accumulation of reserves for bad times, the new law threatens the very stability of business, and with it the stability of employment and investments, as well as the Federal revenue. Financially weak corporations which must repair their capital structure are penalized, while large, well-financed corporations which are so situated as to declare out all their earnings may escape the penalty tax altogether. This is not only oppressive and unjust to corporations which are struggling to stay on their feet but it creates unfair competitive conditions between different corporations in the same line of business.

The new law even penalizes the payment of debts by imposing the penalty tax on amounts reserved for that purpose. It discourages rehabilitation and expansion by penalizing amounts retained for these purposes. This will result in retarding recovery and reemployment.

Many other objections to the new law could be cited. It is universally opposed by business and is advocated by no one of experience or ability in the field of taxation. It is a product of the "brain trust", none of whom have ever had to meet a Saturday-night pay roll, and constitutes another ill-advised step in the administration's program of regimentation. Every unemployed man, every man who wants to keep his job, every investor, and everyone interested in recovery and business stability should urge its speedy repeal.

THE LIQUOR TAX ADMINISTRATION ACT

A third major piece of legislation considered by the Ways and Means Committee was the so-called Liquor Tax Administration Act, which makes certain changes in the administrative provisions of the laws relating to the collection of liquor taxes. In addition it provides a 50-percent reduction in the existing internal-revenue taxes on wines, which will be of great benefit to the grape industry of New Jersey. This same act also makes an independent agency out of the Federal Alcohol Administration, which is now under the Treasury Department.

At the last session of Congress, when similar legislation was under consideration, an effort was made to amend the liquor laws so as to permit so-called "bulk sales" in barrels. Over my bitter opposition, this amendment was passed in the House, but we were able to have it eliminated in the Senate. Had bulk sales in barrels been permitted, it would have resulted in serious injury to the glass-bottle industry in south Jersey and other States.

TARIFF REDUCTIONS UNDER THE NEW DEAL

While no tariff legislation has been enacted during the past session, I wish to say a few words about the trade treaties negotiated by the President under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which was enacted by the New Deal Congress over solid Republican opposition.

Some 14 trade treaties have thus far been negotiated, and many more are in the process of negotiation. Those negotiated up to the present time and their effective dates are as follows:

Cuba, September 3, 1934.
 Belgium, May 1, 1935.
 Haiti, June 3, 1935.
 Sweden, August 5, 1935.
 Brazil, January 1, 1936.
 Canada, January 1, 1936.
 Netherlands, February 1, 1936.
 Switzerland, February 15, 1936.
 Honduras, March 2, 1936.
 Colombia, May 20, 1936.
 Guatemala, June 15, 1936.
 France, June 15, 1936.
 Nicaragua—Not yet ratified by Nicaragua.
 Finland—Not yet ratified by Finland.

It is to be noted that two of the treaties have not yet been ratified by the countries concerned. A number of the treaties now in effect were subject to ratification by the foreign country before becoming effective. So far as our own Congress is concerned, however, it has no opportunity to approve or reject the treaties. They are not even approved by the Senate, as required by the Constitution.

The treaties are negotiated in secret with representatives of foreign countries. A small group of impractical theorists in the State Department sit down with these foreign representatives to decide upon the tariff concessions to be made by each country. American producers are not even given a hearing with respect to the proposed treaty once the terms have been agreed upon. The first time they have any definite knowledge of its provisions is after it has been concluded and announced by the President. Under this method of procedure, foreign countries are given an opportunity to help decide what our tariff rates are to be, while American producers and the United States Congress are not even given a look-in.

The Cuban treaty is the only one of the 14 that is strictly bilateral—that is, where the concessions made are extended only to the countries signatory to the treaty. In the case of the other 13 the duty concessions which we extend to one country in return for supposedly reciprocal concessions from it are gratuitously extended to all other countries, Germany alone excepted, without requiring them to give us any concessions in return. Thus the effect of a treaty is just the same as if Congress had passed a law reducing the duties on the products concerned with respect to imports from all countries. This "good neighbor" policy on the part of the New Deal is one of the reasons why the trade-treaty program is resulting in such a disadvantage to American producers. The New Deal is surrendering our home market to foreign competition, but is not gaining much in the way of foreign markets for our surpluses. Every time a treaty is negotiated we get a small market for some of our products in one country, but surrender our market for certain products to the whole world. That is the kind of "Simple Simon" foreign trades the New Deal is making. Not only are our foreign-market advantages limited to the one country with whom we negotiate a treaty, but our ability to take advantage of the concessions extended depends upon whether our exporters can undersell the rest of the world. So far as the home market is concerned, our producers are already having a difficult enough time meeting

foreign competition without having the tariff rates reduced still further.

Let us see to what extent the New Deal has reduced tariff duties under some of the treaties negotiated to date. I shall refer principally to those items in which my own State of New Jersey is vitally interested.

Under the Cuban treaty, reductions of up to 50 percent were made in the duties on the following products among others: Lima beans, potatoes, tomatoes, cucumbers, egg-plant, okra, peppers, squash, honey, jellies, fish, and numerous other commodities. These reductions applied only to imports from Cuba and in the case of the vegetables named only during the winter season.

Under the 13 other treaties, reductions of up to 50 percent, applying to commerce from all countries except Germany, were made in the duties on hundreds of products, including the following:

Belgian treaty: Cement, glass (silica) sand, plate glass, sheet glass, laminated glass, various iron and steel products, asbestos building materials, and whiting.

Swedish treaty: Various iron and steel products, various manufactures of iron and steel such as saws, pliers, files, and so forth, calculating machines, vacuum cleaners, and safety matches.

Canadian treaty: Cream, Cheddar cheese, poultry, fish, canned razor clams, apples, strawberries, blueberries, cherries, seed potatoes, and turnips.

Netherlands treaty: Edam cheese, pickled onions, gin, and cordage.

Switzerland treaty: Dyes, certain machinery, Swiss cheese, certain cotton and silk cloths, knit underwear of cotton, wool, silk, rayon, machine embroideries, and lace handkerchiefs.

French treaty: Certain articles of carbon and graphite, perfume bottles, watch crystals, cast-iron pipe, Roquefort cheese, mushrooms, wines, silk and rayon fabrics, certain cotton and silk apparel, laces, and wool-knit fabrics.

I want to emphasize that these are only a few of the hundreds of items affected by the various treaties which have been negotiated. To give a complete list would take up many pages.

Just as an example of how the reductions in duty adversely affect our American producers, let me cite the case of glass or silica sand, the duty on which was reduced under the Belgian treaty from \$2 to \$1 per ton. Imports in 1934 were 21,889 tons, all of which came from Belgium. In 1935, with the Belgian treaty in effect for 8 months, imports rose to 39,546 tons. Doubtless they will rise still further during the present year. Every additional ton imported from abroad means that much less of our own consumed. By reducing the duty on glass sand, the New Deal has struck a blow at one of the important industries of my own district. A great deal of glass sand is found in the southern portion of New Jersey.

The reductions made in the duties on various agricultural commodities have had a most detrimental effect upon the producers of my district. For example, imports of tomatoes have jumped from 55,000,000 pounds in 1934 to 79,000,000 pounds in 1935.

As the trade treaties gradually come into operation, foreign competition on all fronts will continue to increase. New Jersey poultry raisers were given a blow by the administration by virtue of the 40-percent reduction in the duty on dressed poultry and the 50-percent reduction in the duty on live poultry under the Canadian treaty. This reduction has been in effect since the 1st day of January of this year.

The cement industry has also been adversely affected by New Deal trade treaties. This is strikingly shown in the increase in imports from 1934 to 1935. In 1934 imports were around 94,000,000 pounds. In 1935 they rose to 232,000,000 pounds, an increase of 138,000,000 pounds under the stimulus of the 25-percent reduction in duty under the Belgian treaty. The domestic industry can thank the New Deal for depriving them of the home market to this extent.

The New Deal tries to justify its trade-treaty program on the theory that by hurting some American industries it

benefits others by providing increased export markets for them. Even if this result were being accomplished, I could not agree with a philosophy which denies equal opportunity to domestic producers. But what makes matters worse is that after striking down certain of our industries the New Deal has failed to provide corresponding increases in the foreign markets of other domestic industries.

The failure of the New Deal program is best illustrated by a comparison of the increase in imports and exports from 1934 to 1935. Imports increased 24 percent, but exports only increased 7 percent. Our favorable balance of trade shrank from \$478,000,000 in 1934 to only \$235,000,000 in 1935. In the first 5 months of the present year our favorable balance of trade disappeared altogether, with imports of \$972,000,000 and exports of only \$969,000,000.

While some few industries may have been benefited by the trade treaties as a result of increased exports, the general effect on the country as a whole has been adverse. We have surrendered more than we have gained, and as time goes on the ratio of losses to gains increases. When the trade-treaty legislation was enacted it was said that it was necessary to restore our foreign trade, even though at that time it was rapidly increasing from the low point of 1932.

Our foreign trade has continued to increase, even with countries with whom no treaties are in effect. It would therefore appear that the New Deal is giving away our home market unnecessarily.

It is said that we must buy abroad if we wish to sell abroad. This may be true, but we do not have to buy those things which we can and do produce at home. There are plenty of things which we must buy that do not come in competition with the products of our own people. Already two-thirds of our imports come in free of duty, and if we must bargain with foreign countries to secure additional markets, let us bargain with the free list, rather than with the dutiable list. We can force other countries to give fair treatment to our products by threatening the imposition of penalty duties on products now enjoying free entry into our market.

TARIFF PLANK OF REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1936

I shall close these remarks by quoting the tariff plank in the Republican platform of 1936, with which I am in complete accord. It follows:

Tariff

Nearly 60 percent of all imports into the United States are now free of duty. The other 40 percent of imports compete directly with the product of our industry. We would keep on the free list all products not grown or produced in the United States in commercial quantities.

As to all commodities that commercially compete with our farms, our forests, our mines, our fisheries, our oil wells, our labor, and our industries, sufficient protection should be maintained at all times to defend the American farmer and the American wage earner from the destructive competition emanating from the subsidies of foreign governments and the imports from low-wage and depreciated-currency countries.

We will repeal the present reciprocal trade agreement law. It is futile and dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage earner and the farmer.

We will restore the principle of the flexible tariff in order to meet changing economic conditions here and abroad and broaden by careful definition the powers of the Tariff Commission in order to extend this policy along nonpartisan lines.

We will adjust tariffs with a view to promoting international trade, the stabilization of currencies, and the attainment of a proper balance between agriculture and industry.

We condemn the secret negotiation of reciprocal-trade treaties without public hearing or legislative approval.

THE ROOSEVELT NEW DEAL AND THE COLORED CITIZEN

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt in a recent speech said:

There are none of us who do not hope that our children get a better break than we had. * * * We want them to have an opportunity for profitable character building—decent, wholesome living—good work and good play.

This statement is exemplary of the inclusiveness of the spirit and practice of the Roosevelt New Deal administration.

June 26, 1935, by Executive Order 7036, the President created the National Youth Administration. August 1, 1935,

Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, of Daytona, Fla., for many years one of the leading educators of the colored race, and Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, Washington, D. C., were appointed as members of the N. Y. A. national advisory committee by the President.

April 29, 1936, in the drawing room of the White House from 9 p. m. until nearly midnight, President Roosevelt sat down with the members of the N. Y. A. national advisory committee to review at first hand the phenomenal progress made to date in this new social endeavor.

Aubrey Williams, the inspired genius and executive secretary of the N. Y. A., presented each member of the committee to the President. In her turn Mrs. Bethune recited the accomplishments of the colored youth as reflected in the statistical records of the organization, which were in brief as follows:

Twenty-eight colored leaders are members of the State N. Y. A. advisory committees, North and South. An equal number of colored assistant State directors and trained college men and women of the colored race are filling high executive positions in New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, Tennessee, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, Michigan, Kansas, Georgia, Colorado, California, and Texas, which State programs have had the largest participation of young colored men and women.

The National Youth Administration is helping approximately 26,000 colored youth to continue in school through payments for part-time work under supervision of school authorities. These young people range in age from 16 to 25. There are approximately 5,000 of these colored students in the undergraduate class and 70 graduate college students in both the strictly Negro institutions and the leading universities. The average monthly rate per college student is \$15, while the graduate students receive from \$25 to \$30 monthly. Those students of high-school class are being paid a maximum of \$6 per month.

Of the \$50,000,000 expended by the N. Y. A. organization during the past year, it is conservatively estimated that the financial benefits to the colored youth of the Nation has been proportionate to their population ratio and particular needs.

Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, addressing a group of colored educators under the auspices of the national conference to discuss Fundamentals in the Education of Negroes, at Washington, D. C., on May 9, 1936, said:

I noticed in the papers this morning the figures given of the cost in certain States per capita for education of a colored child and of a white child, and I could not help but think as I read that item how stupid we are in some ways, for of course in any democracy the one important thing is to see as far as possible that every child receives at least the best education that that child is able to assimilate. * * * I feel that while we have been fortunate in this country in having many fine men and women interested in the education of the Negro race, we have also been slow, many of us who are of the white race, in realizing how important to our race, that you should have the best educational advantages.

I believe that the Negro race has tremendous gifts to bring to this country in the way of artistic development. I think things come by nature to many of them that we have to acquire, such as an appreciation of art and of music and of rhythm, which we really have to gain very often through education. I think that those things should be utilized for the good of the whole Nation, that you should be allowed to make your greatest contribution along the lines that you want and that give you joy. And, therefore, I am very happy to see this conference, and I have the hope that out of it will come a realization not only to you who are here, but to all the people throughout the country who may be listening in today and who may later come in contact with those of you who are here, that we as a democracy in these times must be able to grasp our problems, must have sufficient general education to know not only what our difficulties are but what the Government is trying to do to help us meet those difficulties. Without that ability in our people and without the willingness to sacrifice on the part of the people as a whole, in order that the younger generation may develop this ability, I think we have harder times ahead of us than we have had in the past. I think the day of selfishness is over; the day of really working together has come, and we must learn to work together, all of us, regardless of race, or creed, or color; we must wipe out, wherever we find it, any feeling that grows up of intolerance, of belief that any one group can go ahead alone. We go ahead together, or we go down together, and so may you profit now and for the future by all that you do in this conference.

Dr. Ambrose Caliver, former dean of Fisk University, sponsor of the above-mentioned conference and specialist in Negro education, United States Office of Education, Department of the Interior, was subsequently loaned to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. He recommends the appointment to Administrator Harry L. Hopkins of James A. Atkins, as full-time assistant to direct the field activities of the emergency education program, adult education, nursery schools, and workers' education camps for colored men and women.

It is important to note here that recent surveys reveal that the educational facilities, length of school term, and salaries of colored teachers in the South have been advanced more than 30 percent since the Federal Government stepped into this program and the advent of the Roosevelt New Deal.

The physical equipment and health benefits to the colored race and the Nation as the result of the erection of new school buildings, playgrounds, swimming pools, gymnasiums, auditoriums, and recreation centers under the P. W. A., F. E. R. A., and W. P. A. programs are incalculable to present and future generations. Millions of dollars in wages have come to colored workmen and great stimulus has been given to the heavy industries and business has picked up generally through purchases of materials by the Government for this emergency construction. In production plants, steel mills, and factories thousands of negroes have again been gainfully employed.

It is estimated that nearly 30,000 otherwise unemployed colored school teachers have been given work in all parts of the country. Better salaries, especially in the South, have been reported. It should be noted that the minimum salary rate approved by Administrator Hopkins for all W. P. A. workers has meant payment of a much higher scale of wages for the hundreds of thousands of colored persons on State and Federal projects. The largest number of colored citizens have been employed under the Federal Government's emergency public-works program in capacities commensurate with their specialized training than heretofore in private industry.

Hundreds of research technicians, administrative officials, supervisors, skilled workmen, foremen, and other white-collar workers of the Negro race have had equal opportunity under the Roosevelt administration.

Nearly \$2,000,000 was specially earmarked by President Roosevelt for surveys on the occupational opportunities for Negroes, State vocational and educational aid, and a Nationwide household workers' project to train the tens of thousands of persons now on relief for gainful employment. Colored instructors and personnel workers, men and women, have been employed to prosecute this important job of training and placing competent household workers.

Reflecting the general improvement in conditions throughout the country among colored people is the statement of Dr. J. E. Walker, president of a life-insurance company of Memphis, Tenn. Practically all of the business of the company is among colored people in Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Tennessee. The company suffered the usual loss of business during the dark days prior to 1932. In 1933 officials were forced to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to continue in business. Early in 1932 Dr. Walker reports, it was found necessary to take over a number of farms on which the company held mortgages. Things were dark, indeed. But to quote Dr. Walker:

Better conditions were reflected shortly after the beginning of the A. A. A. program and have continued to improve. In 1934, in fact, our business was better than in any year of the existence of our company. In March 1935 we were able to pay our loan to the R. F. C. due to payments made by colored farmers on their indebtedness.

C. C. Spaulding, president of the North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co., and Harry A. Pace, president of the Supreme Liberty Life Insurance Co. of Illinois, and F. B. Ransom, head of the Mme. C. J. Walker Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis, Ind., are other Negro leaders who have reported improved business conditions during the past 3 years.

In a recent letter received by Robert Fechner, Director of the Emergency Conservation Work, John L. Webb, Hot

Springs, Ark., grand master of the Free and Accepted Masons, jurisdiction of Mississippi, wrote:

Mr. Roosevelt is going to be very hard for anybody to beat, because of the fine service he has rendered. He has done more for the Negroes than any other President of the past 10 years or more, and because of his enlarged program, helping the youth in the N. Y. A., in the C. C. C., and the other departments, I am looking for him to be reelected by a large majority.

John R. Hawkins, secretary and treasurer of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, in reporting receipts before the thirtieth general conference in New York City, May 6, 1936, indicated that church dollar money throughout the connection had increased approximately \$350,000 in the past quadrennium.

Marion Anderson, of Philadelphia; Etta Moten, of Chicago, the great leading colored contraltos; and Mme. Lillian Evanti, of Washington, the leading colored coloratura, have all been honored by the President and Mrs. Roosevelt and their guests at the White House.

The paintings of Sam Brown, of Philadelphia, have elicited special public citation by the first lady.

Housing conferences have been attended by Mrs. Roosevelt at Howard University and Miner Teachers College. Colored women representatives of Greek letter sororities have been invited to conferences at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

One of the Easter dresses of Mrs. Roosevelt was the prize-winning design of a colored New York high-school girl.

Mrs. Roosevelt, like the President, has given new meaning to the creed of service to all mankind regardless of race or color.

In the Post Office Department, which gives permanent employment to the largest number of colored workers in the United States classified civil service, notable progress has been made under Postmaster General James A. Farley, both in status and working conditions. Hundreds of additional colored eligibles have secured permanent appointments and received promotions in the service. St. Louis, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and New York now have colored branch managers. Postmaster General Farley appointed Sydney M. Jackson, secretary of the Colored Employees Postal Alliance, as special clerk at large in the Post Office Department at Washington, D. C.

The Civilian Conservation Corps was established by President Roosevelt on April 5, 1933. On the same day Robert Fechner was named director.

The purpose of Emergency Conservation Work—the C. C. C.—is to relieve acute conditions of distress and unemployment in the United States and to provide for the restoration of the country's natural resources and the advancement of an orderly program of useful public works.

Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees are selected on a State-quota basis by the Labor Department from the public-relief rolls. Veterans are selected by the Veterans' Bureau.

From the beginning of the C. C. C., colored youths have shared in the program. At the peak strength of the C. C. C., reached in August 1935, there were 506,000 young men and war veterans enrolled. Of this number, approximately 50,000 were colored.

Today there are approximately 350,000 men in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Of this number, 35,000 are colored enrollees, selected from every State in the Union. They are engaged on numerous conservation projects which are of present and future benefit to our country. At present there are 37 colored C. C. C. companies engaged in soil-conservation projects. Other colored companies are carrying on reforestation and forest-protection work, recreational development, levee, drainage, flood control, and other projects. Millions of dollars have been saved for the country by the conservation activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps. About 2,500 colored enrollees are assigned to C. C. C. projects in the State of Texas.

Approximately \$700,000 is sent back home to their parents and dependents by colored C. C. C. enrollees each month out of their earnings. At the time they enter the corps these young men arrange to send approximately five-sixths of their

monthly cash allowances directly to their families. The C. C. C. enrollees receive a basic cash allowance of \$30 a month board and keep. This means that approximately \$25 a month is allotted home by each enrollee. This money has been of great assistance to the dependent families of the boys. Often these C. C. C. men are the chief breadwinners for their families. The enrollees' ability to help support their dependents increases their self-respect and their pride of accomplishment.

Mindful of the health of these colored boys, medical officers from the United States Army Reserve Corps have been assigned to look after their physical well-being. Fourteen colored medical officers are now on active duty at C. C. C. camps throughout the country. Each company is provided with a first-aid building, company hospital, or dispensary, with a medical officer in charge. Orderlies are appointed from among the enrollees.

The United States Office of Education has acted in an advisory capacity to the War Department in working out an educational and recreational program. Each company has an educational adviser who develops a program suited to the individual needs of each camp. College graduates are appointed to fill these positions. Many enrollees who were illiterate have been taught to read and write in classes offered by the C. C. C. camps. There are today 132 colored men serving the C. C. C. camps as educational advisers, according to Edgar G. Brown, special assistant to the Director of the E. C. W. organization. Most of the educational work is carried on at the camp. Arrangements are often made, however, for enrollees to carry on additional school work in public-school evening classes in nearby cities. The camp educational programs offer instruction in carpentry, shorthand, typing, forestry, auto mechanics, landscaping, and numerous other vocational subjects. While attendance at classes is voluntary, approximately 75 percent of the enrollees attend. Classes in first aid, safety, morale, guidance, leadership, and hygiene have been well attended. While at work C. C. C. enrollees are given practical instruction on the job by the project superintendent and the technical staff.

Baseball and soft-ball diamonds, tennis courts, and basketball courts have been laid out to provide recreational facilities at the camps. Some of the camps have produced championship teams in baseball and other sports. Current movies, health education films, lectures on geography, conservation, history, and other topics, and plays are included in the camp educational and entertainment program. Trips to nearby museums and other points of interest are frequently scheduled.

Eight colored chaplains of the United States Army Reserve Corps direct the religious activities in a number of the colored camps. They are aided by ministers from nearby communities.

Through the experience and training received in the C. C. C., boys learn how to live together and work together amicably. Experience and training afforded by the C. C. C. has helped many boys to secure employment. The specialized knowledge gained by filling such positions as mess sergeant, company clerk, assistant educational adviser, leaders, store clerk and manager, foreman, and first-aid men has proved valuable to these enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps. At present regular employment is given to 1,200 colored cooks and 300 colored typists in the C. C. C.

In Boston, March 29 of this year, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Negro adviser to the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, also Administrator of Federal Emergency Public Works, gave a departmental estimate of \$25,000,000 expended under the Federal Government in cooperation with local communities through P. W. A. loans and grants for the erection of 215 colored elementary and high-school buildings. This program added 1,165 new educational classrooms and accommodations for approximately 50,000 colored students.

In Jefferson Davis and Lee Counties, Miss., \$135,000 was expended under the New Deal administration for colored schools.

In Missouri an estimated expenditure of \$2,000,000 for a new colored high school and repairs on 13 existing structures resulted from P. W. A. financial aid.

In Baltimore, Md., a half million was granted by P. W. A. officials in Washington for school buildings to serve colored students. A like sum was made available for completion of the Wendell Phillips High School in Chicago, Ill.

A \$3,000,000 school-building program was made possible by P. W. A. funds in the State of Texas to increase the educational facilities for colored children.

Howard University has received \$5,000,000 from the Public Works Administration in loans and grants for the Frederick Douglass Hall, new library and dormitories, and the Freedmen's Hospital.

The new city hospital sought for the past decade by colored citizens of St. Louis, Mo., has been completed through P. W. A. financial support.

The veterans' hospital in Tuskegee and the Joseph B. Knowles Home for the Aged in Nashville, Tenn., have likewise been provided with new additions and repairs through the P. W. A. program of the Roosevelt New Deal administration.

Out of a total of 40 low-cost housing project managers assembled in Washington by the P. W. A. Housing Division, 14 were colored men and women. They were recommended by local advisory housing committees composed of leaders in welfare work of both races. Cleveland, Nashville, Atlanta, New York, Detroit, Indianapolis, Washington, and other cities will benefit by these large-scale slum-clearance projects under the P. W. A. housing program. Colored architects and builders and consultants have had a conspicuous part in drafting and the prosecution of the program in all its ramifications. Dewey R. Jones, associate advisor to Dr. Weaver; Hilyard Robinson, of Howard University, a noted architect; and John Langford, well-known colored builder, have been in the forefront of the program. In the legal division of P. W. A., Theopolus Mann, a colored lawyer of Chicago, has made an enviable record. John Lewis Wilson, another colored architect, served as associate architect on the Harlem housing project of New York. This particular model received honorable mention in the leading technical journals of the country.

In the building of these Federal slum-clearance projects during the past year, close to 30 percent of the wages for skilled and unskilled labor has gone to colored workmen, a sum estimated at close to a half million dollars, as a result of the strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the congressional amendment and Presidential rules and regulations specifically stating there was to be no discrimination on these jobs because of race or color. In many cases it was necessary to grant colored workmen temporary "union" cards in order to permit their immediate employment on these P. W. A. projects. In following through on these contracts the office of the Adviser on Negro Affairs and P. W. A. authorities had working agreements with all private contractors which permitted check-ups made in the field monthly. This rigid departmental policy has resulted in a most satisfactory participation of colored labor in every section of the country.

Employment opportunities for colored workers have been initiated also by the Interior Department and the Tennessee Valley Authority on the large Federal power-development projects, such as Grand Coulee Dam, Boulder Dam, and T. V. A.

Reports received by H. A. Hunt, Negro assistant to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration indicate not only colored farmers are receiving this important Federal service, but that they are paying back and meeting their obligations promptly and fully. It is important also to note that, without exception, the annual conference of the local and State associations are attended by the farmers in the South of both races. The local borrowers from the F. C. A. automatically become members of the association.

Credit unions under the jurisdiction of the Farm Credit Administration not only appeal to rural communities but also to urban sections, and here, too, the participation of colored citizens in such group organizations as the railway clerks, waiters, school teachers, and so forth, are general, and many colored officers are represented on the governing boards of these organizations in all sections of the country. Nothing

could be more revealing as to the forces at work for mutual understanding and progress under the Roosevelt New Deal than the unanimous confirmation by the Senate of the colored Presidential appointees: Hon. William J. Thompkins, Kansas City, Mo., for recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia; Hon. Lester Walton, of New York, as Minister to Liberia; and Hon. Armond W. Scott for judge of the municipal court, District of Columbia, were among this number. It is significant also to note that the other two colored lawyers serving as municipal court judges in the United States, Hon. James Watson and Hon. Charles Toney, of New York City, were elected as a result of the law signed by President Roosevelt during his tenure of office as Governor of New York State, which created two judicial districts in Harlem. This law, though passed several times by the New York Legislature, had, up to this time, always met with executive veto, both at the hands of a Democratic and Republican Governor.

The allocation of \$100,000 to the Negro division of the Department of Commerce for an exhibit and building of Negro progress in Dallas, Tex., headed by Hon. Eugene Kinckle Jones, executive secretary of the National Urban League and chairman of the Texas Negro Centennial Committee; by Vice President Garner, Secretary Roper, Secretary Perkins, Secretary Wallace, members of the President's Cabinet, and the others of the Texas Centennial Commission, is evidence of the Federal Government's plan and program of equal representation. The other members of the Texas Centennial Committee headed by Mr. Jones are Robert L. Vann, Dr. F. D. Patterson, Mrs. Sadie Alexander, Dr. M. O. Bousfield, William Banks, and Jesse O. Thomas, general manager, and Maceo Smith, assistant general manager.

The recent conference held in Washington of colored leaders in field and extension work headed by T. Y. Campbell of Tuskegee and J. B. Pierce of Hampton Institute, under the Department of Agriculture, called by Director C. A. Cobb, of the Cotton Allotment and Soil Conservation, is indicative of the liberal policy of the Roosevelt administration in its efforts to treat intelligently, fairly, and scientifically the problems of all alike engaged in the great farming industry of the country, North and South.

Charles Hall, specialist in Negro statistics, United States Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, pointed out in a recent speech at the Cheyney Normal School of Pennsylvania that despite a decrease of 35,570 colored owners of farm property in the South from 1920 to 1930, in this same section during the past few years there has been an increase of 4,046 colored farm owners, bringing the total to 186,065 colored farm owners in 1935. It is estimated by Mr. Hall that approximately 25,000 colored retail merchants do an annual gross business of \$101,000,000, giving direct employment to about 40,000 colored men and women.

Joseph H. B. Evans, administrative assistant in the Rural Resettlement Administration under Dr. Guy Tugwell, on leave at President Roosevelt's special request, from Columbia University for another year, in a review of the activities of this department of the New Deal administration before the Capitol Club of Washington, revealed an interesting picture. Mr. Evans is a colored leader, long active in the business development of colored people in the North and South. He received his Phi Beta Kappa Key at Michigan University at the age of 20 in 1914.

There are, according to Mr. Evans, more than a hundred colored employes in the R. A. office in Washington, 30 per cent of them are on technical and white-collar jobs.

Charles S. Duke, of Chicago, a Harvard graduate and a colored architect and engineer, is the R. A. progress engineer who is directing the Newport News, Va., project of a hundred and fifty homes for colored farmers of that section. This rural resettlement community will be ready for occupancy in the fall. Joseph H. Rousseau, a colored general contractor has a force of nearly 250 colored skilled and unskilled workmen engaged at the present time on the construction work.

President Roosevelt declared at the outset of his administration:

In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others.

That this policy has been inclusive of all nations on the basis of equality is attested by the removal of the marines from Haiti and the recognition of this sister republic's independence by the Roosevelt administration after the visit of President Stenio Vincent to the White House in 1934. Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, too, have felt the beneficence of the good-neighbor policy of the Roosevelt administration.

The consummation of the Philippine Islands' independence during the past year is likewise noteworthy.

President Roosevelt has stated further:

* * * The people of America and the Government of those people intend and expect to remain at peace with the world.

President Roosevelt is the living embodiment and spirit of an American concerned for spiritual ascendancy and power. In a recent Sunday evening appeal over the ether waves he pictured the glorious salvation of a people who are building a heaven on earth; he said:

You have come through the threshold of a new era in which your churches and the other churches recognize and stand ready to lead in a new war of peace—the war for social justice.

If I were asked to state the great objective which church and state are both demanding for the sake of every man and woman and child in this country, I would say that that great objective is "a more abundant life."

Yet I do not look upon these United States as a finished product. We are still in the making. The vision of the early days still requires the same qualities of faith in God and man for its fulfillment.

No greater thing could come to our land today than revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a reassertion of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, or economic—that would not melt away under the fire of such a spiritual awakening. At our neighbor's fireside we may find new fuel for the fires of faith at our own hearthside.

The social objective, I should say, remains just what it was, which is to do what any honest government of any country would do—to try to increase the security and happiness of a larger number of people in all occupations of life and in all parts of the country; to give them more of the good things of life; to give them a greater distribution, not only of wealth in the narrow terms but of wealth in the wider terms; to give them places to go in the summertime, recreation; to give them assurance that they are not going to starve in their old age; to give honest business a chance to go ahead and make a reasonable profit; and to give everyone a chance to earn a living. (President Roosevelt, June 7, 1935.)

The following news story was published in Negro newspapers throughout the country following the Democratic national convention in Philadelphia, June 23–27, 1936.

DEMOCRATIC FIRSTS

1. First to institute Negro Press Conference.
2. First to seat a Negro woman as a regular delegate to a major-party convention.
3. First to seat a Negro in the general press box.
4. First to open convention with invocation by Negro.
5. First time in history to seat 10 delegates and 22 alternates (Negro).
6. First time a Negro addressed a convention (Congressman MITCHELL of Illinois).

JUSTICE FOR THE NEGRO

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, the final session of this Congress has come to a close and there still remain in the hands of the Judiciary Committee no less than 33 bills against lynching, not one of which has become law at this session, or, indeed, will at any time while the Democratic Party is in control of the National Government.

Having introduced one of these antilynching bills myself, I find it difficult to understand the persistent unwillingness of the Democratic Party to do justice to the people of a great race. In a Nation which is admittedly the land of the free a party calling itself "Democratic" makes no secret of its hostility to granting freedom in its complete sense to many millions of Negro Americans. It is a deep blot upon the honor of America that lynching is thus not only permitted to continue but apparently given the stamp of approval by the political party which dominates our Southern States.

This attitude was evident at the Democratic convention in Philadelphia, when Democratic leaders strategically retreated whenever they were asked what they intended to do about the

evil of lynching. As Chesly Manly stated in the Chicago Daily Tribune for June 27:

Democratic leaders at the convention here have exuded a spirit of racial tolerance and brotherly love, particularly the eminent Jeffersonians from New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, where the colored vote is worth going after, but when you ask them about a constitutional amendment to permit Federal antilynching legislation they become extremely preoccupied with the business of running the convention. * * *

The Senator gasped as if stunned by the question, and, upon regaining his composure, declared:

"I'm not going to say anything about that now—not till this convention is over. There's plenty of time for that!"

There was a note of finality in the Senator's voice which indicated plainly that it would be futile to pursue the matter.

The beaming Jim Farley, Postmaster General, national chairman, and New York State chairman of his party, was sitting over in a box, talking garrulously about the incredible majority by which President Roosevelt would be reelected. But when approached on the subject of antilynching legislation he had no time for meditation and no disposition to talk. He explained apologetically that the stupendous task of running a convention left little time for thoughts of legislative policy, remarked he might make some comment later and suggested "seeing some of the boys."

The solicitude of the Democratic Party for the colored vote and the almost religious zeal with which the leaders make their professions of humanitarian liberalism have been exemplified not only at this convention but in the New Deal Senate of the Seventy-fourth Congress, when the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill was filibustered to prenatal death on the calendar.

As far as I can remember, Mr. Speaker, the only time that such a measure passed this House was upon the recommendation of a Republican President, Warren G. Harding, to a Republican Congress. At that time, of the 234 Republicans, 221 voted for the antilynching bill, while of the 155 Democrats, only 8 voted for justice to the Negro. And yet the Democratic Party professes to be liberal.

At the present time there are 315 Democrats and only 103 Republicans in the House of Representatives, and there are 70 Democrats and only 23 Republicans in the Senate. On the Committee on the Judiciary, which has the antilynching bills under consideration, there are 18 Democrats and only 7 Republicans. It is, therefore, obvious that if the Democratic Party were as friendly to the Negro as some of its spokesmen pretend this salutary legislation, which would so effectively safeguard the Negro people, would not be buried in committee.

There is only one thing that today prevents justice to the Negro by the passage of an antilynching bill, and that is the determined and unreasonable opposition of leaders in the Democratic Party. I have been amazed lately to hear Democratic speakers insult the Negro by saying that he can be bought by a Democratic dole or an empty Democratic political promise. The Democrats who assert this have a very poor conception of the honor of the Negro. Go among these people whose skin wears a darker shade than ours only because their fathers labored under a hotter sun, and ask them if they can be purchased by Democratic bribery, and your question will receive an unmistakable answer. Ask them whether they owe their freedom to a Democrat or to the great-souled Abraham Lincoln. Ask them if today they are permitted to vote in the Democratic States in the South, as they can in the Republican States of the North. Ask them if, in the Southern Democratic States, they have the rights to which their citizenship should entitle them—the right to serve on a jury, the right to protection against a bloodthirsty mob, the right of equal opportunity and justice under the law, and the hundreds of other rights which have been denied to the Negro by the Democratic Party for three-quarters of a century. Ask them who it was who wrote into the Constitution the amendments which guaranteed freedom to the Negroes and gave them the right to vote.

When Democratic leaders today impudently intimate that the Negro can be bought by a Democratic dole, they dishonestly imply that the Negro is forgetful of the sacrifices of his fathers. They insult the intelligence of the Negro people by insinuating that our colored citizens have forgotten the blood which Democratic hands have shed in the lynching murders of the South. The crack of the whip, the cry of the child torn from the mother's breast, the agonizing prayers in the huts of bondage, the terrifying sight of a bullet-

ridden body hanging indistinct in the moonlight from the limb of a tree by the roadside, have seared the Negro heart so deeply that this heartless Democratic injustice will not go unremembered.

For the Democrats to say that Negroes are an inferior people is false and slanderous. Today Negroes own 700,000 homes and 20,000 farms, and they operate an additional 700,000 farms as renters and tenants throughout the United States. They own more than 22,000,000 acres of land, an area larger than the five States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. It is estimated that they have an aggregate wealth of over \$2,000,000,000. Thousands are employed in skilled labor; the Negro professional men and women have amazingly increased from 34,000 in 1890 to 135,000 in 1930. There are 70,000 business enterprises conducted by Negroes in over 200 different lines. In 1930 there were 51 Negro banks doing an average business of \$75,000,000. In the United States there are 68 towns and many villages and settlements populated and governed entirely by Negroes. In spite of unjust discrimination, in spite of hampering traditions from the cruelty of slave days, in spite of the recent unfairness of the N. R. A. codes in the South, where wage differentials were sought in favor of white labor for the same work in the same occupations, in spite of restricted opportunities, the progress of the Negro race is remarkable and impressive. In the arts and the sciences, in literature and medicine and law, the Negro people have so enriched culture and human thought that their contribution cannot be over-estimated. Like slavery, the curse of lynching places its stigma not upon the enslaved, but upon the oppressor. While lynching is a terrible ordeal for the victim, it is much worse for the mobs of white men who stultify their natures by gloating over fiendish and inhuman torture. The danger of lynching is not so much to the injury of the unfortunates who are thus murdered, as in the effect on the social institutions which permit these nauseous carnivals of intolerance, cruelty, and crime. As the eminent Booker T. Washington succinctly and significantly stated, "You cannot hold a Negro in the gutter, unless some white man stays in the gutter to hold him there."

I, therefore, urge upon the Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, that they give greater attention to the question of justice to this persecuted people. Abraham Lincoln once said that the Nation could not exist half slave and half free. It is equally true that no nation can progress when one political party, the Republican, is attempting to go forward with the Negro, while, at the same time, another party, the Democratic, is seeking to hold the Negro back.

In spite of Democratic opposition, there are some of us who will not be silent concerning the wrongs of an injured people. America must face the problem of lynching without further delay. Convinced of the soundness and justice of this cause, I intend to lend my voice and my efforts to its accomplishment. Let it not again be said of America, as was once uttered by a great American, when he contemplated the existence of slavery in the land:

I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just!

KERR BILL AND PALMISANO RESOLUTION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the general permission granted to all Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD I desire to quote, as inherent parts of my remarks, some very essential resolutions and some important endorsements favorable to the Kerr-Coolidge deportation bill and to the Palmisano stay-of-deportation resolution, and to briefly comment upon the failure of either of these important measures to be passed by the House during the closing days of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the peculiar situation which presented itself to Congress on the eve of its adjournment with reference to the so-called Kerr-Coolidge bill—S. 2969 and H. R. 8163—which is so close to my heart because of its beneficial features, to deport undesirable aliens and to relieve the hardship desirable aliens will suffer if the provisions of this bill are not enacted into law.

On June 18 last the Honorable Daniel W. MacCormack, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service,

addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House, which reads as follows:

JUNE 18, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BANKHEAD: May I set before you the situation which will result if there is adverse action or if there is no action before the adjournment of Congress on the Kerr-Coolidge bill (S. 2969 and H. R. 8163), which has been approved by the President, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Labor.

(1) More than 3,000 aliens of good character will be separated from their families and deported.

They will leave behind more than 7,000 members of their immediate families, including more than 5,000 American citizens—wives and children—who will for the most part become public charges.

(2) Every month's delay in strengthening the present law means that more than 500 alien criminals and illegal entries escape deportation.

At least 15,000 criminals and illegal entries have escaped during more than 2 years the passage of this legislation has been delayed. If there is no action in the present Congress, this number will probably have reached 20,000 or more before legislation can be introduced and enacted in the next session.

If, however, corrective legislation is enacted at this session, we will be able to avoid a mass deportation which will be an outrage to our civilization and a scandal and disgrace to America in the eyes of the world. We will also be able to deport more than three times as many alien criminals as can be deported under the present law.

Very sincerely yours,

D. W. MACCORMACK, *Commissioner.*

A partial list of organizations which have endorsed the bill are the following:

American Bar Association.
 American Citizenship League, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 American Federation of Labor.
 American Friends Committee.
 Association of the Bar of the City of New York.
 Board of Social Service of the Episcopal Diocese of Newark, N. J.
 Committee of Fifty for Social Action in the Passaic (N. J.) Valley.
 Department of Social Service of the Episcopal Diocese of Albany, N. Y.
 Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
 Federation of Hungarian Churches and Societies of Los Angeles, Calif.
 Foreign Language Information Service.
 Immigrants Protective League.
 Indiana State Senate.
 International Association of Chiefs of Police.
 International Association of Catholic Alumnae.
 International Institute, Young Women's Christian Association.
 International Migration Service.
 National Council of Jewish Women.
 National Catholic Welfare Conference.
 National Crime Commission.
 National Institute of Immigrant Welfare.
 National League for American Citizenship.
 Northwest International Anti-Crime Conference (Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, and Montana).
 Norwegian-American Civic Committee.
 Oregon League of Women Voters.
 Polish Association of America.
 Second Baptist and First Methodist Churches of Edmeston, N. Y.
 Southeastern Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police.
 Southeastern Missouri Council of Churches.
 State of Illinois Committee on Citizenship and Naturalization.
 Toledo Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Travelers Aid Society.
 United German Societies of Greater New York.
 Washington, Iowa, City Ministerial Association.
 Young Women's Christian Association, National Board.
 The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing the Catholic bishops and clergy of the United States, has endorsed the bill, and more than 2,200 of the leading Protestant bishops and clergy of the country have likewise given it their approval.

Special resolutions in support of the bill were passed by the American Bar Association and the National Association of Chiefs of Police. These resolutions read as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

At a meeting of the executive committee of the American Bar Association held at Washington, D. C., on May 6-9, 1935, upon motion, duly carried, the following resolution was adopted, with the understanding that the bill was to be amended so as to provide for an interdepartmental committee or board composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, and Labor to pass upon cases involving extraordinary hardships:

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the American Bar Association favors the enactment into law of H. R. 6795, introduced in the Seventy-fourth Congress by Congressman KERR, of North Carolina, which is intended to increase the classes of undesirable aliens, particularly criminals, subject to deportation; to strengthen the Government's authority to effect deportations; and permit alleviation of certain extraordinary hardships such as separation of families or enforced termination of long-established residence in cases of aliens of good character."

Resolution adopted at the Forty-second Annual Convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., July 11, 1935

RESOLUTION REGARDING DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Whereas the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Labor has been for the past 2 years engaged in an intensive study of the deportation laws and their enforcement; and

Whereas the results of this study reveal that it is imperative to give the Department of Labor powers that it now lacks, and badly needs, for the apprehension of aliens who have entered the country illegally; to make possible the deportation of many alien criminals who cannot be reached under existing laws; and to authorize the Secretary of Labor to exercise limited discretionary power in certain deportation cases, in which extreme hardship to individuals, often including American-born wives and children, is not justified or compensated by any corresponding public advantage; and

Whereas bill H. R. 8163, introduced by Congressman KERR and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, provides for the foregoing recommendations, and renders violators of State narcotic laws subject to deportation in the same manner as violators of Federal narcotic statutes; and further provides for the deportation of any alien who has been convicted in the United States within 5 years, of the institution of deportation proceedings against him of a crime involving moral turpitude, even if the alien is not sentenced to imprisonment, as required under existing law, and if the deportation of the alien who has been convicted in the United States within 5 years of the institution of deportation proceedings against him of a crime involving moral turpitude, even if the alien is not sentenced to imprisonment, as required under existing law, and if the deportation of the alien who has been convicted in the United States within 5 years of the institution of deportation proceedings against him of the crime of possessing or carrying any concealed or dangerous weapon, if the deportation of such alien is in the public interest; and

Whereas the members of this association consider the above proposals necessary for the welfare and protection of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Association of Chiefs of Police requests the Congress of the United States to enact the provisions of bill H. R. 8163, and that the secretary of the association send a copy of this resolution to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

National organizations not mentioning the Kerr-Coolidge bill but urging immediate action on the alien problem are the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the executive committee of the American Legion. Resolutions by these organizations read as follows:

Resolutions adopted at Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., April 23-30, 1936

CRIME AND DEPORTATION

Definite action should be taken to free the country of alien criminals. There should be immediate extension of provisions of law for deportation to include all classes of criminal aliens, convicted within 5 years of any crime involving moral turpitude, even if there was not sentence of imprisonment, aliens violating State narcotic laws, alien smugglers, and aliens convicted of possessing or carrying concealed or dangerous weapons.

On the other hand, there should be such amendment to existing law as to prevent deportation from being visited suddenly upon law-abiding aliens who have been resident in the United States for many years. There should be provision which would allow such aliens, upon a proper showing of their good character and useful lives, to remain. Any such provision, however, should contain such limitations that it may not be utilized upon behalf of any alien Communist, anarchist, criminal, or member of the immoral classes.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, which includes more than 14,000 women's organizations throughout the country, and has a membership of more than 2,000,000, at the annual council meeting on April 30, 1936, passed the following resolution:

"That the General Federation of Women's Clubs petition the Congress of the United States to pass legislation during the present session, which shall strengthen the existing laws relating to the deportation of criminal aliens, making it mandatory that those aliens shall be deported who have been convicted of violating the narcotic laws, State or Federal statutes; of illegal smuggling of aliens into this country, or who shall have been convicted of crimes importing moral turpitude carrying with it a sentence of imprisonment of a year or more, as well as those known to be habitual criminals."

Executive committee of the American Legion, meeting at Indianapolis, May 4, 1936

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Whereas there are pending before Congress different measures dealing with the subject of immigration; and

Whereas numerous amendments have been proposed to the pending measures by Congressmen and Senators of divergent views; and

Whereas the matter of tightening our immigration restrictions and securing stricter and more efficacious enforcement of immigration law has been at a standstill through several sessions of Congress by reason of the widely divergent views of Congressmen and Senators and the diversion of strength among opposing groups; and

Whereas it appears certain the stalemate will continue and no beneficial immigration legislation will be obtained at this session of Congress if the American Legion continues to insist upon the passage of legislation embodying the full program endorsed at the St. Louis national convention; and

Whereas it appears that urgently needed restrictions and enforcement measures can be obtained if the American Legion yields in part and urges a compromise; and

Whereas the Americanism commission has reached the conclusions above recited, after hearing the subject discussed at length by E. J. Shaughnessy, Deputy Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Labor, the national commander, and the national legislative director: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national Americanism commission recommends to the national executive committee that the legislative director of the American Legion be authorized and directed to endeavor to secure at this session of Congress the passage of an immigration act embodying so much of the program endorsed at the St. Louis convention as will not bar immediate passage, and which act, in his judgment, will effect a substantial betterment of existing law.

A partial list of newspapers throughout the country supporting the Kerr-Coolidge bill are the following:

Albany (N. Y.) Knickerbocker Press.
 Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution.
 Atlanta (Ga.) Journal.
 Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times.
 Birmingham (Ala.) News.
 Birmingham (Ala.) Post.
 Bisbee (Ariz.) Daily Review.
 Boston (Mass.) Globe.
 Boston (Mass.) Herald.
 Boston (Mass.) Post.
 Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle.
 Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express.
 Buffalo (N. Y.) Times.
 Canton (Ohio) Repository.
 Charlotte (N. C.) News.
 Chicago (Ill.) Daily News.
 Chicago (Ill.) Tribune.
 Cleveland (Ohio) Press.
 Davenport (Iowa) Times.
 Dayton (Ohio) News.
 Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News.
 Detroit (Mich.) News.
 Duluth (Minn.) Herald.
 El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post.
 El Paso (Tex.) Times.
 Evansville (Ind.) Courier.
 Fresno (Calif.) Bee.
 Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram.
 Galveston (Tex.) News.
 Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald.
 Greensboro (N. C.) News.
 Gulfport (Miss.) Daily Herald.
 Hamilton (Ohio) Journal-News.
 Hartford (Conn.) Courant.
 Helena (Mont.) Independent.
 Houston (Tex.) Press.
 Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger.
 Jacksonville (Fla.) Florida Times-Union.
 Kansas City (Mo.) Star.
 Kenosha (Wis.) News.
 Little Rock (Ark.) Democrat.
 Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal.
 Lowell (Mass.) Sun.
 Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News.
 McKeesport (Pa.) News.
 Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal.
 Miami (Fla.) News.
 Miami (Fla.) Herald.
 Minneapolis (Minn.) Star.
 Minot (N. Dak.) News.
 Modesto (Calif.) Bee.
 Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser.
 Nashville (Tenn.) Banner.
 New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier.
 New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune.
 New York (N. Y.) Times.
 New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram.
 Niagara Falls (N. Y.) Gazette.
 Olympia (Wash.) Olympian.
 Pawtucket (R. I.) Times.
 Paterson (N. J.) Call.
 Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette.
 Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press.
 Pontiac (Mich.) Press.
 Port Huron (Mich.) Times-Herald.
 Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin.
 Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times.
 Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer.

Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle.
 Saginaw (Mich.) News.
 St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch.
 St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch.
 St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press.
 Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News.
 San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune.
 San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle.
 San Francisco (Calif.) News.
 Scranton (Pa.) Times.
 Seattle (Wash.) Times.
 Springfield (Ohio) News-Sun.
 Savannah (Ga.) News.
 Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald.
 Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard.
 Tacoma (Wash.) Ledger.
 Toledo (Ohio) Blade.
 Troy (N. Y.) Times-Record.
 Tulsa (Okla.) World.
 Utica (N. Y.) Press.
 Washington (D. C.) Daily News.
 Washington (D. C.) Post.
 Waterbury (Conn.) Democrat.
 Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer.
 Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record.
 Youngstown (Ohio) Telegram.
 Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator.

So it will be seen that public organizations of importance and consequence, representative bodies of the American people throughout the country and press generally have fully, completely, and generously endorsed this bill.

The reason for such universal support is simple.

The bill, if enacted, would not have added one single undesirable alien to our present alien population; on the contrary, the provisions of the bill would have resulted in the deportation from this country of many aliens not deportable under present law who are a menace to our communities. Furthermore, this bill would afford needed relief to law-abiding aliens in this country whose only offense is that they are here in technical violation of some statutory provision of our immigration laws with no evidence of any criminal activities. Unless the relief afforded by this bill is enacted into law, these aliens in many cases will be forced to separate from their homes and their kindred, and for no good reason their American families will be thrown as new burdens on our relief agencies.

Changes and amendments to the bill were suggested from time to time by persons and organizations opposed to the provisions of the bill as it was originally reported from committees to both Houses of Congress. I was willing to accept all offered amendments, providing only that the primary purposes of the bill were carried into effective law; but in spite of my willingness to cooperate, efforts to have this legislation enacted was not successful.

I have no doubt about the outcome if the House had been given an opportunity to act on the reported bill; and if the Committee on Rules had been more cooperative, the Kerr-Coolidge bill would have been passed by the House before the adjournment of Congress.

However, something should have been done by the House leaders to permit the House to consider and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 632), which was temporary legislation.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO] on June 16, 1936, introduced this House joint resolution as a temporary law, in the event the Kerr-Coolidge bill could not be enacted before adjournment. The text of House Joint Resolution 632, as introduced, reads as follows:

Whereas, under existing provisions of the immigration laws, there is no statutory requirement that aliens found to be subject to deportation shall be immediately deported by the Secretary of Labor forthwith upon determination that the facts in any case justify deportation pursuant to law; and

Whereas, having knowledge of this implied discretion as to the date upon which actual deportation shall be effective, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, has heretofore delayed the execution of deportation orders against approximately 2,860 aliens of the non-criminal classes whose deportations have been ordered on grounds of technical violations of the immigration laws rather than on grounds involving violations of law for which penalties in addition to and more severe than deportation is provided by statute; and

Whereas the continued delay of actual deportation in cases of such noncriminal aliens has been heretofore predicated upon requests for such delayed action made upon the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and upon the Secretary of Labor (1) by committee resolution adopted by the House Committee on

Immigration and Naturalization, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of House proceedings on June 18, 1934; and (2) by House resolution adopted by the House of Representatives as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of House proceedings on August 23, 1935; and

Whereas the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization has officially stated that the actual deportation of the aliens involved in this group of approximately 2,860 cases would thereby create immediate and unusual hardship within fireside families established, probably causing native-born American children and other citizen fireside relatives to be left behind in this country without adequate means of support and objects of public and private charitable support and that the number of such native-born American children and other citizen fireside dependent relatives likely to be left behind is over twice the number of these noncriminal aliens whose actual deportations have been thus delayed; and

Whereas a primary reason for the exercise of the above referred to implied authority to delay the actual deportation heretofore ordered in these cases has been the humane desire of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization to obviate, if possible, the added hardship of permanent separation of these noncriminal aliens of good moral character from the citizen members of their fireside family established in the United States, which would be the result in many cases if the alien member of the family is actually deported, until Congress has been advised of the situation and had concluded its consideration of remedial legislative measures; and

Whereas legislative measures proposed by the Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Service calculated, when enacted, to provide authority for administrative extension of permanent relief in such noncriminal alien deportation cases, within certain defined limitations, have received favorable consideration by, and have been reported from, both the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the Senate Committee on Immigration; and

Whereas Congress has not concluded orderly consideration of these favorably reported measures just referred to and there probably will be insufficient time for final legislative action thereon prior to the sine-die adjournment of the Seventy-fourth Congress; and

Whereas the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the Secretary of Labor should have some effective expression from this Congress, regarding the further delay of actual deportations of these cases and similar hardship cases or regarding the immediate execution of the orders for deportation in such cases, for their official guidance during the period following final adjournment of this Congress and the convening of the next Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Labor be, and hereby is, authorized to stay the execution of orders for deportation, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, until April 1, 1937, of aliens in the following general groups in cases where deportation has heretofore been ordered or hereafter ordered and stayed pursuant to this resolution:

(a) The group of aliens, numbering approximately 2,860, whose deportation has heretofore been delayed and in whose cases the records have been transmitted to the House of Representatives under date of January 15, 1936, and referred to in the printed House Document No. 392 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session: *Provided*, That any alien in this group shall be deported forthwith if the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization hereafter finds, upon further examination, that the facts in the case of such alien do not justify further delay of actual deportation;

(b) The group of aliens, approximately 150 in number, who have heretofore been recorded as lawfully admitted to the United States and some of whom have proceeded toward naturalization, in whose cases deportation has been ordered, held in abeyance, or is likely to be ordered and held in abeyance, on grounds predicated upon an opinion by the Attorney General of the United States issued subsequent to the admission of such aliens to the United States which held that an offense, to which it has been interpreted these aliens may have been guilty participants, should be considered as within the purview of "Crimes involving moral turpitude, namely, perjury or forgery." Approximately 50 or 60 private bills for the relief of aliens in this group have been introduced in the House, but consideration of them has not been concluded by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; and

(c) An additional group of aliens, which may be hereafter segregated in the records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in whose cases deportation may be hereafter ordered "solely" on the grounds that any such alien "is in the United States in violation of the immigration law in that he or she entered the United States without inspection or when not in possession of an unexpired valid immigration visa", whenever an examination of the facts of any such case convinces the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization that the immediate deportation of such alien would operate an unusual hardship upon citizen members of an established American family who are dependent, in part or wholly, upon the alien found subject to deportation.

On June 18, 1936, the committee amended this resolution by striking out the "whereas" clauses of the preamble and reported the resolution to simply provide for relief until April 1, 1937, to the aliens mentioned in this resolution.

After the committee had reported this resolution the American Federation of Labor through its president, William Green, sent a letter to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], which reads as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM P. CONNERY,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to advise you that the American Federation of Labor endorses and approves the adoption of a joint resolution by Congress providing for a stay in the execution of deportation proceedings in hardship cases until an opportunity is extended to enact remedial legislation dealing with this particular matter at the next session of Congress.

It is my opinion that not only for humanitarian, but in addition, for practical purposes the joint resolution providing for a stay in deportation proceedings in the classified hardship cases which have been reported to Congress should be adopted before Congress adjourns.

Very sincerely yours,

W. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

However, we were confronted with a practical situation. The Congress was coming to a close, and no legislation could be passed during the concluding days of the session unless a special rule was provided for the consideration of a bill, or permission was granted to suspend the rules for the purpose of passage of a bill. Even then consideration of a bill under either a rule or suspension of the rules did not mean passage.

The Speaker definitely told me that he had been informed that the resolution was highly controversial, having no chance for passage, and therefore he would not recognize me for any suspension of the rules. My only recourse, therefore, was to appeal for assistance to the Committee on Rules and ask them to report out a special rule for the consideration of either the bill or the resolution; but the Committee on Rules, for some reason or other, would not cooperate with me.

It was perfectly clear on the floor of the House that such a rule would have been supported by a majority of the Members of the House and that, upon the adoption of the rule, either the bill or the joint resolution would have been passed without any trouble and with a minimum of debate.

Where the idea originated that this bill, and especially that this resolution, was controversial legislation and could not be passed is beyond me. I can see absolutely no logical basis for such a contention; but, even admitting the allegation, that is no just reason for denying the bill or resolution proper consideration on the floor of the House.

On the other hand, the bill had the backing of the country and of responsible organizations throughout the United States; the resolution, as temporary legislation, was supported by many of the opponents of the bill, and was specifically endorsed by the American Federation of Labor. I am satisfied that either the bill or the resolution would have been supported by more than the usual number of the active and alert Members of the House had either been given the right-of-way for consideration.

The peculiar thing about this alleged so-called controversial character of this legislation becomes more apparent when the record of the closing days of Congress is studied. The Speaker did recognize some Members for suspension of the rules on bills which proved so controversial that they were defeated, and, furthermore, the Committee on Rules did report out special rules for the consideration of bills which, when considered under the rule, were almost defeated. In some instances a bill was first defeated under suspension of the rules, then a special rule was reported out, and the bill was passed after considerable controversy and debate.

Some instances of these unusual procedures are as follows:

On June 19, 1936, the Speaker recognized a Member for the purpose of moving suspension of the rules and passage of the bill H. R. 8555. That bill has been for over a year a very controversial measure in both Houses of Congress. The record vote on the motion to suspend and pass was lost by a vote of 118 to 83, 16 less than the required two-thirds favorable vote. However, on June 20, 1936, the Com-

mittee on Rules reported out a special rule for the consideration of this defeated bill, and when a vote was taken on the resolution for a rule the House adopted the resolution, but the resolution was so worded that the adoption of the resolution actually passed the bill without further debate or chance for any amendments to the bill.

On June 20, 1936, the Speaker recognized a Member for the purpose of moving suspension of the rules and passage of the bill H. R. 12445, relating to the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia and North Carolina. The principle of this bill was rejected by the House earlier in the session, when a similar bill under the same title was stricken from the Consent Calendar on May 4, 1936. On the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 12445, the House rejected the bill by the vote of 175 for and 125 against, or 25 votes less than the required two-thirds. Within an hour the Committee on Rules submitted a special rule, which cut off all further debate on the bill and in every way expedited final passage of the already defeated measure. Only a majority vote was required to pass the resolution for the rule and only a majority vote was required, under the rules, to pass the bill. On the vote on the resolution for a rule, 146 Members voted for the rule and 139 voted against the rule. On the vote under the rule to pass the bill there were 145 votes for passage and 131 votes against passage, so that the bill was passed by only 7 more than the required majority.

Recognition was granted by the Speaker on June 20, 1936, for motions to suspend the rules and pass four other bills. Two of these were passed, but the other two proved to be so controversial that the vote to suspend and pass in the case of one bill was 61 for and 170 against; in the case of the other bill was 36 for and 125 against.

Another instance is the bill S. 3107. This bill was refused passage by the House on June 1, 1936, when it was reached on the Consent Calendar. When recognition was given on June 20, 1936, for suspension and passage, the House passed the bill by the small vote of 100 for passage and 44 against, or only 4 votes more than the required two-thirds vote. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that this bill was pocket vetoed on June 29, 1936.

One of the bills for which suspension was asked was a measure granting certain retirement privileges to William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department. This proved very controversial and was defeated by a vote of 36 for passage and 125 against.

Another of the bills defeated, after recognition had been granted on the last day to suspend the rules and pass the bill, was a Senate bill to provide for the survey of a part of the Clark Fork of the Columbia River. This developed such a controversy that the vote was 61 for passage with 170 against passage.

So there is apparent reason to believe that the controversial character of these bills I have just referred to did not prevent the Speaker and the Committee on Rules from arranging for the consideration of those bills under either suspension of the rules or under a special rule reported from the Rules Committee, and in some cases both suspensions and a special rule.

I cannot understand upon what premise the Speaker and the Rules Committee refused to give bills so important as the Kerr-Coolidge bill and the Palmisano resolution at least an equal status to that given the bills of minor significance or private or local importance for which they granted suspension of the rules and special rules.

I have excellent reasons to believe that during the course of the last day of the session, June 20, 1936, the Speaker and the Committee on Rules were advised that the passage of the Palmisano joint resolution by the House before final adjournment was much desired by the President and also by the Secretary of Labor. Notwithstanding these facts, the Speaker and the Rules Committee did not cooperate with me to expedite consideration and passage of that resolution, which was a necessary temporary measure in no way amending or changing any of our immigration laws.

That resolution simply would have prevented unusual hardship and inhuman punishment upon American-citizen wives and children in all parts of the Nation, whose fathers

and husbands will now be in danger of immediate deportation. The relief provided was only for a period ending April 1, 1937. Something should have been done about this temporary relief measure.

In conclusion, let me repeat that the Speaker had definitely informed me that he would not recognize me for any suspensions and that the Committee on Rules would not cooperate with me on the granting of any special rules either on the Kerr bill or the Palmisano resolution.

I am confident if such a special rule had been given me, on either the bill or the resolution, the adoption of the rule would have been supported by almost all of the Members of the House and that upon the adoption of the rule either the resolution or the bill would have received considerably more than the majority favorable vote then required for passage by the House.

Therefore, let me say that in spite of my effort to cooperate in every way and notwithstanding my great desire to have this legislation enacted, I cannot help but lay the blame upon the leadership of the House of Representatives for permitting the Kerr bill and the Palmisano resolution to die with the sine die adjournment of Congress without even giving the House membership the right to consider them, on their merits, on the floor of the House.

It is very embarrassing for me to be forced into a position where I have to complain about the effectiveness of our House leadership, and I am very sorry to see the good, which would have followed the enactment of the Kerr-Coolidge bill or the Palmisano resolution, fall by the wayside simply because of improper management in the House during the concluding week of the Congress, after 2 years of constructive effort to secure a satisfactory bill.

Something very drastic will have to be done to avoid any future recurrences of similar situations and put an end to this useless bickering for favored consideration by the House in the closing days of a session, of insignificant measures or measures of local or private importance, by Members who will not raise a finger or give proper cooperation to pass general legislation of real significance and benefit to the people of all sections of the United States.

REPUBLICAN CONVENTION AND PLATFORM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is regretted that, after the splendid acclaim given to the minority leader [Mr. SNELL] when he was presented with the gavel to be used by him in the Republican convention, such ill fortune should befall him as happened to the gentleman on the other side of the Capitol [Senator STEINER], both of whom, I fully appreciate, endeavored, with the best of intentions, to bolster their repudiated party. Instead of offering our congratulations we are obliged to extend our sympathy.

The offspring of the hasty marriage of the reactionaries and the few misguided progressives is a two-faced baby, in all likelihood due to too many doctors taking part in bringing that offspring to life, all of whom, we learn, including Dr. Hoover and Dr. BORAH, were going in opposite directions. This, naturally, unnerved both of these keynoters, neither of whom should be held responsible, and who are, as I have stated, entitled to our condolence and sympathy. No doubt they must have believed that their newly created brain trust would devise ways and means to enable them to successfully ride elephants in opposite directions. Furthermore, there was reason to believe that it would not have been thought necessary to "crib" from the Democratic platforms of 1912 and 1932. But as it is, the only thing of value in the liberty-appealing Republican document has been "lifted" from the Democratic platforms. It is on a par with the great artificial demand that was heard in the Cleveland auditorium—"We want Hoover", and the Hoover assertion that "the people must fight to regain liberty."

Republican delegates were asked by the erstwhile head of the defunct Republican Party whether they would "for expediency's sake also offer will-o'-the-wisps which beguile the people? Or have you determined to enter into a holy crusade for liberty which shall determine the future and perpetuity of a nation of free men?" The great former leader, Mr. Hoover, told us that "fundamental American

liberties are at stake." The charge is that the great Democratic Party has beguiled and is beguiling the people. When he speaks of fundamental American liberties being at stake we assume that he means benevolent liberties. Benevolent liberties are at stake, admittedly. By whom are they jeopardized, I ask? The whole trouble from Mr. Hoover's viewpoint is the substitution on March 4, 1933, of benevolent liberties for the 12-year-old malevolent liberties of the Republican Party, which includes all the racketeers, all the plunderers, all the blood-sucking termites, all the bloated tax dodgers, all the oppressors of the humbler masses, all the tariff beneficiaries, from Wall Street to San Francisco, and from Portland, Maine, to Brownsville, Tex.

The restraint by law of Wall Street vipers from continuing to impoverish our good and worthy citizens is the restraint and abridgment of liberty to which Mr. Hoover refers; and the reenthronement of those dastardly liberties under the influence of the Republican Party is the thing that rests nearest to dear Herbie's altruistic heart. Of what stuff is this erstwhile leader of the defunct Republican Party made? Herbert Hoover of London and Johannesburg! How did Herbert Hoover meet the pleading of World War veterans for bread when they assembled in Washington about 4 years ago? Why, sirs, with real bullets and tear gas. Did he then, I ask, consider the guaranteed liberty of those men; did he consider the right of those American citizens, those worthy ex-soldiers, to peacefully assemble and petition their Government for remedial action? Or was he too busy listening to the suave pleadings of Wall Street emissaries?

That is not all. There is another shocking and condemnable parallel.

About 5 years ago the Congress, after certain States had declared themselves financially impotent, provided approximately \$62,000,000 for drought-stricken areas. This money was entrusted to Herbert Hoover and his Secretary of Agriculture. What then happened causes blood to boil in men of humane sentiments. Why, this great engineer, this present-day self-designated humanitarian, ruled that livestock might be fed with this relief money while deserving, destitute citizens of England, Ark., and elsewhere in that stricken area would be allowed to starve. That was the personal attitude of the man who now pleads for salvation of fundamental liberties. That man's cruel attitude in that particular respect did not change until the late Senator from Arkansas and the present majority leader of the Senate centered upon him a most humane, logical, and devastating fire.

What was the attitude of this self-same Republican spokesman in relation to a guaranty of bank deposits when he was at the helm and willing, earnest, deserving men and women were falling on all sides victims of the most abominable banking system the world had ever seen? Responsibility for inaction in that catastrophe rests upon his own head, because the Democratic House told him it would cooperate thoroughly in the framing of any bank-deposit guaranty he might recommend. Still he did nothing. It was not in him to act for the salvation of thrifty and deserving citizens in the face of large and unconscionable rewards; rewards akin to the spoils of pirates, for big business and big finance, which rewards meant larger contributions to the Republican war chest. Then it was that the nefarious liberties of American financiers must be preserved.

It must be evident to anybody that there is a well-laid plan, yes, conspiracy, on the part of these predatory interests, especially the officials of these selfish, soulless corporations, and the malevolent banking fraternity, to regain control of American business and finance through politics. These blatant racketeers of darkest hue are not grateful for being rescued from the results of their own inexcusable iniquities, and content to leave sound government in able and promising hands; they want to regain political power and wipe from our statutes every vestige of law that restrains the hands of these Beelzebubs raised for the injury of their humbler fellow citizens. Place this gang of repulsive apostates again in control of our Government and it would wipe from the statutes every law destined to wrest by taxation from it a just burden of government.

This gang of shameless buccaneers would jettison every piece of social legislation and leave the humble and defenseless, without hope, to slowly starve to death.

This gang of ruthless malefactors would place upon statute books tax laws through which a high-salaried lawyer could with his client ride without retardation, just as the richest man in America escaped all income-tax payment a few years ago under a Republican-made tax law by hiring a well-known apostate lawyer whose ability as a circumventer of income-tax laws caused him to be adopted politically by such evasionists.

Place this diabolical wrecking crew again in charge of our Government and it would junk the securities act and unload again upon innocent and worthy American investors 50 billions of securities, one-half of which would not be worth the paper upon which they were written.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Republican convention was well oiled, at the direction of Oilman Landon, it did not function so smoothly as was anticipated. The absence of Mr. Sinclair, Albert Fall, and Blackmere was not conducive to complete success. As it was, too much oil finally got into the carburetors of that once mighty machine, judging by the unusual exhausts and backfires. But those backfires are as nothing contrasted to the one big backfire we shall hear next November.

Among the delegates of stellar magnitude was our old friend Charlie Dawes—Gen. Charlie Dawes—who rendered such conspicuous "combatant" service on the field of Flanders. And this man was not a corporal in the uniform of a general. He was not a midget sitting in the seat of a mighty. Such a great contribution to allied success resulted in Charlie being chosen as the first generalissimo of the Bureau of the Budget, where his success was instantaneous, enduring, and much appreciated. In that big job he was a worthy assistant to the "greatest" Secretary of the Treasury since Hamilton—Mr. Mellon. What a smooth-working team! What great, hopeful, permanent results for a country leavened with mediocrity!

But Charlie took that job for a temporary tenure, until the perfect machinery could be set in motion and steadied; then he was to further bless our Government, which was suffering from a dearth of talent of really high order, by being persuaded to temporarily forsake private banking and return to the service of his Government as a member of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. From that superb service, the General received his highest and proudest title—90-Million-Dollar Charlie. The General, a modern Cincinnatus, showed his altruism and patriotism by ostensibly quitting the Central Republic Trust of Chicago and returning to the service of his country. The only objection is that Charlie served—the Central Republic Trust—too well; and when he found the call of private business so urgent and commanding that he had to yield, the treasury of the R. F. C. found itself emptied of 90 million dollars. Of course, nobody who really knows the General would associate his patriotic service with an improper loan; nevertheless, our Treasury is to this good day short about 48 million of that 90 million.

Only a casual perusal of the Republican Party's platform shows it contains certain Democratic planks of 1912 and 1932. The Republican platform is a promise to take over the New Deal, as it stands today, and to administer it more economically and more efficiently. There is no fight with President Roosevelt over the purposes of any of the essential features of the New Deal as at present conducted. The fight is over methods.

That platform uses the very words of Bryan, who was by the restrained Republicans of that day called a demagogue and a danger to the Republic. The Republican plank regarding enforcement of criminal laws, as well as civil laws, against monopolies and trusts, swings back to wordage virtually identical with the Democratic platform of 24 years ago. Senator Borah admits that he copied these planks almost verbatim from Democratic platforms. In every paragraph of that platform they have left their indelible marks.

It is a two-faced monster, a hybrid, one face smiling upon agriculture, labor, and legitimate business; the other winking at the racketeers of Wall Street, the big tax dodgers,

the tariff barons, the oil gang of plunderers and their ilk. It is a despicable monster propelled by reptilian blood of subzero temperature, but it is destined to fool few who can do only superficial thinking.

Herbert Hoover allied himself with certain men of ill character and for 4 long and devastating years sold and helped to sell millions of dollars of worthless and watered stock. Then, suddenly, he decided that liquidation, however painful and destructive, must take its unrestrained course. Then when the fury of withering storm came upon us, he and his coadjutors, named Mellon, Morgan, Whitney, and Mills, sought storm cellars.

Now, when safe and sound laws enacted by a wise Democratic program have alleviated and in most cases completely relieved the suffering born of Republican misrule, when wise Democratic legislation has decreased unemployment by 8 million and increased wages; has rehabilitated legitimate business by from 50 to 300 percent; when prices for farm products have increased from 100 to 200 percent; when our Government revenues have increased by about 100 percent; when bank deposits and building-and-loan associations have been made safe; these miscreants are brazenly emerging from storm cellars to set themselves up as carping, unjustified, repudiated, accursed, abominable critics of the safe and sound achievements of the Roosevelt administration.

I will now insert a statement by the Securities and Exchange Commission of salaries paid to these arch critics of the Roosevelt administration. The statement is illustrative rather than exhaustive, as some of the offending tycoons are not included. Many of these men draw unconscionable bonuses and other money from other companies and corporations with which they are at least nominally connected, to say nothing of dividends and interest they receive on stocks and bonds acquired dubiously, sometimes as presents. Most of these men drawing these unreasonable salaries and hidden bonuses do not devote their time and ingenuity to managing these institutions, but most of them, especially those connected with the Liberty League, devote their time to dealing and conniving with Wall Street brokers and members of the stock exchange, to the injury of legitimate business and worthy stockholders and security holders. As an additional excuse for drawing these unconscionably high salaries they have themselves elected "chairmen of the general boards." A euphemistic title, I say! The statement in question follows:

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
Allied Stores Corporation:		
B. Earl Puckett.....	President and director.....	\$73, 147
Richard Mitton.....	Chairman and director of registrant; officer of 1 subsidiary.....	50, 235
American Express Co., F. P. Small.....	President and director.....	68, 665
American Rolling Mill Co.:		
George M. Verity.....	Chairman and director.....	63, 000
Charles R. Hook.....	President, general manager, and director.....	54, 000
American Smelting & Refining Co.:		
Francis H. Brownell.....	Chairman and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.....	100, 000
H. G. Gness.....	Vice president and director.....	70, 000
Simon Guggenheim.....	President and director.....	50, 000
American Sugar Refining Co., Earl D. Babst.....	Chairman and director.....	77, 180
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.:		
W. S. Gifford.....	President and director.....	206, 250
C. P. Cooper.....	Vice president and director.....	74, 250
C. M. Braclen.....	Vice president and general counsel.....	61, 875
B. Gheradi.....	Vice president and chief engineer.....	61, 875
H. D. Pillsbury.....	President and director of 1 subsidiary.....	55, 008
Leonard H. Kinnard.....	Chairman and director of 1 subsidiary.....	55, 000
American Tobacco Co.:		
George W. Hill.....	President and director.....	137, 043
James E. Lipscomb, Jr.....	Director and president of 1 subsidiary.....	100, 000
Vincent Riggio.....	Vice president and director.....	60, 000
Charles F. Neiley.....	do.....	60, 000
Thomas R. Taylor.....	do.....	50, 000
Paul M. Hahn.....	do.....	50, 000

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
American Water Works & Electric Co., Inc., H. Hobart Porter.....	President and director.....	\$80, 625
American Woolen Co.:		
Lionel J. Noah.....	President and director.....	85, 300
Moses Pendleton.....	Vice president and director.....	50, 300
Anaconda Copper Mining Co.:		
Cornelius F. Kelley.....	President and director of registrant; president of 8 subsidiaries.....	174, 504
James R. Hobbins.....	Vice president and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.....	60, 574
Associated Gas & Electric Co., J. I. Mange.....	President and director.....	55, 572
Atlantic Refining Co.:		
J. W. Van Dyke.....	Chairman and director.....	100, 000
W. M. Irish.....	President and director.....	75, 000
Bethlehem Steel Corporation:		
Charles M. Schwab.....	Chairman and director of registrant; officer or director of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	230, 000
Eugene G. Grace.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	180, 000
Quincy Bent.....	Director of registrant; officer, director, or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	90, 000
C. Austin Buck.....	do.....	90, 000
Paul Mackall.....	do.....	75, 000
R. E. McMath.....	Vice president, secretary, and director of registrant; officer or director of 1 or more subsidiaries.....	58, 500
Borden Co., Arthur W. Milburn.....	President and director.....	95, 000
Brooklyn Union Gas Co., James H. Jourdan.....	do.....	81, 092
Coca-Cola Co., R. W. Woodruff.....	President and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary.....	100, 500
Columbia Gas & Electric Corporation:		
Philip G. Gosler.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.....	91, 300
Thomas B. Gregory.....	Senior vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.....	51, 050
Commercial Credit Co.:		
A. E. Duncan.....	Chairman and director.....	55, 000
J. P. Maguire.....	President of subsidiary.....	55, 000
Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, Wendell L. Wilkie.....	President and director.....	65, 971
Consolidated Gas Co. of New York:		
George B. Cortelyou.....	President, trustee, and member executive committee of registrant; officer or director of 22 subsidiaries.....	108, 506
Frank W. Smith.....	Trustee and member executive committee of registrant; officer or director of 9 subsidiaries.....	78, 818
Floyd L. Carlisle.....	Chairman, trustee, and member executive committee of registrant; officer or director of 9 subsidiaries.....	57, 930
Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore, Herbert A. Wagner.....	President, member executive committee, and director.....	66, 640
Continental Oil Co., Dan Moran.....	President and director.....	100, 000
Corn Products Refining Co.:		
George M. Moffett.....	do.....	144, 750
Frederick T. Fisher.....	Vice president, secretary and treasurer, and director.....	121, 500
George S. Mahana.....	Vice president and director.....	121, 500
Curtis Publishing Co.:		
G. H. Lorimer.....	Chairman, president, and director.....	100, 000
P. S. Collins.....	Vice president and director.....	60, 751
F. A. Healy.....	do.....	54, 000
Detroit Edison Co., Alex Dow.....	President and director.....	75, 715
Eastman Kodak Co.:		
Frank W. Lovejoy.....	do.....	90, 904
William G. Stuber.....	Chairman and director.....	61, 230
Electric Power & Light Corporation, H. C. Couch.....	Director of registrant; officer or director of 8 subsidiaries.....	71, 335
Federal Water Service Corporation, C. T. Chenery.....	President and director of registrant; chairman and director of 14 subsidiaries.....	56, 700
Federated Department Stores, Inc.:		
Simon Lazarus.....	Vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.....	100, 440
Fred Lazarus, Jr.....	Director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.....	100, 320
Louis E. Kirstein.....	do.....	80, 400
Edward J. Frost.....	Secretary, treasurer, and director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.....	80, 320
Lincoln Filene.....	Chairman and director of registrant; chairman and treasurer of subsidiary.....	80, 140
Samuel J. Bloomingdale.....	Director of registrant; chairman of 1 subsidiary.....	76, 201
Edward C. Blum.....	Assistant secretary and assistant treasurer of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary.....	57, 720

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Co.: Ernest Sturm	Chairman and director of registrant; chairman of 5 associated companies and director of 8 associated companies.	\$96,597
Bernard M. Culver	President and director of registrant; president of 5 associated companies and director of 8 associated companies.	56,201
General Electric Co.: Gerard Swope	President and director	87,260
Owen D. Young	Chairman and director	87,260
General Motors Corporation: William S. Knudsen	Executive vice president and director	211,129
Alfred P. Sloan, Jr.	President and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary.	201,744
Charles F. Kettering	Vice president and director	140,695
Donaldson Brown	Vice president and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary.	134,688
John L. Pratt	Vice president and director	134,528
Lawrence P. Fisher	do	125,219
John Thomas Smith	do	125,213
Richard H. Grant	Vice president	118,802
James D. Mooney	Vice president and director	118,129
William A. Fisher	Vice president	110,569
Albert Bradley	Vice president and director	98,253
Charles E. Wilson	do	98,018
Ormond E. Hunt	Vice president	98,003
Charles T. Fisher	Vice president and director	78,840
John T. Schumann, Jr.	Director of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary.	71,631
B. F. Goodrich Co., J. D. Tew	President, member executive committee and director	60,143
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., P. W. Litchfield	Chairman, president, and director	81,000
Great Western Sugar Co.: W. L. Petrikin	Chairman of board and director	55,000
W. D. Lippitt	President and director	53,363
Houston Oil Co. of Texas, Geo. A. Hill, Jr.	do	51,480
International Business Machines Corporation: Thomas J. Watson	do	365,339
Otto E. Braitmayer	Vice president and director	60,330
International Harvester Co., Addis E. McKinstry	President and director	60,757
International Paper & Power Co.: Archibald R. Graustein	President and director or registrant; president of 2 subsidiaries.	95,696
Frank D. Comerford	Vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of 3 subsidiaries.	73,100
International Paper Co., R. J. Cullen	Vice president or registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.	62,880
International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, Soethenes Behn	President and director of registrant; director of 10 subsidiaries; director of foreign subsidiaries not named.	51,648
International Utilities Corporation, P. M. Chandler	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 7 subsidiaries.	57,110
Kennecott Copper Corporation: D. C. Jackling	Chairman operating committee of registrant; officer or director of 6 subsidiaries.	101,410
E. T. Stannard	President and director	75,820
Stephen Birch	Chairman and director of registrant; director of 1 subsidiary.	75,700
Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., Albert H. Morrill	President and director	77,756
R. H. Macy Co.: Percy S. Straus	President and director of registrant; vice president of 1 subsidiary.	112,217
Edwin I. Marks	Vice president and director of registrant; vice president of 1 subsidiary.	101,610
William J. Wells	Director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.	75,300
Delos Walker	Vice president and director	70,135
Jack Isador Straus	Vice president and director of registrant; vice president of 1 subsidiary.	61,465
May Department Stores Co., Morton J. May	President and director	100,000
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corporation, Jacob France	do	81,000
National Dairy Products Corporation: Thos. H. McInnerney	do	108,700
L. A. Van Bommel	Vice president and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.	60,800
J. L. Kraft	Director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.	56,390
National Distillers Products Corporation, Seton Porter	President and director	75,400
National Lead Co., William H. Croft	Director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.	88,014
National Steel Corporation: Ernest T. Weir	Chairman and director	53,672
John C. Williams	Vice president and director of registrant; president and director of 3 subsidiaries.	53,671
George R. Fink	President and director of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary.	53,643

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
North American Co.: Louis H. Egan	Director of registrant; officer or director of 30 subsidiaries.	\$56,350
James F. Fogarty	President, member executive committee, and director of registrant; director of 16 subsidiaries.	52,108
Harrison Williams	Chairman executive committee and director.	50,260
Owens Illinois Glass Co., Wm. E. Levis	President, general manager and director.	100,000
Pacific Gas & Electric Co., A. F. Hookenbeamer	President and director	70,133
Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co.: Louis Blaustein	do	65,250
Jacob Blaustein	Executive vice president and director.	55,250
Phelps-Dodge Corporation, Louis S. Cates	President and director	76,440
Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Corporation, Andrew J. Maloney	President and director of registrant; president of 1 subsidiary.	60,717
Philadelphia Electric Co., W. H. Taylor	President, member executive committee and director, officer or director of 8 subsidiaries.	61,531
Pittsburgh Coal Co., J. D. A. Morrow	President and director	74,440
Procter & Gamble Co.: Richard K. Deupree	President and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.	100,000
Renton K. Brodie	Vice president and director of registrant; officer of various subsidiaries.	60,000
Herbert G. French	Vice president and director of registrant; officer or director of various subsidiaries.	60,000
Floyd M. Barnes	Vice president and director of registrant; officer of various subsidiaries.	55,000
Public Service Corporation of New Jersey: Thomas N. McCarter	President and director of registrant; president and director of 5 subsidiaries.	150,000
Edmund W. Wakelee	Vice president and director of registrant; vice president and director of 5 subsidiaries.	90,000
Percy S. Young	do	90,000
Pure Oil Co., Henry M. Dawes	President	55,250
Radio Corporation of America: David Sarnoff	President and director of registrant; director of 4 subsidiaries.	52,330
James G. Harbord	Chairman and director of registrant; director of 4 subsidiaries.	50,160
Reading Co., C. H. Ewing	President and director of registrant; president and director of 1 subsidiary.	60,000
Republic Steel Corporation: T. M. Girdler	Chairman, president, and director	129,372
B. F. Fairless	Vice president and director	64,692
R. J. Wysor	do	64,692
Myron A. Wick	do	51,744
Reynolds (R. J.) Tobacco Co.: S. C. Williams	Vice chairman and director	60,000
Jas. A. Gray	President and director	50,000
Shell Union Oil Corporation, J. C. Van Eck	Vice chairman and director	60,000
Standard Brands, Inc.: Joseph Wilshire	President and director of registrant; president of 4 subsidiaries.	152,560
Paul W. Fleischmann	Vice president of registrant; vice president of 2 subsidiaries.	60,050
Hugo A. Oswald	Secretary and treasurer of registrant; secretary and treasurer of 1 subsidiary.	55,660
Standard Oil Co. of California: K. R. Kingsbury	President and director	136,418
Oscar Sutro	Vice president and director	90,987
W. H. Berg	do	54,596
H. D. Collier	do	54,546
R. W. Hanna	do	54,546
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana: E. G. Seubert	President and director	117,900
Allan Jackson	Vice president and director	64,800
E. J. Bullock	do	60,300
R. H. McElroy	do	54,900
C. J. Barkdull	Executive vice president, treasurer, and director.	51,400
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey: W. O. Teagle	President and director	125,000
W. S. Farish	Chairman and director	112,500
Christy Payne	Vice president, treasurer, and director.	85,000
E. J. Sadler	Vice president and director	85,000
C. O. Swain	General counsel and director	85,000
R. G. Stewart	Director	83,500
G. H. Smith	do	70,000
O. Harden	do	60,000
F. H. Bedford	do	50,000
R. W. Gallagher	do	50,000
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio); W. T. Holliday	President and director	81,000

TABLE 1.—Total remuneration of officers and directors receiving annually \$50,000 or more. Selection limited to domestic corporations with assets of \$50,000,000 or greater and having securities permanently registered on national securities exchanges—Con.

Name of company and official	Capacity	Remuneration
Texas Corporation:		
C. B. Ames.....	Chairman and director.....	\$75,000
W. S. S. Rodgers.....	President and director.....	50,000
Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Walter H. Aldridge.....do.....	50,750
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.:		
W. F. Humphrey.....	President and director of registrant; president and chairman of 2 subsidiaries.....	63,555
E. L. Shea.....	Vice president and director of registrant; president of subsidiary.....	53,278
United Corporation, George H. Howard.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.....	75,320
United Drug, Inc., Louis K. Liggett.....	Director of registrant; officer or director of 2 subsidiaries.....	62,255
United Fruit Co., Francis R. Hart.....	President and director.....	58,450
United Gas Improvement Co., John E. Zimmerman.....	Chairman, president, and director.....	100,000
United Light & Power Co.:		
William Chamberlain.....	Chairman and director of registrant; officer or director of 6 subsidiaries.....	63,710
Charles S. McCain.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 5 subsidiaries.....	57,000
United States Rubber Co.:		
Francis B. Davis, Jr.....	Chairman and president.....	125,220
William de Kraft.....	Vice president and director.....	50,700
United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., C. A. Hight.....	President and director.....	55,210
United States Steel Corporation:		
Myron C. Taylor.....	Chairman and director.....	161,672
William A. Irvin.....	President and director of registrant; director of 20 subsidiaries.....	102,162
William J. Filbert.....	Chairman finance committee and director of registrant; director of 19 subsidiaries.....	87,942
Utilities Power & Light Corporation, H. L. Clarke.....	President and director of registrant; officer or director of 5 subsidiaries.....	50,880
Wesson Oil & Snowdrift Co., Inc., A. D. Geoghagen.....	President and director.....	80,116

Repeating, this statement is not complete, as some of the biggest men are not included; nor does the statement show all the salaries, bonuses, rake-offs, and so forth these men receive.

It is perfectly obvious that many of the men shown on this list are behind the Liberty League and other such organizations formed solely to disparage, besmirch, and unjustifiably assail the Democratic administration and the fair name of President Roosevelt. These are the men who cry for "restoration of fundamental American liberties" when they mean liberty to plunder, debase, and strengthen the monopolistic grip and control, to enable them to a still greater degree enslave the humble wage earners and destroy the small, independent merchants and manufacturers.

There is a continual chorus of complaints from these plunderers when we contemplate a tax bill that would justifiably affect these unconscionable and unwarranted salaries and bonuses only. What an altruistic sentiment these men adopt, what crocodile tears they shed, in the face of a tax bill, for farmers and wage earners! They allege that this proposed tax will necessarily fall heaviest upon the farmers and the wage earners. Did anybody anywhere ever hear of one of this gang having a really unselfish thought for a farmer or a wage earner? Emphatically, no.

The speeches nominating the President contain additional information to accurately acquaint our countrymen with the vile, conniving, unworthy, dastardly efforts of these predatory interests to belittle and defeat the laudable aims and purposes of President Roosevelt.

STRIKES

The "mighty" chieftains of the once proud and powerful, but now inert, Republican Party complain about the number of strikes we have. In lifting American labor from the near thralldom into which it had been with studied cruelty submerged by late corrupt Republican misrule and shilly-shaliness to promote sundry reprehensible interests, notably the United States Steel Corporation, the great Democratic Party of Roosevelt enacted more beneficial labor and social legislation than all the Republican administrations combined. There were few strikes under Republican misrule simply because American labor was largely unemployed and cowed to the point of abject slavery, and the few who were employed

received only wages the men of big business dictated, without regard for actual needs. With this new freedom, it is but natural that labor should try to properly rehabilitate itself.

The Democratic Party favors collective bargaining, as does the Republican Party at least vocally, and to that end the Democrats enacted the Wagner-Connery bill. The Democratic Party favors protection of women and children in industry and legislative failure to effect this result rests upon the Supreme Court.

COLORED

As regards the colored race, it is obviously unfair to charge the "liberal-minded" Republican leaders with not evincing due consideration for the colored race, because they did consider members of the colored race when they excluded them from the Republican convention and thereby saved them from the cruel and unmerited punishment inflicted upon the white office-seekers and paid applauders who were by their prospects and terms of employment compelled to remain.

Seriously, if any fair man wants to learn the attitude of the Democratic Party toward the colored race, let him read from the pen of the able colored Representative in Congress of the colored race, his enlightened interpretation of that attitude.

MAURY MAVERICK: HIS RECORD

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, all Congressmen are likely to have opponents. I have two. One of them is greatly increasing the purchasing power of my district by large expenditures of money. An advertisement appeared in San Antonio newspapers; three of which cost this candidate nearly \$1,000. I estimate that he has either contracted for or has paid for advertising and other matters more than \$15,000 and to use some good old-style English "that ain't a drop in the bucket."

In these highly expensive advertisements, with their rambling, disconnected inanities, which utterly fail to disclose just what this opponent is for or against, I do find something of value—namely, subheads. These subheads of his, duly identified by quotation marks, I propose to use as the basis of my comments.

He says in the first paragraph of his tiresome advertisement, "No selfish desire prompted me to hold office in the past." This is not altogether a new or original statement for an aspirant to make in seeking office, but to this it can only be said that he was elected to the office of district attorney, made an inconspicuous record, and resigned before his term was up. How do we know that he will not do the same thing again? Previously he did it on account of the pressure of business, and from what I understand business may increase at any time and pressure may get him out again, when he will move to Oklahoma to take care of his interests.

But to use these headlines of his I will give direct quotations from other sources which concern me—and some comments from myself. Bear in mind that the subheads are his and not mine, but the statements thereunder concern me.

"AN EARNEST DESIRE TO SERVE"

President Roosevelt:

My good friend, MAURY MAVERICK.

Public Opinion (San Antonio publication):

MAURY MAVERICK should be returned to Congress.

The Nation:

The emergence of a group of first-term Congressmen enthusiastically progressive, including MAVERICK, of Texas, has been the happiest event of the present Congress.

The services of the Congressman from Bexar County have been and will continue to be at the command of any citizen. No red tape must be cut in order to secure his attention for any matter that concerns the county or any of its citizens.

"ADVOCATE OF PEACE"

Washington Merry Go Round (one of the most widely read of the Washington newspaper features):

The Congressman of the year: MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas. Because of his consistent campaign for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and to keep this country out of war.

Heywood Broun (Internationally known writer and economic observer):

Mr. MAVERICK's fight for a stringent American neutrality policy undoubtedly played an important part in the enactment of the present neutrality legislation.

Christendom, scholarly quarterly review of Christian bodies, and greatest publication of its kind in the world, says that in the United States of America, MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas:

is fast winning his right to the designation "Public Friend No. 1."

Oswald Garrison Villard (one of the outstanding liberals of America):

MAVERICK is one of the best and most courageous Congressmen in America.

Rodney Dutcher (famed Scripps-Howard columnist):

It was the red-hot indignation of certain Members, conspicuously Senator HOMER BONE, of Washington, and Representative MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas, which impressed and infected others to the extent of wrecking a neat plan to bury the proposals designed to keep us out of war.

The record shows that MAVERICK has consistently supported all legislation designed to promote good will between our Nation and those of the other people of the earth.

"FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE"

The Secretary of War in a letter to MAVERICK said:

The War Department appreciates your deep interest in the Army and your efforts in its behalf. The results obtained are best evidenced by the sums of money expended by and for the Army in and near San Antonio, to the lasting good not only of the national defense but of the community as well.

Hospital at Fort Sam Houston: MAVERICK got it.

Improvements at Fort Sam Houston to the extent of approximately \$2,000,000: MAVERICK got them.

Increase in Army (THOMASON, of Texas, bill): MAVERICK voted for it and increases in Army personnel will go on for the next 12 months.

Air Service: MAVERICK will be appointed to the Subcommittee of Aviation, most important for San Antonio, next year. No new Congressman can get on this committee.

Congressman LISTER HILL, new Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of which MAVERICK is a ranking member, said:

This will place you (MAVERICK) in a fine strategic position for service to your district and for service to the whole country.

My record in Congress is the best evidence.

"FRIEND OF AGRICULTURE"

Voted for all constructive agricultural legislation.

Had Agriculture Department give special attention to Bexar County and southwest Texas.

Cooperated in fruit-fly extermination.

Brought Under Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Rex Tugwell, for personal inspection of agricultural situation in southwest Texas and Mexico.

Have received special consideration from Resettlement Administration in working for adjustment of agricultural problems.

Served on important committees, such as Southern Policy Committee, and with other Texas Congressman and Senators for passage of Bankhead Tenant Act which will be of extreme benefit to Texas.

Now working on Texas soil-conservation plan, which has been discussed with President Roosevelt personally. When the plan is finally placed in operation it will be of tremendous benefit to Texas farmers in the conservation and reclamation of rich farming lands. Such conservation measures are vital also to city life—San Antonio more than any. Included in this work is the matter of flood control, vital to the Nation—and this district. The administration is especially interested in such plans.

"RESTORE PEOPLE'S BUYING POWER"

This statement of my opponent is so completely at variance with the caption that it is hard to tell what he means. Such cliches are used as "Labor cannot prosper when industry cannot prosper", and so forth; "Labor and capital

should march side-by-side", and so on and so on, and a meaningless rigmarole of long and tiresome sentences.

Concerning MAVERICK:

Voted for all intelligent labor legislation protective of women, children, and all people in general.

Supported measures designed to guard the rights of the laborer as both a wage earner and a consumer.

Supported movements to aid youth in securing education through National Youth Administration and through the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Kept in close contact with local, State, and national labor leaders on legislation in Congress affecting labor.

Have consistently been a friend of the worker, favoring decent pay and bearable working conditions.

Social-security legislation: Voted for it and believe it should be extended and improved.

Of course we all want to increase purchasing power. The people who back my opponent favor the sales tax, are opposed to all progressive legislation which would benefit the people of the United States, are connected with "hot oil" racketeers; (there is no reason why an honest oil man should not vote for me); and an aggregation of neo-Liberty Leaguers and such as think they can get rich by making everybody else poor.

"TO WORK FOR BEXAR COUNTY"

This has been covered reasonably well under other sub-heads. "To work for Bexar County" is not merely to wangle "pork barrel" legislation, but I think it well recognized that I have obtained for Bexar County its just deserts. I have voted for legislation beneficial to the Nation as a whole and it must be remembered that Bexar County is a part of the Nation.

New York Post: "He (MAVERICK) is a man who is not afraid to speak his mind."

Baltimore Sun: "Too bad there aren't more like him (MAVERICK) in Congress."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "Over 700 newspapers throughout the country commented favorably on his (MAVERICK's) fight for civil, religious, and academic liberties."

New York Herald Tribune, conservative Republican and bitter anti-Roosevelt paper: "Representative MAVERICK is to be congratulated on his stand in reference to civil and religious liberties."

MY OWN SUBHEAD

I stand upon my record as a Congressman who already represents his people and does his duty, and ask the voters of Bexar County, "Why exchange a Congressman of known and proven ability for one who has yet to prove himself capable of representing you in the national legislative body?"

A CORRECTION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on page 10799 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the heading of Unwise Legislation, my friend, Hon. ROBERT F. RICH, of Pennsylvania, has an extension of remarks which refers to the passage of two resolutions reported by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. RICH has been very vigilant in watching legislation, and his contributions during the Seventy-fourth Congress toward preventing the passage of bills that would be a charge upon the Treasury is to be commended. It so happens we are members of the same committee, and we have cooperated in preventing the passage of unwise legislation. In this instance it is evident Mr. RICH did not have all the facts before him. In the third paragraph of his remarks he states that the resolution provided for increases for the six official reporters of debates of \$640 per year each. The fact of the matter is the salaries of the official reporters of debates remained the same; no suggestion was ever made for a change, but the bill did provide for an increase of \$260 per year for the six transcribers of the official reporters. The original resolution provided for an increase of \$660 per year for the transcribers but was amended in committee and was reduced to \$260 per year, and it was specifically provided by amendment the increases should not be in force during the vacation period but should start with the opening of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

The salaries with the increases granted by the committee to the official transcribers, who are experts, is not in excess of the amount paid to the senior transcribers in Government departments under the Classification Act. That was ascertained by the committee before acting on the resolution.

The man who has served for a number of years as assistant to the clerk at the Speaker's desk, who keeps the accounts and assembles all the copy for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has been carried on the rolls as a janitor at \$1,440 per year. The committee felt this was unfair in view of the important duties to which he is assigned and did abolish the position of janitor paying \$1,440 per year and provided for an assistant clerk at a salary of \$2,000 per year.

This amount is much less than is paid to the clerk in the Senate doing similar work.

In regard to House Resolution 518, which abolished the position of janitor to the stenographers of committees, and created the position of clerk at an annual rate of pay at \$3,360, it can be said that the man holding this position was formerly an official reporter retired on account of defective hearing and he now reads the proof of over 100,000 pages of copy and assembles it as well as keeps all records for the official committee stenographers. The reason that this resolution was passed is that several members of the Appropriations Committee advised the Committee on Accounts that there should be at least one, if not two, additional committee stenographers. The senior committee stenographers appeared before the accounts committee and stated that there would be no necessity for creating two new positions paying \$7,500 per year or even one provided the committee would abolish the position of janitor paying \$1,440 and create the office of clerk, paying \$3,360 per year. The former committee stenographer holding the position referred to being married, was going to seek another place. The senior stenographers advised the committee that if he could be retained, then he would continue to do the assembling work as well as read the proof, which would give them several additional hours a day to serve committees as they would be relieved from that work and could immediately return to the committees after preparing their notes.

When you take into consideration that this man is supervising the work of all of the stenographers serving at times as many as 20 House committees in a day, as well as reading the proof, surely a salary of \$3,360 per annum is not excessive. The fact is that the committee saved money by abolishing the position of janitor and creating the position of clerk, because it was not required to provide for two additional reporters, as was suggested by some members of the Committee on Appropriations.

I might also say specific provisions were made in this resolution, as amended, so as to provide that the increases cannot go into effect during the vacation period, but will start when Congress assembles next January. The committee stenographers who this clerk serves and the clerk do work during the vacation period, because those stenographers are required to serve special committees of Congress and also take the hearings of the Appropriations Committee, which start many weeks before Congress convenes so that appropriation bills will be ready when the Congress assembles.

I feel sure that my good friend, Mr. RICH, would not have made the statement he did in his extension of remarks if he would have seen the amended resolutions as they came from the Committee on Accounts or had attended the hearings before the committee.

Before considering these resolutions the Accounts Committee appointed a subcommittee composed of Representative JOSEPH STARNES, of Alabama, Democrat, and Representative DONALD H. McLEAN, of New Jersey, Republican, to make a thorough investigation and report to the committee. Their investigation covered a period of several weeks and it was on the basis of their report that the committee acted. I might further say that the Accounts Committee did not take favorable action on the resolutions referred to until they had been approved by the Speaker, the majority leader, as well as the

minority leader. No committee of the House has been more careful in protecting the taxpayers than has the Committee on Accounts.

This committee, of which I have been a member for 9 years, withstood the demands for additional stationery allowances, clerical hire, and the creation of new positions for the House, and has always held down just as far as possible the expenses of special committees. It is an agency of the House, and when the House passes a resolution providing for an investigation its Members feel it is mandatory to provide reasonable expenditures, but it carefully examines all vouchers and is continually protecting the contingent fund. The committee also abolished the payment of all special bonuses, which had been going on for many years, effecting a saving of thousands of dollars annually by its action.

FARM RELIEF UNDER NEW DEAL

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been no subject before Congress in recent years that has claimed more attention, provoked more discussion, brought forth more promises, produced more proposals, and with respect to which less has been accomplished than that of relief for agriculture.

All sorts of fantastic schemes have been brought forward as a "cure-all." Some have been tried with disastrous results; some so inherently weak were discarded without trial; some were abandoned because of an aroused resentment upon the part of both the consumer and producer; some were outlawed by the Supreme Court; and yet, unabashed, unafraid, and with assurance, new theories and policies are continually advanced with the thought that at last has been found the long-sought solution of all agricultural ills.

It is needless to say that as a result of all this confusion of ideas and variety of remedies, with consequent failure, there has been growing an ever-increasing sense of discouragement and hopelessness among our American farmers.

It is not strange that they should begin to lose confidence. The very policies that are inaugurated are frequently sufficient in themselves to create this condition.

For instance, at this present session of Congress the administration pushed through, over Republican opposition, an authorization of seven gigantic irrigation projects in seven different States, with an ultimate cost to the taxpayers of this country of approximately one and a half billion dollars. The effect of this New Deal policy will be to add about 5,000,000 acres of new irrigated land, in the arid States of the West, to the already overabundant supply of tillable farm lands now available for productive cultivation. It is estimated that the 5,000,000 acres of irrigated land which is hereby created will produce the equivalent of 15,000,000 acres of good nonirrigated land, thereby displacing such lands now in use or creating a surplus of production.

Why does the New Deal, under the direction and leadership of Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace, Dr. Rexford Tugwell, and Mordecai Ezekiel, claim that our farmers are producing too much in the agricultural field, and thereupon inaugurate a reduction-of-production program that takes approximately 40,000,000 acres out of use, at a cost of millions of dollars in benefits paid, and, at the same time, press forward irrigation projects to bring new land into production, at an additional cost of one and one-half billion dollars? There can be no satisfactory answer given to this question. The fact is that the two policies are diametrically opposed. There is no way to justify the existence of both at the same time. Either one or the other is wrong and should be discarded. The tax burden is increased and the farmer further depressed by the use of these two conflicting policies at the same time. It is time for common sense to find expression.

Another instance of the detrimental effect upon our farmers resulting from conflicting New Deal policies, both in effect at the same time, is that of permitting importation of agricultural products from abroad when farm acreage is reduced at home to prevent surplus, create scarcity, and increase

prices. It is perfectly apparent that if there is need to import then there is no need to restrict. This is likewise a case where both policies cannot be right. Either one or the other is wrong and should be discarded.

It is almost unbelievable that when our American farmers, in accordance with a governmental policy, produce less cattle, corn, hogs, wheat, rye, barley, butter, and other farm crops in order to cut down the surplus, the present administration literally invited foreign farmers to increase their cheap foreign production of the same products and to ship them to the United States and sell them in the American market in direct competition with domestic production.

The amazing increase of importations of agricultural products from foreign countries, as a result of New Deal policies, has reached such alarming proportions as to cause serious concern to thoughtful persons who realize the disastrous effect on American agriculture that will result if the policies are not changed or the importations checked.

The following table, taken from official Government figures, showing a comparison of imports of farm products for the year 1935, as compared with the year of 1932, before the present administration adopted the policy of scarcity of farm products, presents a condition that justifies the fear of the future that now exists:

	1932 imports	1935 imports
Corn.....bushels.....	347,627	43,242,296
Oats.....do.....	58,786	10,106,903
Wheat.....do.....	10,026,320	27,438,870
Barley, malt.....pounds.....	52,532,636	320,622,537
Rye.....bushels.....	87	9,642,523
Tapioca.....pounds.....	130,000,372	202,112,319
Hay.....tons.....	13,858	67,171
Soybeans.....pounds.....	36,568,700	107,463,044
Cottonseed.....do.....	1,058,945	59,743,572
Butter.....do.....	1,052,598	22,674,642
Cattle.....number.....	95,407	364,623
Hogs.....pounds.....	28,875	3,414,317
Fresh pork.....do.....	1,657,500	3,922,609
Hams, bacon, etc.....do.....	3,015,489	5,297,335
Fresh beef.....do.....	796,594	8,584,114
Canned meats.....do.....	24,638,261	76,653,242
Total meat products.....do.....	45,706,925	115,059,124
Eggs, in shell.....dozen.....	243,784	432,076
Dried yolks.....pounds.....	726,400	3,952,664
Frozen yolks.....do.....	422,060	1,199,772
Egg albumen.....do.....	1,275,790	1,876,445
Wool and mohair.....do.....	56,535,176	202,732,658
Dried milk.....do.....	596,448	2,743,349
Hides.....do.....	188,013,286	303,475,633
Inedible molasses.....gallons.....	155,888,307	235,161,684

These figures clearly indicate that the American market is being flooded with cheaply produced foreign farm commodities which have taken just that much of the home market from our own farmers.

The value of imported competitive farm products in 1935 was approximately \$750,000,000. All of those products could have been produced in this country by American farmers and laborers. Therefore, it was a loss to that extent to our farmers that should not have occurred. It could have been avoided had not the administration been so intent, under the leadership of Secretary of State Hull and Secretary of Agriculture Henry S. Wallace, in encouraging the spirit of internationalism at the expense of our own people.

Furthermore, in addition to the loss of \$750,000,000 representing the value of products actually displaced by foreign commodities it has been estimated by reliable authorities that the farmers in this country were compelled to suffer a further loss of \$2,000,000,000 by way of lower prices for their products as a result of the large competitive foreign imports for 1935.

Explanations and excuses have been offered by administration officers for this unfortunate state of affairs. The fact, however, remains that 40,000,000 acres of American farm land were taken out of production by a New Deal policy, and the food that could and would have been produced and sold in America was in fact produced on foreign soil and permitted to be imported into this country by another New Deal policy in competition with our own farm products.

If our farmers are to cut their acreage and reduce production on the theory that we are producing too much, then they should at least have the benefit of the home market without the competition of foreign-grown foodstuffs.

The strange results attained under the New Deal policies are still further emphasized when we consider the effect of the farm policy, which reduces American production and substitutes foreign, with respect to the question of employment. This has been the great problem that has blocked recovery.

The seriousness of the situation can be seen when it is realized that notwithstanding the present administration has expended more than \$24,000,000,000 in the last 3 years—more money than it cost to run the entire Government of the United States from the Presidency of George Washington to that of Woodrow Wilson—yet there are between five and six million families on relief, representing an aggregate in excess of 20,000,000 persons, and, according to the estimate of the American Federation of Labor, approximately 12,500,000 unemployed.

One of the main reasons for this condition is the fact that jobs and work which should have been performed by American labor were given to the cheap labor of other countries, and the goods there produced shipped into America under New Deal policies that permitted the same to come into competition with American-made goods.

An analysis of the agricultural products imported into this country in 1935 from foreign countries will disclose that from 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 persons could have been employed in the United States in the production and processing of the imported commodities if the same had been produced here. Thus, pay checks from the consumers of America went into foreign lands to pay foreign workers, and unemployed farm hands in this country were driven in many cases to join the relief rolls.

Prominent labor leaders have stated that if it were not for the importation of cheaply produced competitive manufactured products now coming into this country from abroad there could be gainfully employed in private industry nearly 3,000,000 persons who are now out of work and on relief. Thus, New Deal policies, upon the basis of these estimates, are directly responsible for a total of 6,000,000 Americans who would have work if the New Deal would save the home market for American farmers and laboring men.

In conclusion, I wish to give some figures taken from official records that will show a most interesting situation and still further emphasize the inconsistencies of New Deal policies. I have frequently said that when the administration speaks in terms of agricultural relief, in most cases, in practical application, it relates to Western and Southern States, and seldom, if ever, contemplates our Eastern States. Nothing can more surely and quickly demonstrate this fact than the following table, which shows the amount paid by the States that are named for processing taxes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the amount received in return, and the amount received for each dollar contributed.

State	Amount paid	Amount received	Amount received for each dollar contributed
Maine.....	\$1,254,029.35	\$3,758.00	\$0.003
Massachusetts.....	19,874,136.95	895,575.09	.05
Rhode Island.....	2,262,519.65	5,172.11	.002
New Hampshire.....	1,559,178.48	50,367.35	.03
New Jersey.....	4,167,098.19	391,753.03	.09
New York.....	58,852,770.85	389,134.71	.007
Pennsylvania.....	18,600,912.60	1,895,644.51	.10
Arkansas.....	294,105.86	12,476,618.18	42.42
Mississippi.....	619,272.96	12,677,153.71	20.48
New Mexico.....	112,915.68	1,624,104.51	14.38
Oklahoma.....	4,085,494.07	21,416,880.37	5.24
Texas.....	13,149,698.73	46,074,292.61	3.50
North Dakota.....	937,186.22	18,038,317.62	19.25
South Dakota.....	395,565.58	19,140,063.41	48.39
Idaho.....	612,181.02	5,718,503.90	9.34
Nebraska.....	5,042,113.13	37,104,619.69	7.36
Wyoming.....	212,821.62	1,585,733.84	7.45
Iowa.....	20,629,504.23	68,137,227.74	3.30

It is perfectly apparent that what American agriculture needs is a permanent, well-considered, and thoughtful program, based upon study and experience, instead of temporary, makeshift, or vote-catching proposals that cannot result in the permanent rehabilitation of agriculture.

NEW DEAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, back in March 1933, at the time his administration took office, President Roosevelt in a message to Congress said:

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy.

This was before the New Deal embarked upon a dangerous fiscal policy which has grown more and more loose.

If my memory serves me correctly, it was Patrick Henry who said, "I know of no way of judging the future but by the past." These few words present a very effective indictment of the present administration.

Who would have believed in 1932 that the Presidential candidate who promised to consolidate departments and bureaus, abolish useless commissions and offices, and eliminate extravagance in order to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, to balance the Budget, and to stop the deficits could in less than 4 years have left a record representing the very opposite of those promises?

The people cannot become too familiar with the promises made. The New Deal must be judged by the manner in which New Deal pledges have been consistently ignored. Either they were not made in good faith or they were completely forgotten in the lust for power and theoretical experimentation.

The four sessions of the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses representing, roughly speaking, the term of the President, have appropriated in excess of \$39,000,000,000, including appropriations through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Democratic platform of 1932, accepted 100 percent by the President, contained the following plank:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance * * *

In accepting his nomination for President, Candidate Roosevelt used the following language:

We must abolish useless offices * * * we must merge. We must consolidate subdivisions of government and * * * give up luxuries which we can no longer afford * * *. I propose * * * that government of all kinds, big and little, be made solvent and that the example be set by the President of the United States and his Cabinet.

His promise at Columbus on August 20, 1932, was:

I shall share the complaint against regimentation * * *. I dislike it not only when it is carried on by an informal group amounting to an economic government of the United States, but when it is done by the Government of the United States itself.

And in Sioux City, September 29, 1932, he stated:

I propose to analyze the economic increase in the growth of bureaucracy. We are attempting too many functions.

A trail of consistently definite and unequivocal pledges was left on the subject up to the time he took the oath of office. Thereafter we find rather than a reduction of Government bureaus and commissions an astounding increase in the number of new Federal agencies, due entirely to the establishment of alphabetical arrangements by legislation insisted upon by the Chief Executive.

No one knows exactly how many new agencies have been created, but the number runs well over 100. This brought what officials of the National Federation of Federal Employees choose to call political manipulation of the Federal

service by rapacious spoilsmen. I shall only take time here to quote the following from the biennial report of the president of that federation, to which I call your particular attention:

Not within the memory of anyone now living has the merit structure in the Federal service been so beset by attacks, open and covert. * * * By congressional enactment and by Executive order, positions by the thousands have been placed in a political category. Political influence in permanent establishments has not only been permitted, but in numerous instances has been a requisite.

The number of employees on the Federal pay roll has increased from 563,000 on March 1, 1933, to 810,418 as of April 30 of this year. This figure does not include 35,000 contract workers in the Postal Service or the personnel of such organizations as the Civilian Conservation Corps. The increase represents almost entirely the political appointees placed on the roll under the supervision of Postmaster General Farley. To substantiate this statement it can be said that as a matter of fact the number of employees under classified civil service is several thousand less than the number employed at the end of the previous administration, with the total number of employees increased nearly 300,000. The proportion of civil-service employees to the total number on the Federal pay roll today is 63.3 percent as compared with 80.1 percent during the previous administration. It is clear that not only all of the increase is represented by political appointments, but the spoils system even has eaten into the number under classified civil service.

On the subject of reduction in costs in government, the plank in the 1932 Democratic platform read:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures * * * to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government. * * *

With the rest of the platform of his party, the present occupant of the White House accepted this solemn pledge 100 percent. He took occasion to say at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932:

I shall carry out the plain precept of our party, which is to reduce the cost of the current Federal Government operations by 25 percent.

Of course that means a complete realignment of the unprecedented bureaucracy that has assembled in Washington in the past 4 years.

I am no stranger to Washington. I knew it at first hand during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. I served in Washington for seven and a half years under the Wilson administration. I have some familiarity with the psychology of the administration of the National Government.

What action was intended, or at least what the people of this country had a right to expect, was entirely clear. But what has actually taken place?

The administration's method of giving out information is at times confusing and misleading. As a result, one not officially connected with Washington would have to possess an intimate knowledge of governmental activities in order to fully appreciate the enormous funds appropriated during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses.

Immediately upon taking office, the President made his first and only gesture toward reducing expenditures. I refer to the Economy Act of March 1933. It was not many weeks after before it became evident that this was but a shallow attempt to fool the public because there was immediately launched a series of expensive experiments, so much so that those who had conscientiously supported the economy bill began to realize that they had been mistaken in taking the President seriously. The tables appearing at the end of these remarks demonstrate clearly the policy of the administration to constantly recommend enormous increases rather than make any attempt at reducing expenditures. Attention is called to the fact that not only has there been made available to the present administration the \$39,600,000,000 appropriated by the four sessions of the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses upon the demand of the President but

the last session of the Seventy-second Congress had passed appropriation measures for the first fiscal year under the New Deal, beginning July 1, 1933, totaling \$1,879,000,000. This makes a total of appropriations available for expenditures during the 4 fiscal years of approximately \$41,500,000,000.

Do you realize that if one dollar had been laid away every minute of every day and every night from the beginning of the year 1 to January 1, 1936, there would have been on the latter date \$1,300,404,000? In other words, just a little more than a billion dollars in 1,936 years at the rate of a dollar a minute. As a comparison, note that the present administration is spending at the rate of \$10,000 per minute.

Roger Babson, noted economist, has made the following comment:

If every dollar spent were being matched by a dollar in tax revenues, I would not be alarmed. If this were so, the voters would soon take care of the spending problem.

The American people are showing signs of awaking to the situation, because they realize that this spending on the part of the New Deal means that every penny spent must be raised by taxation, whether by direct or indirect measures. It is a well-known fact that the tax measure just passed is only another attempt to give the impression that this is the end of higher taxation. On the contrary, present taxes levied are inadequate, and the next session will demonstrate the need for larger income by taxation, simply because the country cannot continue to live on borrowed money and at the same time maintain national credit; or, far better, the people will demand at the coming election a reduction in expenditures to bring the cost of the Federal Government within revenues.

On the question of Budget balancing the 1932 Democratic platform speaks for the party as follows:

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

This is part of the covenant with the people to be faithfully kept accepted 100 percent by Candidate Roosevelt.

Is it necessary to recall that in his Budget message of January 3, 1934, the President said:

It is my belief that, so far as we can make estimates with our present knowledge, the Government should seek to hold the total debt within this amount. Furthermore, the Government during the balance of this calendar year should plan to bring its 1936 expenditures, including recovery and relief, within the revenues expected in the fiscal year 1936.

That the Budget message of January 3, 1935, stated:

• • • it is evident that we have not yet reached a point at which a complete balance of the Budget can be obtained. I am, however, submitting to the Congress a budget for the fiscal year 1936 which balances except for expenditures to give work to the unemployed. If this budget receives the approval of the Congress, the country will henceforth have the assurance that, with the single exception of this item, every current expenditure of whatever nature will be fully covered by our estimates of current receipts.

In the Budget message of January 3, 1936, there was the same optimistic note, but Treasury statements show that receipts for the fiscal year just ended were \$4,763,000,000 short of the expenditures.

We have had many words and numerous promises but no results.

When decrying the deficit of a little over a billion dollars in 1932, Candidate Roosevelt did not realize the possibilities under President Roosevelt.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury is authority for the statement that the deficit at the end of the fiscal year 1934 was \$3,965,991,685; at the end of the fiscal year 1935 the Treasury faced another deficit of \$3,082,128,643; and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, brought a further deficit of \$4,763,841,642. Simple addition tells us that the total of deficits for the first 3 full years under the New Deal total nearly \$12,000,000,000. This is not all reflected in the public debt as yet, due to the fact that there is to be some refinancing at this time and it is natural for the debt to lag behind the deficits. However, the national debt has increased from \$20,934,728,350 on March 1, 1933, to nearly \$34,000,000,000 at the present time. Treasury statements show \$6,000,000,000 of recovery and relief funds still unexpended. We are told most of this has been obligated. That means ultimately it will practically all be reflected in the deficits and a continued increase in the public debt, so the prediction of a \$40,000,000,000 debt is a mere matter of arithmetic.

The following table sets forth the appropriations of the two New Deal Congresses and the general appropriation bills passed during the second session of the Seventy-second Congress for the first year of the New Deal. It must be remembered that practically all of these funds were appropriated upon the recommendation and the insistence of President Roosevelt. He has taken full responsibility, and in fact has demanded such broad powers that in the expenditure of huge sums made available to him, he is acting in a legislative capacity, as well as an administrative. He has far more authority than any wartime President ever was given.

	Appropriations (2d sess. 72d Cong. and 1st sess. 73d Cong.) for year 1934	Appropriations (2d sess. 73d Cong.) for year 1935	Appropriations (1st sess. 74th Cong.) for year 1936	Appropriations (2d sess. 74th Cong.) for year 1937
General:				
Agriculture.....	\$100,203,091	\$62,621,673	\$125,157,983	\$613,565,608
Independent offices.....	631,802,546	588,574,714	777,501,956	2,450,026,905
District of Columbia.....	30,375,834	35,411,178	40,547,115	43,523,910
Interior.....	43,753,936	31,474,319	61,220,928	114,579,357
Legislative.....	16,689,285	25,075,995	20,746,760	23,314,428
Navy.....	308,669,562	284,658,799	458,684,379	526,546,533
Treasury.....	244,383,219	150,092,430	175,786,109	211,940,303
Post Office.....	713,033,378	669,628,940	727,949,569	780,584,589
State.....	12,196,519	13,885,618	14,013,895	17,829,550
Justice.....	41,154,050	28,700,778	34,556,500	41,223,925
Commerce.....	36,588,465	32,267,321	34,631,500	35,257,220
Labor.....	12,677,365	14,030,805	15,360,000	21,784,700
War.....	349,840,749	316,228,991	401,998,170	572,446,844
Total, regular annual.....	2,541,373,999	2,252,651,561	2,888,054,864	5,452,623,869
Independent offices, indefinite:		190,000,000		
Third deficiency, 1933.....	\$994,598			
Fourth deficiency, 1933.....	\$3,082,630			
Deficiency resolution, legislative (Public Res. No. 12, 73d Cong.).....		213,500		
Deficiency resolution, District of Columbia (Public Res. No. 13, 73d Cong.).....		26,667		
Urgent deficiency resolution (Public Res. No. 23, 73d Cong.).....		335,000		
Deficiency and supplemental (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.).....		15,642,698		
First deficiency, 1935.....			112,633,830	
Second deficiency, 1935.....			272,901,517	
Supplemental, 1936.....				368,232,463
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937.....				950,417,538

[Footnotes at end of table]

	Appropriations (2d sess. 72d Cong. and 1st sess. 73d Cong.) for year 1934	Appropriations (2d sess. 73d Cong.) for year 1935	Appropriations (1st sess. 74th Cong.) for year 1936	Appropriations (2d sess. 74th Cong.) for year 1937
General—Continued				
Ninth Pan American Conference (Public Res. No. 42, 73d Cong.)		\$3,000		
Fort Niagara celebration (Public Res. No. 50, 73d Cong.)		6,000		
Miscellaneous and deficiency resolution (Public Res. No. 51, 73d Cong.)		121,000		
Chinch bug control (Public Res. No. 30, 73d Cong.)		1,000,000		
Interior, Duchesne County, Utah, school (Indians) (Public, No. 265, 74th Cong.)			\$50,000	
Agricultural Adjustment Administration, eliminate diseased cattle (sec. 37) \$10,000,000; relief, 30 per cent of customs duties (sec. 32) \$92,111,741 (Public, No. 320, 74th Cong.)			102,111,741	
Deficiency resolution (Public Res. No. 3, 74th Cong.)			1,771,750	
George Washington Bicentennial Commission (Public Res. No. 6, 74th Cong.)			35,000	
Federal Communications Commission, American Telephone & Telegraph Investigation (Public Res. No. 8, 74th Cong.)			750,000	
District of Columbia, Shrine convention (Public Res. No. 17, 74th Cong.)			54,000	
House of Representatives, pages (Public Res. No. 39, 74th Cong.)			9,348	
District of Columbia, Grand Army of the Republic encampment (Public Res. No. 40, 74th Cong.)			15,000	
Justice, United States courts fees (Public Res. No. 82, 74th Cong.)				\$900,000
House of Representatives, special and select committees (Public Res. No. 89, 74th Cong.)				75,000
Senate, folding room (Public Res. No. 90, 74th Cong.)				4,000
House of Representatives, election contest (Public Res. 122, 74th Cong.)				3,740
Interior, Territories and island possessions (Public Res. 126, 74th Cong.)				35,000
Agriculture, grasshopper control (Public Res. No. 127, 74th Cong.)				250,000
Total, general	\$2,545,451,227	2,455,900,273	3,378,387,050	6,772,541,610
Emergency:				
Public Works Administration (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.)	3,300,000,000			
Emergency Bank Act (Public, No. 1, 73d Cong.)	2,000,000			
Agricultural Adjustment Administration (Public, No. 10, 73d Cong.)	100,000,000			
Federal savings and loan associations (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.)	50,000,000			
Federal land Banks (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.)	65,000,000			
Farm Credit Administration (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.)	42,000,000			
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.)	150,000,000			
Gold Reserve Act (Public, No. 87, 73d Cong.)		2,000,000,000		
Federal Relief and Civil Works Administration (Public, No. 93, 73d Cong.)		950,000,000		
Crop-production loans (Public Res. 16, 73d Cong.)		40,000,000		
Agricultural Adjustment Administration, cattle (Public Res. 27, 73d Cong.)		150,000,000		
Deficiency and supplemental (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.)		1,808,270,000		
Federal Reserve banks, payment to surplus, loans to industry (Public, No. 417, 73d Cong.)		139,299,537		
Work relief (Public Res. 11, 74th Cong.)			4,000,000,000	
Relief and work relief (Public, No. 739, 74th Cong.)				1,425,000,000
District of Columbia, relief (Public Res. 79, 74th Cong.)				350,000
Total, emergency	3,709,000,000	5,087,569,557	4,000,000,000	1,425,350,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (see following table)	1,105,075,000	1,910,000,000	625,000,000	447,000,000
Permanent and indefinite	1,397,977,695	2,304,784,450	2,200,101,127	2,139,664,970
Total appropriations	8,757,503,922	11,762,353,433	10,203,488,177	10,784,556,580

¹ Passed last session 72d Cong. for fiscal year 1934.

² Agricultural Appropriation Act, \$173,565,600, plus \$446,000,000 for Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (A. A. A.) carried in Independent Offices Act and shown in later tables under "New agencies."

³ In later tables \$972,323 apportioned in 1933; \$22,275 in 1934.

⁴ In later tables \$755,720 apportioned in 1933; \$2,326,910 in 1934.

⁵ Plus \$500,000,000 from Reconstruction Finance Corporation and \$380,000,000 reappropriated.

⁶ Eliminating processing taxes and collections under Tobacco Act from Budget estimates and adding \$509,175,000 carried in appropriation acts.

Appropriations through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

	Seventy-third Congress		Seventy-fourth Congress	
	First session	Second session	First session	Second session
Farm Relief Act, 1933 (Public, No. 10):				
Loans to—				
Joint stock land banks	\$100,000,000			
Farmers	200,000,000			
Drainage and irrigation districts	50,000,000			
Advances to reclamation projects	5,000,000			
	\$355,000,000			
Unemployment relief (Public, No. 15, 73d Cong.)	500,000,000			
Securities Act, 1933, Corporation of Foreign Security Holders (Public, No. 22, 73d Cong.)	75,000			
Loans to insurance companies (Public, No. 35, 73d Cong.)	50,000,000			
Home Owners' Loan Act, 1933, capital stock of corporation (Public, No. 43, 73d Cong.)	200,000,000			
Increased authorization (Public, No. 84, 73d Cong.)		\$850,000,000		
Deficiency and Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1934 and 1935 (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.):				
Public Works Administration	\$500,000,000			
Purchase of securities held by Public Works Administration	250,000,000			
		750,000,000		
Loans to industry (Public, No. 417, 73d Cong.)		300,000,000		
National Housing Act, excluding unlimited and indefinite authority (Public, No. 479, 73d Cong.)		10,000,000		
Work relief (Public Res. No. 11, 74th Cong.)			\$500,000,000	
Loans to national mortgage associations (Public, No. 1, 74th Cong.)			100,000,000	
Increase in loans to insurance companies (Public, No. 1, 74th Cong.)			25,000,000	
Public Works Administration (Public, No. 739, 74th Cong.)				\$300,000,000
Commodity Credit Corporation, purchase of capital stock (Public, No. 489, 74th Cong.)				97,000,000
Flood control loans (Public, No. 525, 74th Cong.)				50,000,000
Total	1,105,075,000	1,910,000,000	625,000,000	447,000,000

The items below, acknowledged by Treasury statements as contingent obligations of the Government, are not included in any of the accompanying tables, nor is the total of contingent obligations used elsewhere. Admittedly, some

of the items will be the basis for future appropriations. If they were included the total appropriations and contingent obligations would be well over \$50,000,000,000, without the indefinite items.

Contingent obligations guaranteed by the Government as issued (not included as appropriations)

Guaranty of farm-loan bonds (Public, No. 88, 73d Cong.)	\$2,000,000,000
Guaranty of interest on farm-loan bonds (Public, No. 88, 73d Cong.)	?
Guaranty of home-loan bonds (Public, No. 178, 73d Cong.)	2,000,000,000
Guaranty of interest on home-loan bonds (Public, No. 178, 73d Cong.)	?
Repairs on mortgaged property covered by home-loan bonds (Public, No. 178, 73d Cong.)	200,000,000
Increase in authority of Home Owners' Loan Corporation to issue bonds (Public, No. 479, 73d Cong.), also guaranteed as to principal and interest	1,000,000,000
National Housing Act (Public, No. 479, 73d Cong.):	
Insurance on present mortgages	1,000,000,000
Insurance on new mortgages to be issued	1,000,000,000
Guaranty of interest on these mortgages	?
Guaranty of National Mortgage Association bonds	?
Guaranty of interest on National Mortgage Association bonds	?
Additional for repairs on mortgaged property	100,000,000
Insurance of financial institutions	200,000,000
Replacement of P. W. A. funds for which authorization has been given to divert to emergency purposes (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.)	?
Increase in authority of Home Owners' Loan Corporation to issue bonds, also guaranteed as to principal and interest (Public, No. 76, 74th Cong.)	1,750,000,000
Additional for repairs on mortgaged property (Public, No. 76, 74th Cong.)	100,000,000
Tennessee Valley Act (Public, No. 412, 74th Cong.)	50,000,000
	9,400,000,000

A glance at the above table and those following, which are in more detail, will answer any claim to the fulfillment of the promises to eliminate bureaucracy. A better understanding can be had by examining the tables hereafter inserted, particularly those covering independent offices and new agencies.

Of course, the pledge to reduce the cost of government 25 percent was not taken seriously by the administration from the beginning. In some departments, notably Agricul-

ture, Interior, Navy, Treasury, and War, activities involving Federal aid for highways, construction of reclamation projects, ships, public buildings, rivers and harbors, and flood-control projects have been taken care of in increased amounts out of recovery and relief funds. But even this misleading attempt to show a saving in the Regular Establishment has failed because, with appropriations for these projects transferred from the general Budget to the emergency Budget, total appropriations for the regular establishment still show substantial increases. Eliminating the appropriations for soldiers' bonus and the new A. A. A., the general appropriation measures passed at the session just closed total \$3,282,000,000, an increase of more than 20 percent, or \$500,000,000 over the previous year. The Budget cannot be balanced under the policy of increased spending and unlimited experimentation which forms the nucleus of the New Deal program.

How long can this continue if we are to maintain national credit? The conduct of our fiscal affairs forms the basis of national credit, and there is a limit. The people are the stockholders of the Government. They furnish the capital through taxation. They pay the full bill, and it is up to them to elect officers to run their governmental business on a sound basis. Deficits are net losses which mean added borrowings to increase the national debt, a debt which is the obligation of the people themselves, and which the people eventually must pay.

If we own a little store or business establishment, we do not retain a manager who continually is on a spending spree and reporting losses, and who is repeatedly borrowing from the bank on our credit. If we did, the bank would soon tell us we have no more credit, and foreclosure would follow with complete loss of the enterprise.

Our Federal Government is a large business and should be operated within its income, and not on deficits which are borrowed funds. We need a manager who does not have a spending fever and who, having ability to manage our business of government, will proceed to save the country from costly theory and impractical experiments.

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Agriculture	\$306,673,811	\$142,209,091	\$566,040,887	\$154,102,711	\$644,500,000	\$136,632,756	\$800,000,000	\$182,199,279	\$413,250,000
Independent offices	1,022,876,324	1,237,542,545	3,376,594	1,931,240,155		926,868,312		2,735,509,177	
New agencies		1,600,000,000	997,286,900	1,810,000,000	999,675,000	738,120,251	2,850,000,000	1,482,093,824	726,750,000
District of Columbia	41,257,564	30,375,834	1,759,500	35,790,685		41,411,439		44,934,435	
Interior	69,387,945	43,753,936	202,341,012	35,795,167	1,500,000	77,970,430	213,306,831	125,323,177	
Legislative	19,227,747	16,839,920	2,800,000	19,291,015		23,918,755		24,354,780	
Navy	327,724,856	308,669,562	277,098,924	285,292,667		484,609,344		529,181,191	
Treasury	378,598,015	511,383,219	94,740,653	2,289,581,728	162,595,000	301,425,480		566,022,580	155,750,000
Post Office	805,970,571	713,033,378	532,600	669,678,256		734,682,386		821,242,449	
State	14,164,731	12,232,219	4,761,000	22,993,882		17,526,111		19,310,140	
Justice	46,198,970	41,154,050	785,512	31,162,886		36,641,555		44,309,441	
Commerce	45,510,045	36,588,465	15,652,600	32,804,746		34,738,659		36,195,410	
Labor	13,576,010	14,177,365	2,298,980	14,058,385		15,732,648		25,517,191	
War	458,067,930	349,840,749	362,352,928	317,506,700		433,108,914	136,693,169	583,698,556	128,250,000
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	3,549,234,519	4,057,800,334	2,531,798,090	7,649,298,983	1,808,270,000	4,003,387,050	4,000,000,000	7,219,891,610	1,425,003,000
Non-Federal and other allotments not carried in departmental tables			768,201,910						
Total, public works			\$3,300,000,000						
Permanent and indefinite	1,285,191,028	1,397,977,695		2,304,784,450		2,200,101,127		2,139,664,970	
Add public works, supplemental and work relief		3,300,000,000		1,808,270,000		4,000,000,000		1,425,000,000	
Grand total	4,834,425,547	\$8,755,778,029		11,762,353,433		10,203,488,177		\$10,784,556,580	

¹ Does not include \$3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation covered in next column.
² Appropriation of \$440,000,000 carried in Independent Offices Act for Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. In this and following tables it is omitted in Independent Offices and included in Agricultural Adjustment Administration under New Agencies.
³ In addition to this sum there are reappropriations totaling \$73,792,786.
⁴ This total could be shown under Public Works Administration in new agencies, but is broken down by departmental allocations instead.
⁵ Includes \$2,150 (Second Deficiency, 1933), not shown in previous table; does not include items (Third Deficiency, 1933, and Fourth Deficiency, 1933), apportioned to 1933. (See footnotes 2 and 3 of previous table).

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Secretary's office.....	\$13,076,911	\$12,754,854	\$13,443	\$11,225,567		\$11,622,554		\$22,107,870	
Weather Bureau.....	4,164,038	3,731,235	183,840	3,032,292		3,439,204		3,861,024	
Animal Industry.....	12,283,622	11,358,964	1,611,240	8,802,787		11,313,419		10,063,963	
Dairy Industry.....	717,448	655,130	262,420	559,862		636,179		697,094	
Plant Industry.....	4,030,874	4,496,155	4,822,007	3,476,342		4,998,497		4,551,266	
Forest Service.....	12,383,304	11,531,039	40,967,745	8,394,323		11,600,973		17,738,505	
Chemistry and Soils.....	1,825,030	1,670,194	163,919	1,311,698		1,279,434		1,398,272	
Entomology.....	2,471,700	2,213,968	2,386,535	3,130,536		1,781,421		5,317,675	
Biological Survey.....	1,756,177	1,356,280	976,050	1,054,084		1,421,492		1,961,224	
Public Roads.....	100,000,000	35,000,000	412,696,000	8,000,000	\$119,500,000	51,059,256	\$800,000,000	60,000,000	\$413,251,000
Forest Roads.....	8,905,000	4,457,400				7,082,600		8,000,000	
Agricultural Engineering.....	518,690	411,810	281,538	350,318		423,269		438,269	
Agricultural Economics.....	6,649,841	6,095,290		4,916,031		5,724,801		5,992,896	
Home Economics.....	233,365	212,749	1,200	178,701		193,485		219,085	
Plant Quarantine.....	2,490,125	2,158,514	(¹)	(¹)		(¹)		(¹)	
Grain Futures Act.....	218,838	200,000		181,498		196,500		196,500	
Food and Drug Administration.....	1,716,167	1,589,505	70,000	1,557,713		1,968,637		2,077,758	
Miscellaneous.....	1,330,485	316,034		4,060,255		396,262		75,000	
Experiment Stations.....			4,950						
Farm Credit Administration.....			101,600,000	2,389,666		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Drought relief.....					525,000,000				
Soil Conservation Service ²								\$24,869,285	
Total regular.....	175,671,665	100,209,091	566,040,887	62,621,673	644,500,000	125,157,983	800,000,000	173,565,606	413,250,000
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933.....	1,000,173								
Second deficiency, 1933.....	1,590								
Third deficiency, 1933.....	29								
Fourth deficiency, 1933.....	354	42,000,000							
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935.....				481,038					
First deficiency, 1935.....						2,370,943			
Second deficiency, 1935.....						9,103,830			
Supplemental, 1936.....								8,264,979	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937.....								118,694	
Special acts:									
Emergency Relief and Construction Act (Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.):									
Highway-aid system.....	120,000,000								
Forest roads.....	5,000,000								
Forest improvements.....	5,000,000								
Crop production loan (Public Res. No. 16, 73d Cong.).....				40,000,000					
Eradication of cattle diseases (Public Res. No. 27, 73d Cong.).....				50,000,000					
Control of chinch bugs (Public Res. No. 30, 73d Cong.).....				1,000,000					
Grasshopper control (Public Res. No. 127, 74th Cong.).....								250,000	
Total, regular, deficiency, and special.....	306,673,811	142,209,091	556,040,887	154,162,711	644,500,000	135,632,756	800,000,000	\$182,199,279	413,250,000
Permanent and indefinite.....	11,211,571	10,303,116		840,280,600		578,452,596		\$117,654,497	
Add public works, supplemental, and work relief.....		566,040,887		644,500,000		800,000,000		413,250,000	
Grand total.....	317,885,382	718,553,094		1,638,883,311		1,515,085,352		\$713,103,776	

¹ Bureaus of Entomology and Plant Quarantine have been consolidated.

² Includes:

Public roads.....	\$400,000,000
Public-land highways.....	5,015,000
Drought-relief highways.....	7,431,000
Administrative fund.....	250,000
Total.....	412,696,000

³ Includes:

Public roads.....	100,000,000
Highway Act, Nov. 9, 1921, to remain available.....	10,000,000
Federal reservation roads.....	2,500,000
National park roads.....	5,000,000
Indian reservation roads.....	2,000,000
Total.....	119,500,000

In addition \$100,000,000 is appropriated for 1936, and \$100,000,000 for 1937, the latter amount to be matched by the States.

⁴ Highways and grade crossings.

⁵ Created by consolidation and transfer of agencies from Interior and other Departments.

⁶ \$440,000,000 appropriation in Independent Offices Act for soil conservation, shown under new agencies, not included.

⁷ Processing taxes deducted from permanent appropriations account, Supreme Court decision.

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
INDEPENDENT OFFICES

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Executive offices.....	\$392,000	\$369,483	\$6,000	\$442,050		\$437,232		\$437,130	
Battle Monuments Commission.....	275,000	129,000				199,059		71,000	
Arlington Bridge Commission.....	340,000	198,000							
National Mediation Board.....	152,135	120,000		125,564		336,450		346,500	
Board of Tax Appeals.....	560,000	490,000		502,116		540,000		532,000	
Bureau of Efficiency.....	159,500	(9)							
Civil Service Commission.....	1,312,370	1,051,000		1,522,816		42,595,000		48,879,000	
Commission of Fine Arts.....	7,800	8,800		(9)					
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	4,880,000	4,169,700		4,353,410		4,719,000		(19)	
Federal Board for Vocational Education.....	2,864,000	2,487,700							
Federal Oil Conservation Board.....	10,000	7,803							
Federal Power Commission.....	254,000	210,000	700,000	277,303		312,600		1,709,000	
Federal Communications Commission ¹¹	382,000	640,000		666,885		1,525,000		1,474,000	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....						254,043			
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,466,500	920,000		1,742,730		1,403,309		1,439,000	
General Accounting Office.....	4,262,620	3,280,000	11 506,000	3,461,920		4,970,600		5,306,840	
Clark Sesquicentennial Commission.....	400,000	96,650							
George Washington Bicentennial Commission.....	200,000	(9)							
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	7,148,560	5,190,000		5,430,970		5,850,656		7,089,550	
Mount Rushmore Commission.....	25,000	10,000		(9)					
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	920,000	695,000	247,944	726,492		839,500		1,177,550	
Personnel Classification Board.....	145,116	(12)							
Public Buildings and Parks.....	4,025,933	3,322,500		(9)					
Public Buildings Commission.....	100,000	80,000							
Securities and Exchange Commission.....						2,264,494		4,238,000	
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,074,829	820,000		874,024		950,189		998,915	
Supreme Court Commission.....	1,000,000	3,490,000							
Tariff Commission.....	1,020,000	800,000		840,898		970,000		966,000	
Geographic Board.....	9,678	9,000		9,440					
Shipping Board.....	360,000	310,000		(14)					
Veterans' Administration.....	948,699,000	602,838,000	1,916,650	567,598,096		705,420,000		2,323,727,000	
International Institute of Agriculture.....		48,500		(15)					
Black Bass Act.....		13,110		(14)					
Employees abroad, account devaluation.....						3,904,824		1,800,000	
Central Statistical Board.....								16 175,420	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....								400,000	
The National Archives.....								615,000	
National Labor Relations Board.....								735,000	
Railroad Retirement Board.....								47,645,000	
Great Lakes Exposition Commission.....								17 275,000	
Total, regular.....	982,446,041	631,802,546	3,376,594	588,574,714		777,501,956		18 2,450,026,905	
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933.....	38,052								
Second deficiency, 1933.....	247								
Third deficiency, 1933.....	5,111								
Fourth deficiency, 1933.....	36,873	665,000							
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935.....				2,665,441					
First deficiency, 1935.....						95,679,381			
Second deficiency, 1935.....						26,345,225			
Supplemental, 1936.....								44,714,987	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937.....								190,767,255	
Special acts:									
Veterans' Administration (Public Res. 35, 72d Cong.).....	100,000								
Home Loan Bank Board (Public, No. 305, 72d Cong.).....	250,000								
Federal Farm Board (Public Res. 43, 72d Cong.).....	40,000,000								
Farm Relief Act (Public, No. 10, 73d Cong.), Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans.....		355,000,000							
Foreign Securities Holders Corporation (Public, No. 22, 73d Cong.).....		75,000							
Loans to insurance companies (Public, No. 35, 73d Cong.) through Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....		50,000,000							
Home Owners' Loan Act (Public, No. 43, 73d Cong.), capital stock by Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....		200,000,000							
Increased authorization for Reconstruction Finance Corporation (Public, No. 84, 73d Cong.).....				850,000,000					

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Special acts—Continued.									
Loans to industry (Public, No. 417, 73d Cong.) through Reconstruction Finance Corporation.				\$300,000,000					
Independent offices, Veterans' Administration indefinite, estimated.				190,000,000					
Deficiency resolution (Public Res. 3, 74th Cong.)						\$1,556,750			
George Washington Bicentennial Commission (Public Res. 6, 74th Cong.)						35,000			
Federal Communications Commission (Public Res. 8, 74th Cong.)						750,000			
Loans to insurance companies, increase (Public, No. 1, 74th Cong.), through Reconstruction Finance Corporation.						25,000,000			
Flood control loans (Public, No. 525, 74th Cong.) through Reconstruction Finance Corporation.								\$50,000,000	
Total, regular, deficiency, and special—Permanent and indefinite.	\$1,022,876,324 81,070,850	\$1,237,542,546 79,575,443	\$3,376,594	1,931,240,155 68,505,695		926,868,312 69,290,409		2,735,509,177 580,215,275	
Add public works, supplemental, and work relief.		3,376,594							
Grand total.	1,103,947,174	1,320,494,583		1,999,745,850		996,158,721		3,315,724,452	

⁸ Discontinued Bureau of Efficiency and George Washington Bicentennial Commission.
⁹ Transferred to Department of the Interior.
¹⁰ \$6,689,250 made available out of Civil Works Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps funds.
¹¹ Formerly Federal Radio Commission.
¹² This sum was used for auditing expenditures of the new agencies.
¹³ Functions of Personnel Classification Board taken over by the Civil Service Commission.
¹⁴ Now the Shipping Bureau under the Department of Commerce.
¹⁵ International Institute for Agriculture, appropriation of \$48,500 later transferred to Department of State. Black Bass Act, appropriation of \$13,110 later transferred to Department of Commerce.
¹⁶ Formerly carried under new agencies and allotted from emergency funds, \$113,000.
¹⁷ Transferred from State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Appropriation Act.
¹⁸ Plus \$440,000,000 to Secretary of Agriculture under Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act shown in Department of Agriculture tabulation.

NEW AGENCIES

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Tennessee Valley Authority			\$50,000,000					(19)	
National Recovery Administration			9,665,000						
Civilian Conservation Corps			324,362,315				\$600,000,000	(19)	
Federal Emergency Relief Administration			901,880		\$899,675,000		300,000,000 900,000,000		\$726,750,000
Works Progress Administration			351,000						
National Planning Board			400,005,000						
Civil Works Administration			11,412,205						
Public Works Administration			123,671,500				450,000,000		
Public Works Administration reserves.			49,934,000						
Central Statistical Board			²⁰ 113,000					(21)	
Executive Council			²¹ 60,000						
Federal Alcohol Control Administration			²² 500,000						
National Emergency Council			²² 310,000						
Electric Farm and Home Authority			²² 1,000,000						
Federal Surplus Relief Corporation			25,000,000						
Emergency Leasing Corporation			²² 1,000						
Agricultural Adjustment Administration					100,000,000			²³ \$440,000,000	
National Housing Act, National Mortgage Association, from Reconstruction Finance Corporation				\$10,000,000					
Rural Resettlement Administration							²⁴ 500,000,000		(25)
Rural Electrification Administration							100,000,000	(19)	(25)
Total			997,286,900	10,000,000	999,675,000		2,850,000,000	440,000,000	726,750,000

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
NEW AGENCIES—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Deficiency appropriations:									
Fourth deficiency, 1933 and 1934, Public Works	\$3,300,000,000								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935, Public Works Administration, through Reconstruction Finance Corporation				\$750,000,000					
First deficiency, 1935						\$4,250			
Second deficiency, 1935						35,004,200			
Supplemental, 1936								\$296,186,901	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								\$348,906,923	
Special acts:									
Agricultural Adjustment Administration (Public, No. 10, 73d Cong.)		\$100,000,000							
Unemployment Relief (Public, No. 15, 73d Cong.)		500,000,000							
Federal Emergency Relief and Civil Works Administration (Public, No. 93, 73d Cong.)				950,000,000					
Agricultural Adjustment Administration (cattle) (Public Res. 27, 73d Cong.)				100,000,000					
Agricultural Adjustment Administration (including \$92,111,741 from customs receipts.) (Public, No. 320, 74th Cong.)						102,111,741			
National Mortgage Association (Public, No. 1, 74th Cong.), through Reconstruction Finance Corporation						100,000,000			
Work relief (Public Res. 11, 74th Cong.), through Reconstruction Finance Corporation						500,000,000			
Commodity Credit Corporation (Public, No. 489, 74th Cong.) through Reconstruction Finance Corporation								97,000,000	
Public Works Administration (Public, No. 739, 74th Cong.) through Reconstruction Finance Corporation								300,000,000	
Total, regular, deficiency, and special		600,000,000	\$997,286,900	1,810,000,000	\$999,675,000	738,120,251	\$2,850,000,000	1,482,093,824	\$726,750,000
Add public works, supplemental, and work relief		997,286,900		999,675,000		2,850,000,000		726,750,000	
Grand total		1,597,286,900		2,809,675,000		3,588,120,251		2,208,843,824	

¹⁹ Provided for in First Deficiency and Supplemental Act, 1936 and 1937.

²⁰ The sum of \$93,000 was added by Executive Order No. 6718 of May 25, 1934, to the \$20,000 item shown in Public Works Administration Report of May 7, 1934.

²¹ Carried in Independent Offices Act for 1937, \$175,420.

²² Carried as "Special allotments" in Public Works Administration Report of May 7, 1934.

²³ Provided in Independent Offices Act for 1937 (Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Also reappropriation of \$21,364,000 provided in Agriculture Appropriation Act.

²⁴ Includes irrigation and reclamation.

²⁵ May share in this appropriation.

²⁶ Shown here but not added in total as this fund is distributed in next column.

²⁷ Includes \$308,000,000 for C. C. C., \$1,000,000 for Rural Electrification Administration, \$39,900,000 for T. V. A.; which items were included in relief appropriations heretofore.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Total appropriation	\$41,245,622	\$30,375,834	\$1,759,500	\$35,411,178		\$40,547,115		\$43,523,910	
District of Columbia-Virginia Commission				\$10,000					
Total, regular	41,245,622	30,375,834	1,759,500	35,421,178		40,547,115		43,523,910	
Deficiency appropriations:									
Fourth deficiency, 1933	11,942								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				342,800					
First deficiency, 1935						45,000			
Second deficiency, 1935						750,324			
Supplemental, 1936								165,990	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								894,535	

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937*	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Special acts:									
Alcoholic Beverage Control (Public Res. 13, 73d Cong.)				\$26,667					
Shrine convention (Public Res. 17, 74th Cong.)						\$54,000			
Grand Army of the Republic encampment (Public Res. 40, 74th Cong.)						15,000			
Emergency relief (Public Res. 79, 74th Cong.)								\$350,000	
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	\$41,257,564	\$30,375,834	\$1,759,500	\$5,790,685		41,411,439		44,034,435	
Permanent and indefinite	3,252,000	2,697,500		2,430,000		1,460,000		1,435,000	
Add public works		1,759,500							
Grand total	44,509,564	34,832,834		88,220,685		42,871,439		46,369,435	

* An allotment was made to the District of Columbia for Public Works Administration funds of \$1,759,500 for sewer construction.
** Additional appropriation to legislative establishment for this purpose transferred to District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Secretary's office	\$694,380	\$704,270	** \$18,071	\$1,175,285		\$1,740,190		\$3,505,690	
General Land Office	1,883,300	1,742,050	1,000,000	822,000		1,810,700		1,821,200	
Indian Affairs	20,845,439	18,966,546	19,034,550	16,275,285		27,538,132		28,041,190	
Bureau of Reclamation	8,414,500	11,051,000	** 103,535,000	860,750		1,072,100		48,878,600	
Geological Survey	2,181,000	1,992,500	4,497,164	1,313,500		2,285,560		2,807,817	
Bureau of Mines				(*)		1,970,311		2,093,200	
National Park Service	7,640,620	5,072,790	** 32,091,350	6,319,640		16,199,290		16,122,080	
Bureau of Education	320,000	270,000		1,538,000		4,781,220		7,188,400	
Territories	1,212,300	1,347,250	** 3,284,358	1,113,168		1,532,335		1,565,240	
Hospitals and universities	2,342,133	2,607,530	3,319,311	2,047,711		2,291,060		2,555,940	
Petroleum Industry Administration			559,000		\$1,500,000			(*)	
Service division and special account			** 2,208					(*)	
Soil Erosion Service			10,000,000				** \$213,306,831	(*)	
Subsistence homesteads			25,000,000					(*)	
Commission of Fine Arts				** 9,080		(*)		(*)	
Total, regular	45,533,672	43,753,936	202,341,012	31,474,319	1,500,000	61,220,928	213,306,831	114,579,357	
Deficiency appropriations:									
Second deficiency, 1932	7,155,702								
First deficiency, 1933	1,246								
Second deficiency, 1933	463,499								
Third deficiency, 1933	121								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	233,705								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				4,320,848					
First deficiency, 1935						10,415			
Second deficiency, 1935						16,689,087			
Supplemental, 1936								850,362	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								9,858,458	
Special acts:									
Emergency Relief and Construction Act (Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.)	16,000,000								
Indian Affairs (Public, No. 265, 74th Cong.)						50,000			
Territories and island possessions (Public Res. No. 126, 74th Cong.)								35,000	
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	69,387,945	43,753,936	202,341,012	35,795,167	1,500,000	77,970,430	213,306,831	125,323,177	
Permanent and indefinite	13,921,800	12,122,600		15,503,050		16,786,040		28,136,040	
Add public works, supplemental, and work relief		202,341,012		1,500,000		213,306,831			
Grand total	83,309,745	258,217,548		52,798,217		308,063,301		153,459,217	

* Of this amount, \$14,731 was carried as a special allotment in Public Works Administration report of May 7, 1934. The balance of \$3,340 is listed in a table as of May 21, 1934, shown in the hearing before the Subcommittees of House Committee on Appropriations in charge of deficiency appropriations.
 ** See Department of Commerce (\$1,197,926).
 ** Includes \$7,202,306 for physical improvements and \$24,884,144 for roads and trails.
 ** Includes \$1,981,508 for Alaska, and \$1,320,850 for Virgin Islands.
 (*) Included in Secretary's office.
 (*) Carried as a special allotment in Public Works Administration report of May 7, 1934.
 (*) Balance under War Department; also covers sanitation and reforestation.
 (*) Transferred to Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
 (*) Transferred from independent offices; 1936 and 1937 appropriations included in Secretary's office.

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued

LEGISLATIVE

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Senate.....	\$3,095,490	\$2,848,716		\$2,945,711		\$3,320,302		\$3,332,084	
House.....	8,178,924	7,415,399		7,421,008		8,289,932		8,302,108	
Capitol Police.....	95,430	87,940		100,106		110,650		110,680	
Joint Committee on Printing.....	11,620	10,785		10,618		11,620		11,620	
Legislative counsel.....	75,000	70,000		70,000		75,000		75,000	
Statement of appropriations.....	4,000	3,330		4,000		4,000		4,000	
Architect's office.....	1,900,580	1,586,355	\$2,800,000	1,692,010		1,900,622		4,202,924	
Botanic Gardens.....	140,000	113,725		111,585		114,987		114,987	
Library of Congress.....	2,162,147	2,090,235		2,091,335		2,419,647		2,511,025	
Government Printing Office.....	3,010,800	2,462,800		3,181,612		4,500,000		4,650,000	
Total, regular.....	18,673,991	16,689,285	2,800,000	17,627,995		20,746,760		23,314,428	
Deficiency appropriations:									
Second deficiency, 1932.....	32,150								
First deficiency, 1933.....	168,040								
Second deficiency, 1933.....	250,860	2,150							
Third deficiency, 1933.....	81,560	22,275							
Fourth deficiency, 1933.....	2,318	126,210							
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935:				1,151,520					
First deficiency, 1935.....						51,502			
Second deficiency, 1935.....						2,896,145			
Supplemental, 1936.....								384,440	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937.....								573,152	
House, special and select committees (Public Res. 89, 74th Cong.).....								75,000	
Senate, folding room (Public Res. 90, 74th Cong.).....								4,000	
House, election contest (Public Res. 122, 74th Cong.).....								3,740	
Special acts:									
Senate and House pages (Public Res. 34, 72d Cong.).....	3,720								
Senate and House pages (Public Res. 41, 72d Cong.).....	2,480								
Senate and House pages (Public Res. 4, 73d Cong.).....	12,628								
Senate and House (Public Res. 12, 73d Cong.).....				213,500					
Senate and House (Public Res. 23, 73d Cong.).....				185,000					
House, select committees (Public Res. 51, 73d Cong.).....				110,000					
Senate (Public Res. 3, 74th Cong.).....						215,000			
House pages (Public Res. 39, 74th Cong.).....						9,348			
Total, regular, deficiency, and special.....	19,227,747	16,839,920	2,800,000	19,291,015		23,918,755		24,354,760	
Permanent and indefinite.....	109,800	70,800		62,800		70,800		78,800	
Add public works, supplemental, and work relief.....		2,800,000							
Grand total.....	19,337,547	19,710,720		19,353,815		23,989,555		24,433,560	

* Regular legislative appropriation..... \$17,627,995

Riders on legislative appropriation act:

District of Columbia (Virginia Commission included under District of Columbia)..... 10,000

Foreign pay adjustments, included under State Department..... 7,438,000

Total..... 20,075,995

NAVY DEPARTMENT

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Secretary's office.....	\$2,887,980	\$2,278,504	\$2,850,000	\$2,111,400		\$2,210,850		\$2,314,600	
Naval records and library.....	39,240	35,970		30,672		34,080		34,080	
Judge Advocate General.....	130,240	117,087		104,940		116,780		117,720	
Naval operations.....	73,760	69,423		61,830		70,000		66,020	
Board of Inspection and Survey.....	20,780	17,454		15,516		17,240		19,840	
Naval Communications.....	134,980	123,272		108,720		125,000		130,000	
Naval Intelligence.....	41,440	36,978		32,760		56,080		61,660	
Bureau of Navigation.....	6,530,144	6,304,327		5,372,584		11,161,787		13,635,324	
Bureau of Engineering.....	18,363,040	18,248,407	712,500	15,810,470		19,959,500		20,807,400	
Bureau of Construction and Repair.....	16,214,900	15,792,674	238,000,000	13,974,870		18,635,479		19,547,479	
Bureau of Ordnance.....	11,436,000	11,000,995	330,225	10,680,303		21,349,000		21,849,000	
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.....	166,978,331	159,188,348	205,662	152,326,320		185,210,923		201,254,053	
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	1,995,560	1,934,842		2,031,714		2,352,640		2,373,720	
Bureau of Yards and Docks.....	11,342,320	10,297,129	27,500,537	6,828,335		9,844,600		11,262,100	
Bureau of Aeronautics.....	25,535,820	22,220,879	7,500,000	18,880,398		41,069,310		38,932,270	
Naval Academy.....	1,881,217	1,741,237		1,549,786		1,928,000		(4)	

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
NAVY DEPARTMENT—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Marine Corps.....	\$21,914,839	\$20,349,251		\$20,648,447		\$23,768,110		\$25,641,266	
Increase in Navy and replacement.....	18,063,000	33,412,785		33,619,334		120,795,000		168,500,000	
Modernizing ships.....	14,000,000	5,500,000		470,400					
Total, regular.....	317,583,591	308,669,562	\$277,098,924	285,658,799		458,684,379		526,546,532	
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933.....	3,803								
Second deficiency, 1933.....	1,634								
Third deficiency, 1933.....	33,188								
Fourth deficiency, 1933.....	102,640								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935.....				622,888					
First deficiency, 1935.....						561,623			
Second deficiency, 1935.....						23,363,342			
Supplemental, 1936.....								107,161	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937.....								2,527,498	
Special acts:									
Emergency Relief and Construction Act (Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.).....	10,000,000								
Marine Band expenses (Public Res. 51, 73d Cong.).....				11,000					
Total, regular, deficiency, and special.....	327,724,856	308,669,562	277,098,924	285,292,667		484,609,344		529,181,191	
Permanent and indefinite.....	1,322,550	997,598		1,698,333		1,737,500		1,717,100	
Add public works.....		277,098,924							
Grand total.....	329,047,406	586,766,084		286,991,000		486,346,844		530,898,291	

⁴⁶ Machine tools, \$2,850,000.

⁴⁷ Included in Bureau of Navigation.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Secretary's office.....	\$5,886,220	\$5,255,130		\$4,641,964	\$4,600,000	\$6,811,960		\$8,818,640	
Customs Service.....	22,000,000	19,900,000		18,500,000		34,255,410		38,900,000	
Bureau of the Budget.....	190,000	177,700		171,851		192,000		219,000	
Farm Loan Bureau.....	950,000	900,000		(⁴⁸)		(⁴⁹)		(⁴⁹)	
Office of the Treasurer.....	1,601,746	1,478,596	⁴⁸ \$100,000	1,374,300		1,468,700		1,262,400	
Comptroller of the Currency.....	315,340	291,740		257,202		233,800		245,320	
Internal Revenue.....	33,650,000	⁴⁸ 85,800,000		67,450,520	10,000,000	⁴⁸ 83,004,700		54,516,080	
Bureau of Industrial Alcohol.....	4,525,000	4,000,000		4,086,974		(⁴⁹)			
Federal Alcohol Administration.....								475,000	
Bureau of Narcotics.....	1,525,000	1,400,000		1,244,899		1,249,470		1,275,000	
Coast Guard.....	28,172,220	25,772,950	25,031,872	18,346,400		22,761,315		24,080,028	
Bureau of Engraving and Printing.....	6,430,000	5,060,680		4,568,090		5,988,247		6,328,430	
Secret Service.....	703,419	679,238		696,390	45,000	823,640		1,053,610	
Public Health Service.....	11,021,413	10,386,328	2,207,128	9,155,869		10,777,567		20,151,075	
Mints and Assay Office.....	1,387,870	1,296,842		1,108,559		1,256,600		1,295,660	
Procurement Division.....	⁴⁷ 131,884,930	⁴⁸ 81,919,025	67,401,653	⁴⁸ 18,425,442	65,000,000	⁴⁸ 6,836,700	(⁴⁹)	5,255,000	\$156,750,000
Printing House for the Blind.....	65,000	65,000		65,000		65,000		65,000	
Federal land banks, interest and surplus.....					⁴⁸ 82,950,000			⁴⁸ 48,000,000	
Total, regular.....	250,308,158	244,383,219	94,740,653	150,092,430	162,595,000	175,786,109	(⁴⁹)	211,940,303	156,750,000
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933.....	1,457								
Second deficiency, 1933.....	28,266,061								
Third deficiency, 1933.....	21,266								
Fourth deficiency, 1933.....	1,073	265,000,000							
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935.....				189,740					
First deficiency, 1935.....						1,600,047			
Second deficiency, 1935.....						123,949,324			
Supplemental, 1936.....								11,392,448	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937.....								342,689,829	
Special acts:									
Emergency Relief and Construction Act, public buildings (Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.).....	100,000,000								
Bank Conservation Act (Public, No. 1, 73d Cong.).....		2,000,000							
Gold stabilization fund (Public Res. 87, 73d Cong.).....				2,000,000,000					

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
TREASURY DEPARTMENT—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Special acts—Continued.									
Federal Reserve banks, loans to industry (Public, No. 417, 73d Cong.)				\$139,299,557					
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	\$378,598,015	\$511,383,219	\$94,740,653	2,289,581,728	\$162,595,000	\$301,425,480	(¹¹)	\$568,022,580	\$156,750,000
Permanent and indefinite	1,161,522,917	1,278,731,138		1,353,494,072		1,529,594,580		1,405,640,300	
Add public works, supplemental, and work relief		94,740,653		162,595,000		(¹¹)		156,750,000	
Grand total	1,540,120,932	1,884,855,010		3,815,670,800		1,831,020,060		2,128,412,880	

¹⁰ Transferred to Farm Credit Administration.
¹¹ Carried as a special allotment for relief (or adjustments) to contractors in Public Works Administration report of May 7, 1934.
¹² Includes \$55,000,000 for refund of taxes.
¹³ Includes \$35,000,000 for tax refunds.
¹⁴ Discontinued and consolidated.
¹⁵ Includes \$108,000,000 for construction.
¹⁶ Includes \$53,200,000 for construction.
¹⁷ Public Buildings has been made the procurement division, Public Works branch. This figure includes:
 Supply branch.....\$225,793
 Public Works branch.....14,064,615
 Repairs and equipment.....2,065,035
 Operating expenses.....1,800,000
 Departmental salaries.....270,000
 Total.....18,425,442
¹⁸ Includes only \$2,000,000 for construction.
¹⁹ Allocations from work-relief appropriations unknown.
²⁰ Interest and surplus.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Departmental (District of Columbia)	\$4,383,275	\$3,746,557		\$3,287,022		\$3,706,664		\$3,996,389	
Field service:									
Postmaster General	3,397,450	3,088,450	\$532,600	2,633,145		3,212,500		3,421,200	
First Assistant	497,817,900	443,616,995		398,046,031		352,395,995		397,790,995	
Second Assistant	254,626,800	221,952,867		213,640,600		313,095,000		318,209,745	
Third Assistant	6,424,750	5,622,775		4,145,940		5,082,150		4,890,000	
Fourth Assistant	39,289,500	35,005,734		47,876,202		50,357,250		52,276,250	
Total, regular	805,939,675	713,033,378	532,600	669,628,940		727,849,569		780,584,589	
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933	13,532								
Second deficiency, 1933	5,196								
Third deficiency, 1933	5,238								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	6,930								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				49,316					
First deficiency, 1935						3,111,750			
Second deficiency, 1935						3,721,067			
Supplemental, 1936								24,871	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								40,632,989	
Total, regular and deficiency	805,970,571	713,033,378	532,600	669,678,256		734,682,386		821,242,449	
Permanent and indefinite	165,000	165,000		165,000					
Add public works		532,600							
Grand total	806,135,571	713,730,978		669,843,256		734,682,386		821,242,449	

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Domestic	\$2,265,540	\$2,017,312		\$1,754,045		\$2,124,030		\$2,277,010	
Foreign	11,398,253	10,179,207	\$4,761,000	12,131,573		¹¹ 11,889,865		15,552,540	
Foreign-pay adjustment				¹² 7,438,000					
Total, regular	13,663,793	12,196,519	4,761,000	21,323,618		¹¹ 14,013,895		17,829,550	
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933	190,000								
Second deficiency, 1933	185,455								
Third deficiency, 1933	435								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	125,048	35,700							

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
DEPARTMENT OF STATE—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Deficiency appropriations—Continued.									
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				\$1,667,264					
First deficiency, 1935						\$500,011			
Second deficiency, 1935						3,412,205			
Supplemental, 1936								\$183,807	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								1,296,783	
Special act:									
Ninth Pan American Sanitary Conference (Pub. Res. 42, 73d Cong.)				3,000					
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	\$14,164,731	\$12,232,219	\$4,761,000	22,903,882		\$17,526,111		12,310,140	
Permanent and indefinite	31,000	31,000		31,000		20,000		20,000	
Add public works		4,761,000							
Grand total	14,195,731	17,024,219		23,024,882		\$17,546,111		19,330,140	

‡ Independent offices bill carried \$3,904,824 for pay of employees abroad account devaluation of dollar.
‡ Additional appropriation for this purpose to legislative establishment transferred to State Department.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Department proper	\$15,413,500	\$13,403,133		\$5,285,430		\$8,951,500		\$10,065,900	
Judicial	18,457,000	17,474,374		14,940,435		16,309,435		17,618,570	
Penal institutions	12,126,500	10,276,543	\$785,512	7,474,913		9,295,565		13,539,455	
Total, regular	45,996,000	41,154,050	785,512	28,700,778		34,556,500		41,223,925	
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933	178,282								
Second deficiency, 1933	1,449								
Third deficiency, 1933	2,016								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	21,223								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				2,462,108					
First deficiency, 1935						942,526			
Second deficiency, 1935						1,142,539			
Supplemental, 1936								1,197,565	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								987,951	
Special acts:									
United States courts, fees (Public Res. No. 82, 74th Cong.)								900,000	
Total, regular and deficiency	46,198,970	41,154,050	785,512	31,162,886		36,641,565		44,309,441	
Permanent and indefinite		800,000		785,000		850,000		947,808	
Add public works		785,512							
Grand total	46,198,970	42,739,562		31,947,886		37,491,565		45,257,249	

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Secretary's office	\$10,271,700	\$3,685,370		\$837,410		\$900,000		\$931,500	
Bureau of Air Commerce ‡			\$2,588,803	5,205,250		5,909,800		6,770,000	
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	3,988,000	3,514,370		2,164,157		2,705,100		2,827,400	
Bureau of the Census	862,125	1,903,000		3,863,500		3,434,000		2,100,500	
Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection	1,476,165	1,405,000	33,043	1,337,752		1,598,000		1,927,500	
Bureau of Standards	2,137,280	2,056,045	100,000	1,436,908		1,802,500		1,854,500	
Bureau of Lighthouses	9,849,280	9,114,600	5,620,334	8,517,373		9,431,000		9,865,600	
Coast and Geodetic Survey	2,399,813	2,205,090	6,503,120	2,126,061		2,360,900		2,505,300	
Bureau of Fisheries	1,976,020	1,765,740	564,500	1,291,537		1,564,200		1,565,920	
Patent Office	4,890,700	4,424,950		4,070,231		4,715,000		4,660,000	
Bureau of Mines	1,860,325	1,514,300	272,800	1,197,926		(*)		(*)	
Shipping Bureau				219,216		† 211,000		249,000	
Total, regular	39,711,408	36,588,465	15,652,600	32,267,321		34,631,500		35,257,220	

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933	\$1,086								
Second deficiency, 1933	200,234								
Third deficiency, 1933	33,346								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	3,921								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				\$537,425					
First deficiency, 1935						\$15,082			
Second deficiency, 1935						92,077			
Supplemental, 1936								\$318,215	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								619,975	
Special act: Emergency Relief and Construction Act (Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.)	5,560,000								
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	45,510,045	\$36,588,465	\$15,652,600	32,804,746		34,738,659		36,195,410	
Permanent and indefinite	3,000	17,000		21,000		110,500		147,450	
Add public works		15,652,600							
Grand total	45,513,045	52,258,065		32,825,746		34,849,159		36,342,860	

¹⁴ Formerly Bureau of Aeronautics.
¹⁵ Transferred to Department of the Interior.
¹⁶ Plus indefinite appropriations.
¹⁷ Does not include \$13,110; later transferred from (Black Bass Act) Independent Offices Appropriation Act.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Secretary's office	\$700,500	\$645,000	\$26,000	\$691,815		\$914,300		\$1,268,500	
Bureau of Labor Statistics	450,000	414,000	10,000	668,720		1,084,600		850,000	
Bureau of Immigration	9,480,000	9,494,000	1,422,980	8,485,000		9,595,000		9,850,000	
Bureau of Naturalization	975,770	890,000		(¹⁸)				(¹⁹)	
Children's Bureau	375,500	344,000		337,030		403,300		6,869,000	
Women's Bureau	160,000	147,000		139,160		153,500		153,200	
Employment Service	765,000	734,865	800,000	2,700,000		3,200,000		2,785,000	
Housing Corporation	14,000	8,500		9,080		9,300		9,000	
Conciliation Service			10,000						
Total, regular	12,920,770	12,677,365	2,268,980	14,030,805		15,360,000		21,784,700	
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933	200,000								
Second deficiency, 1933	450,208								
Third deficiency, 1933	3,500								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	1,532	1,500,000							
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				27,580					
First deficiency, 1935						34,217			
Second deficiency, 1935						338,431			
Supplemental, 1936								3,645,894	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								86,597	
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	13,576,010	14,177,365	2,268,980	14,058,385		15,732,648		25,517,191	
Permanent and indefinite	4,000	4,000		4,000				1,735,000	
Add public works		2,268,980							
Grand total	13,580,010	16,450,345		14,062,385		15,732,648		27,252,191	

¹⁸ Bureau of Immigration and Bureau of Naturalization consolidated into Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

WAR DEPARTMENT

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Military:									
Secretary's office	\$949,310	\$868,184		\$849,892		\$982,028		\$1,035,590	
General Staff	349,034	312,621		282,012		398,061		374,477	
Adjutant General	1,821,767	1,607,753		4,051,570		1,956,483		1,796,630	
Inspector General	28,345	24,467		24,005		27,220		27,340	
Judge Advocate General	113,294	103,542		95,095		107,280		108,240	
Finance	138,346,589	130,155,611		122,867,084		165,303,075		159,032,277	
Quartermaster General	55,263,174	51,227,609	\$71,009,926	44,224,268		50,543,958		68,251,878	
Seacoast defense	2,333,136	2,035,431	²⁰ 7,000,000	1,161,805		1,284,970		8,518,994	
Signal Corps	2,650,895	2,499,129		2,040,520		4,937,410		5,424,019	
Air Corps	25,673,236	23,537,769	7,500,000	27,691,793		45,600,444		59,619,694	
Medical Corps	1,640,489	1,504,189		1,406,333		1,483,176		1,810,853	

[Footnotes at end of table]

Summary of regular, deficiency, and special appropriations—Continued
WAR DEPARTMENT—continued

	Fiscal year 1933 appropriations	Fiscal year 1934		Fiscal year 1935		Fiscal year 1936		Fiscal year 1937	
		Appropriations	Public works allotments	Appropriations	Supplemental appropriations	Appropriations	Work-relief appropriations	Appropriations	Relief and work-relief appropriations
Military—Continued.									
Insular Affairs	\$85,413	\$77,636	\$1,500,000	\$72,035		\$66,300		\$66,400	
Engineer Corps	596,036	540,831		441,284		528,834		659,687	
Ordnance	11,209,014	10,641,340	6,000,000	10,153,204		16,744,578		17,589,549	
Chemical Warfare	1,274,279	1,303,485		1,302,681		1,438,667		1,533,945	
Infantry	67,610	60,583		59,805		63,830		63,830	
Cavalry	21,000	19,600		19,432		21,000		23,755	
Field Artillery	25,000	24,220		23,718		24,654		27,191	
Coast Artillery	53,720	50,965		49,679		53,680		54,180	
Military Academy	2,394,808	2,344,584		2,193,260		2,357,256		3,092,104	
Militia Bureau	31,413,869	35,621,498	2,238,624	28,075,034		34,130,866		28,004,550	
Organized Reserves	6,354,348	6,354,348		4,278,859		6,372,178		8,574,195	
C. M. T. C.	6,692,008	5,975,431		4,117,601		6,461,204		6,869,746	
National Board for Rifle Practice	139,150	159,465		145,178		491,054		545,726	
Motorization			\$10,000,000						
Total, military	289,500,024	277,050,381	105,248,550	255,526,147		341,348,204		383,104,859	
Nonmilitary:									
Quartermaster Corps	1,131,049	1,109,675		715,927		760,341		916,990	
Signal Corps	161,285	160,772	176,170	146,055		156,753		163,338	
Engineer Corps	94,139,494	60,413,517	\$255,928,208	53,307,936		50,135,926	\$136,693,169	176,178,008	\$128,250,000
Panama Canal	11,146,661	11,106,404	1,000,000	6,532,926		8,797,597		11,122,944	
United States Soldiers' Home						799,349		799,105	
High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands								161,600	
Total, nonmilitary	106,578,489	72,790,368	257,104,378	60,702,844		60,649,966	136,693,169	189,341,985	128,250,000
Total, regular	396,078,513	349,840,749	362,352,928	316,228,991		401,998,170	136,693,169	572,446,844	128,250,000
Deficiency appropriations:									
First deficiency, 1933	4,198								
Second deficiency, 1933	326,546								
Third deficiency, 1933	786,512								
Fourth deficiency, 1933	208,161								
Deficiency, 1934 and 1935				1,121,709					
First deficiency, 1935						8,017,083			
Second deficiency, 1935						23,093,661			
Supplemental, 1936								794,843	
First deficiency and supplemental, 1936 and 1937								10,456,869	
Special acts:									
Emergency Relief and Construction Act (Public, No. 302, 72d Cong.):									
Military, Quartermaster General	15,164,000								
Nonmilitary, Engineer Corps	45,500,000								
Urgent deficiency resolution (Public Res. 23, 73d Cong.)				150,000					
Fort Niagara celebration (Public Res. 50, 73d Cong.)				6,000					
Total, regular, deficiency, and special	458,067,930	349,840,749	362,352,928	317,506,700		433,108,914	136,693,169	583,698,556	128,250,000
Permanent and indefinite	12,576,540	12,462,500		11,803,900				1,937,700	
Add public works and public relief		362,352,928						128,250,000	
Grand total	470,644,470	724,656,177		329,310,600		571,530,785		713,886,256	

* Carried in Public Works Administration report of May 7, 1934, under War Department.

† In addition there are reappropriations totaling \$2,845,925.

‡ Engineer Corps:

Flood control	\$69,187,000
Rivers and harbors	179,741,208
Seacoast defense	7,000,000

Total 255,928,208

§ Actually allocated as of Aug. 28, 1935.

LEGISLATION FOR ALASKA

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress is now drawing to a close. I feel impelled, before final adjournment, to express to the Members of Congress, both my colleagues in the House and the Members of the Senate, my deep sense of obligation for the uniform courtesy and consideration which I have received from all, and the aid that has been extended to me as the representative of the people of Alaska. The generally careful and sympathetic attention given to Alaskan matters is proved by the volume of legislation particularly concerning Alaska which has been enacted by Congress in the past 3 years.

It is scarcely necessary to say that all of the measures which I introduced and advocated for the benefit of Alaska

were not passed by Congress. Indeed some of the most important of them failed of report by committee and so never came to the floor of the House for action, but I realize that some of these measures were highly controversial and that with the burden of other affairs put upon them, Members of Congress have not the time to devote intimate detailed study to the merits of every bill which is introduced. When we realize that during the present Congress more than 13,000 bills were introduced in the House and nearly 4,800 in the Senate, it is apparent that only measures which are deemed most important may be adequately considered. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of modest pride that I am able to report that during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses, 57 individual bills have been passed and

approved specially relating to Alaska or for the benefit of the citizens thereof and this does not include the extremely large number of general bills which directly affect the well-being of the people of the Territory.

Of course, it would not have been possible to secure the enactment of these bills without the cordial and sympathetic cooperation of the Members of both Houses and for that cooperation and for the treatment I have received here I am profoundly grateful, and I am sure that the people whom I have the honor to represent feel a like measure of gratitude.

In order to show more in detail what has been done for Alaska by the special legislation for the Territory enacted since March 4, 1933, I shall refer briefly to the several individual measures so enacted.

Public, No. 128, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 26, 1934, fixing the date for holding elections of a Delegate from Alaska to the House of Representatives and of members of the Legislature of Alaska; fixing the date on which the Legislature of Alaska shall hereafter meet; prescribing the personnel of the Territorial canvassing board, defining its duties, and for other purposes.

This act is of real importance to the Territory. It provides that general elections in the Territory shall be held on the second Tuesday in September in the year 1934 and on the second Tuesday in September every second year thereafter, and it further provides that the sessions of the legislature of the Territory shall convene on the second Monday in January in the year 1935 and the second Monday in January every second year thereafter. The holding of sessions of the legislature in January and February and early March rather than in March and April and extending over into early May greatly serves the convenience of the members who are chosen for the legislature and generally meets the convenience of the people of Alaska. This act contains further provisions with respect to the official actions of the canvassing board and also embraces the following provision materially enlarging the authority of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, to wit:

That the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska shall have the power from time to time as the need therefor may arise, to change the date of general elections in the said Territory, including the date of election of a Delegate from the Territory of Alaska to the House of Representatives and of the members of the Territorial Legislature, and that the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska shall also have the power by law to change from time to time the personnel of the canvassing board, the dates of its meetings, and may prescribe its duties.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the Alaska Legislature now has power to change the date of elections and also has authority to change from time to time the personnel of the canvassing board, the dates of its meetings, and may prescribe its duties.

Public, No. 134, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 27, 1934, granting abandoned public buildings and grounds at Sitka, Alaska, to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The people of Alaska, through the Territorial Legislature, had expressed their approval of the construction of a new Pioneers' Home at Sitka. The old home and the land on which it was situated belonged to the Federal Government. Before the new home was built it became necessary to secure a transfer of the Government property to the Territory of Alaska, and that object was accomplished by the act above mentioned. The act contains a provision to the effect that the Territory shall never sell or otherwise dispose of any part of said property and that if the same shall ever be abandoned for the uses therein declared, namely, a home for the aged, sick, and infirm pioneers and residents of the Territory, the premises shall revert to the United States.

Upon the passage and approval of the act the Territory, with the aid of funds furnished by the Public Works Administration, constructed a really fine and modern home for the pioneers at Sitka and all of it is now Territorial property.

Public, No. 158, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 13, 1934, to repeal an act of Congress entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the

Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved February 14, 1917, and for other purposes.

This act is more than an act for the repeal of the prohibition laws concerning intoxicating liquor. It is another act conferring larger legislative powers upon the Alaska Territorial Legislature. The prohibition laws were repealed, and the Alaska Territorial Legislature was granted full authority to legislate concerning the sale, disposal, and use of intoxicating liquor.

Public, No. 166, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 16, 1934, to amend sections 3 and 4 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska", approved June 26, 1906, as amended by the act of Congress approved June 6, 1924, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this act was to permit the actual bona-fide residents along the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers to take king salmon from said rivers for commercial purposes. Under the act the fishing is limited to inhabitants and the act provides that no person shall be deemed a bona-fide permanent inhabitant of said rivers who has not resided thereon or within 50 miles thereof for a period of over 1 year. The fishing rights are granted to both native and white inhabitants. Under this act limited catches of king salmon have been packed on both rivers during the past 2 years. Last fall a large cannery was planned to be operated at the mouth of the Yukon River during 1936 and thereafter, but I believed that such an extensive operation would deprive the natives of the upper river of fish, and therefore I opposed the plan and it was finally abandoned.

Public, No. 173, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 25, 1934, to authorize the incorporated city of Juneau, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including regrading and paving of streets and sidewalks, installation of sewer and water pipes, bridge construction and replacement, construction of concrete bulkheads, and construction of refuse incinerator, and for such purposes, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$103,000.

Under the provisions of this act the city of Juneau made application to the Public Works Administration for a loan and grant. The application was approved and the public works described in the act were constructed. This was one of the first public-works projects put into construction in the Territory of Alaska.

Public, No. 174, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 25, 1934, to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to construct, reconstruct, replace, and install a water-distribution system and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000.

The water system of the city of Skagway, prior to the passage of this act, was in very poor condition. Under circumstances existing in 1934 it seemed impossible for the city of Skagway to borrow sufficient money from private sources to reconstruct its water-supply system. Through the passage of this act a loan and grant was made to the city of Skagway by the Public Works Administration and so the water system was entirely rebuilt and the city now has a fine system. The passage of this act and the construction done thereunder exemplify the very large value of the Public Works Administration to many of the municipal corporations of Alaska as well as to the Territory as a whole.

Public, No. 175, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 25, 1934, to authorize the incorporated town of Wrangell, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements of its water-supply system; construction of a retaining wall and to backfill behind same to make a permanent street; and construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements to sewers, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$51,000.

The city of Wrangell under the act above mentioned has rebuilt its water-supply system and undertaken other public improvements greatly to the advantage of the people of the city. But for the passage of this act and the aid given

by the Public Works Administration the city would still be faced with an inadequate water supply.

Private, No. 75, Seventy-third Congress, approved April 26, 1934, to authorize the waiver or remission of certain coal-lease rentals, and for other purposes.

This act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to waive or remit all rentals due the United States and charged against the Alaska Matanuska Coal Co. during the period the company was out of possession and prevented from operating a coal mine which it held under lease from the Government, because the same was in the hands of a receiver appointed by the United States Court for the District of Alaska.

Public, No. 196, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 3, 1934, to authorize the sale of land and houses at Anchorage, Alaska.

The United States Government, through the Alaska Railroad, owned a number of dwelling houses at Anchorage, Alaska, which were rented to employees of the railroad. While the rents were not high, the employees frequently made improvements but could not be compensated therefor nor could they be given any assurance that the lease of these homes would be permanent. It was deemed better to sell the houses to those who occupied them and hence the act was passed. In operation it has worked well and has enabled a number of the employees of the railroad to own their own homes.

Public, No. 200, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 4, 1934, to repeal an act of Congress entitled "An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved August 1, 1912.

By act of Congress approved August 1, 1912, and an amendatory act approved March 3, 1925, special provisions were made with respect to the location and holding of placer-mining claims in Alaska. Most of the people of Alaska believed that any such laws should be enacted by the Territorial legislature rather than by Congress, thus increasing the scope of the self-governing powers of the people of the Territory. Accordingly, the act above referred to was passed repealing the special act of August 1, 1912, and the amendatory act. The act so passed contained a provision that it should take effect 30 days subsequent to the date of convening of the first regular session of the Alaska Territorial Legislature held after the passage of the act. Within that time the Alaska Legislature enacted a law governing the location and holding of placer-mining claims in the Territory.

Public, No. 210, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakatla Indians of Alaska.

This act needs little explanation. Under the general law it was not possible for the Metlakatla Indians who were born in Canada to become citizens of the United States. Without exception they were very anxious to become citizens and exercise the rights thereof. Hence I introduced a bill for this purpose and it was duly enacted into law. The act contains a provision that the granting of citizenship to the Indians should not in any manner affect the rights, individual or collective, of the Indians to any property.

Public, No. 260, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 26, 1934, to amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for right-of-way for railroads in the District of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved May 14, 1898, as amended.

The enactment of this measure filled a long-felt need of some more simple form of securing small homesteads in the Territory. It provides in substance that any citizen of the United States after occupying land of the character described as a homestead or headquarters, in a habitable house, not less than 5 months each year for 3 years, may purchase such tract not exceeding 5 acres without any showing as to employment or business upon the payment of \$2.50 an acre, and that the surveys thereof shall be made without expense to the applicant.

Public, No. 292, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 6, 1934, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes."

By the passage of this measure the laws of Alaska concerning the payment of acreage rentals on Government coal lands were made identical with the laws existing elsewhere in the United States. The act provides that in the event the Secretary of the Interior shall direct or assent to the suspension of operation or production of coal under any coal lease the acreage rental shall be likewise suspended.

Private, No. 214, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 8, 1934, for making compensation to the estate of Nellie Lamson.

Under this act \$325 was paid by the Government to Frank A. Lamson, administrator of the estate of Nellie Lamson, of Lower Tonsina, deceased, as compensation for the loss of 19 foxes which were killed as the result of dynamite blasting on the homestead of Nellie Lamson by employees of the Alaska Road Commission on May 2, 1931.

Public, No. 372, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 16, 1934, to repeal certain laws providing for the protection of sea lions in Alaska waters.

Prior to the passage of this act sea lions in Alaska waters were protected. They caused great damage both in consumption of salmon and in destruction of seines. Accordingly the act was passed to repeal the laws providing for the protection of sea lions and granting the Secretary of Commerce power to prescribe regulations in order to prevent the total extinction of sea lions.

Public, No. 388, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 18, 1934, authorizing the control of floods in the Salmon River, Alaska.

Salmon River flows through the town of Hyder, and in years past floods of the river have caused serious damage in the town. The act mentioned authorizes an appropriation of \$53,000 for the control of the floods. This act was the only act of that nature which passed Congress during the first session of the Seventy-third Congress. After its passage I presented the matter to the Public Works Administration and that administration allotted the money and the work was undertaken and completed. The Territory contributed \$7,000 for the project. As a result of the work done the town of Hyder should be safe from floods for many years to come.

Public, No. 399, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 18, 1934, to authorize the incorporated town of Douglas City, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements of its water-supply system; and construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements to sewers, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000.

By the passage of this act the Public Works Administration was enabled to make a loan and grant to the city of Douglas, Alaska, of \$40,000, with which the water-supply system of the city was reconstructed and improved. But for the passage of the act and the aid of the Public Works Administration the project could not have been undertaken.

Public, No. 401, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 18, 1934, to authorize the incorporated town of Fairbanks, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including construction, reconstruction, and extension of sidewalks; construction, reconstruction, and extension of sewers, and construction of a combined city-hall and fire-department building, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$50,000.

This is an act authorizing the city of Fairbanks to incur bonded indebtedness. Again, the Public Works Administration made the usual loan and grant, of which 70 percent was in the form of a loan bearing 4-percent interest and 30 percent an outright grant, for the construction of municipal improvements. The work has been completed and is satisfactory in every respect.

Private, No. 387, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 26, 1934, for the relief of Erik Nylin.

Erik Nylin, while in the employ of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, suffered severe injury at Elim, Alaska. As a result of such injuries he became crippled for life. Unfortunately, through lack of knowledge of law, he failed to make application in time to the United States Compensation Commission. This act permitted him to do so, and he is now receiving the compensation to which he is entitled.

The foregoing embraces all of the special acts affecting only Alaska which were passed and approved during the Seventy-third Congress. The following were enacted by the Seventy-fourth Congress and approved:

Private, No. 34, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 10, 1935, for the relief of C. H. Hoogendorn.

This act makes an appropriation of \$1,500 to C. H. Hoogendorn, of Petersburg, Alaska, in full settlement of his claims against the Government of the United States for the loss of the gas boat *Comrade* while under charter by the Department of Agriculture. The loss occurred some years ago, and finally the act for the relief of Mr. Hoogendorn was passed.

Public, No. 59, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 15, 1935, to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes.

By act of Congress approved July 3, 1930, the city of Ketchikan was authorized to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring certain public-utilities properties situated in the city of Ketchikan, embracing particularly the electric-light plant. The city, under the provisions of this act, sought to purchase the public-utilities properties but before the transfer could be consummated the company endeavored by legal action to enjoin the purchase, the action being based upon some alleged defects and insufficiencies in the act of July 3, 1930, and in the proceedings thereunder. In order to permit the city to acquire and operate these very valuable public-utility properties it became necessary to pass the act above mentioned validating all things done under the act of 1930, and further defining and clarifying the provisions of that act. It seems clear that the city would never have been able to take over the public utilities of Ketchikan unless this last act had been passed. Upon the passage of this act the suit brought to enjoin the transfer was abandoned, the city took over the public-utility properties and is operating them in successful fashion, just another example of the great good that can be accomplished for the benefit of the citizens of any community through the acquisition and operation of its public utilities.

Public, No. 63, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 20, 1935, concerning the incorporated town of Seward, Territory of Alaska.

By this act the town of Seward, Alaska, was authorized to issue bonds and apply for grants for the construction of a municipal electric system. Under the provisions of this act loan and grant in the total sum of \$166,000 have been made to the city by the Public Works Administration for the purpose of constructing the electric system authorized by the act.

Public, No. 70, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 24, 1935, to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The purpose of this act is to bring Alaska within the benefits of section 5296 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, commonly known as the poor-convicts law. Under that law persons imprisoned for failure to pay fine or costs may, after serving 30 days of the term of such imprisonment, make affidavit of inability to pay the fine or costs and thereupon be released. Prior to the passage of this act it was held that section 5296 did not extend to Alaska. The whole tendency of modern thought opposes imprisonment for debt, and to imprison one for nonpayment of fine or costs because he is poor is really an imprisonment for debt. While the passage

of the act was opposed upon the ground that fines imposed by the courts of Alaska would not be as readily collected unless the persons upon whom the fines were imposed were threatened with imprisonment for nonpayment, Congress enacted the law and it was approved by the President.

Public, No. 71, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 24, 1935, to ratify and confirm the corporate existence of the city of Nome, Alaska, and to authorize it to undertake certain municipal public works, including the construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvement of its sewers and drains, fire-fighting system, streets and alleys, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and a municipal building, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000.

As is well known, the city of Nome, Alaska, suffered a disastrous fire in the fall of 1934. Practically the entire business section of the city, including all public buildings, was destroyed. In order to rehabilitate the city it became necessary to secure funds without delay. Accordingly this act was passed authorizing the city to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for public improvements of several kinds. The Public Works Administration advanced the money and the sum has now all been expended to the great benefit and advantage of the city.

In addition to the foregoing it may be of interest to note that immediately after the fire the Federal Emergency Relief Administration advanced \$50,000 for relief and placed the same in the hands of the Governor for expenditure. In fact the embers were not cold when the Governor had the money and it was actually expended under the direction of a committee of the citizens of Nome. All reports available indicate that all money, both the \$50,000 furnished by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the \$100,000 furnished by the Public Works Administration, was wisely and economically expended and went a long way to relieve the people of Nome from the effects of the fire, although most of them suffered very severe losses.

Public, No. 78, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 28, 1935, to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks, the construction and improvement of sewers, and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$35,000.

This is another municipal-bond bill passed in order to permit the city of Petersburg, Alaska, to avail itself of the benefits granted through the Public Works Administration. The amount of the loan so authorized was \$35,000, the proceeds of both loan and grant to be used generally for construction and improvement of streets, and so forth.

Public, No. 79, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 28, 1935, to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$30,000, and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works.

For many years the town of Valdez, Alaska, has needed a new public-school building, but no funds could be obtained for such construction. Upon the passage of this act the Public Works Administration made an adequate loan and grant, the amount of the loan being limited to \$30,000, and the construction of the school building is now going forward, another instance where a necessary public improvement could not have been undertaken without the passage of an act of Congress and the assistance furnished by the Public Works Administration.

Private, No. 81, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 14, 1935, 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.

Mr. and Mrs. D. E. Stubbs were engaged in the business of raising silver foxes near McKinley Park when an act of Congress was passed enlarging the park so as to surround

their fox ranch. As a result they were obliged to sell off all their foxes and move away, thus losing largely the benefit of their investment. By this act they are authorized to bring suit in the Court of Claims for the recovery of the loss so sustained. The suit has been commenced, and it is expected that trial will be had and decision rendered within a few months from date.

Public, No. 86, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 31, 1935, to amend section 128 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The United States Judicial Code was largely amended in 1925. The amendments then made provided for appeal of criminal cases from the District Courts of the United States to the Circuit Courts of Appeal, but as to Alaska, appeals in criminal cases were limited to such cases wherein the Constitution or a statute or treaty of the United States or any authority exercised thereunder were involved, or where the offense charged was punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year or by death, and in all habeas-corpus proceedings. Under this law one convicted of a misdemeanor in the District Court of Alaska could not appeal to the Circuit Court of Appeals. This was unjust and out of harmony with the law governing the other United States courts. So the act above mentioned was passed providing for appeals from the District Court of Alaska in all criminal cases.

Private, No. 90, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 17, 1935, for the relief of John E. Click.

John E. Click was employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Seattle, Wash. He was ordered to go to Alaska and given assurance that his transportation would be paid. In fact, it was paid, but the Comptroller General refused to approve the voucher and ordered Mr. Click to reimburse the Government. Under all the circumstances it was clear that he should not be obliged to so reimburse the Government and by the passage of this act he is released from all liability in that respect. The amount of the claim was \$261.82.

Public, No. 152, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 19, 1935, authorizing the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska to bring suit in the United States Court of Claims, and conferring jurisdiction upon said court to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment upon any and all claims which said Indians may have, or claim to have, against the United States, and for other purposes.

This is one of the most important bills for Alaska enacted in many years. It authorizes the Tlingit and Haida Indians to bring suit in the Court of Claims for recovery of compensation for the property rights of which they have been deprived. While the bill met with some opposition in Congress, it was finally passed and duly approved. Preparations are now being made for the institution and trial of the suit so authorized.

Public, No. 189, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved July 1, 1935, authorizing a preliminary examination of the Tanana River and Chena Slough, Alaska.

The floods which occur in Chena Slough flowing between Fairbanks and Garden Island do much damage. The bank in one place is being washed away and it is feared that buildings may be destroyed. This bill authorizes a preliminary examination so that protective work may be eventually undertaken and the town of Fairbanks and Garden Island preserved from the ravages of the floodwaters of the slough.

Public, No. 211, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved July 19, 1935, to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Nome, Alaska.

The city of Nome as originally laid out was very irregular in shape; the streets were narrow and crooked. When the fire occurred in 1934, the citizens unanimously decided that it would be advisable in rebuilding the city to straighten the streets and make them much wider. Accordingly, all of the property was transferred to a trustee and then reallocated. This bill makes changes in the lands owned by the Federal Government, granting some to the city of Nome so, as now laid out, the city properties are in much better shape and the buildings constructed thereon more easily protected against fire.

Public, No. 235, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 3, 1935, to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to construct a municipal building and purchase and install a modern telephone exchange, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$75,000; and to authorize said city to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works.

This bill is adequately described in the title. Application was made to the Public Works Administration for a grant and loan, but afterwards the application for the loan was withdrawn and the bonds of the city were sold locally. However, the Public Works Administration made the usual grant and the building is now under construction.

Public, No. 297, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 21, 1935, to authorize the incorporated town of Cordova, Alaska, to construct, reconstruct, enlarge, extend, improve, renew, and repair certain municipal public structures, utilities, works, and improvements, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any amount not exceeding \$50,000, and for other purposes.

This bill also is sufficiently described by title. The Public Works Administration made the usual loan and grant and the work is now under way.

Public, No. 317, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for air-mail service in Alaska.

This act is important by reason of the extension of air transportation, and particularly of air-mail service in Alaska. The act is an amendment of an act of Congress passed many years ago authorizing the Postmaster General to provide for difficult or emergency mail service in Alaska. The new part of the law reads as follows:

and he (the Postmaster General) is authorized, in his discretion, to contract, after advertisement in accordance with law, for the carriage of all classes of mail within the Territory of Alaska, by airplane, payment therefor to be made from the appropriation for star-route service in Alaska.

It was by reason of the passage of this act that the Bureau of the Budget approved an estimate of a sum in excess of \$242,000 for additional air-mail service in Alaska for the current fiscal year. Although approved by the Budget, the House of Representatives struck out the increased amount. At the time the bill was under consideration I offered an amendment to restore the full amount, but upon division the amendment was voted down. I then went to the Senate and had the item incorporated in the bill in the Senate, but when the bill went to conference the increased amount desired was again lost. When the deficiency bill was under consideration, the Senate, upon my request, again inserted the item, but in conference it was again stricken. However, I feel confident that the Members of Congress now understand the situation more clearly and that at the coming session of Congress in January a substantial sum will be granted for improved service of mail by air in the Territory.

Public, No. 345, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 26, 1935, relative to the proposed survey, location, and construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of continental United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and the Territory of Alaska.

Under this act the President is requested to negotiate and enter into an agreement or agreements between the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the survey, location, and construction of what is commonly known as the International Highway through British Columbia and Yukon Territory into Alaska, to connect with the Richardson Highway, and in cooperation with the Government of the Dominion of Canada to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the most practicable route for such highway, as well as specifications and estimates of the probable cost thereof and plans for financing its construction and maintenance. Further provisions of the act authorize the President, upon the conclusion of the negotiations and the execution of the agreement or agreements, to designate such existing agency of the Government of the United States as he may select for this purpose, or such officials or agency as he

may specially appoint or create, to carry on the work of survey and location thereof after such route shall have been determined. As originally introduced, the bill authorized an appropriation to construct that part of the highway which lies in the Territory of Alaska, but during course of passage in Congress the authorization for an appropriation was stricken out upon the objection of the Director of the Budget. Negotiations with the Canadian authorities are now going on and it is expected that a plan will be in shape to present to Congress at the coming session in January.

Private, No. 303, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 26, 1935, for the relief of Joe Reno.

Joe Reno, a resident of Anchorage, Alaska, signed a bond for the admission of an alien to the United States, guaranteeing that she would depart from the United States within a specified time. Before the period for departure arrived the alien died, but the fact of her death was not discovered until many months later. In the meantime the bond was forfeited and the money was deposited in the Treasury of the United States. Clearly Mr. Reno was not liable on the bond, because the alien had died before the time of departure arrived. By this act Mr. Reno was reimbursed for the amount he so paid, namely, \$500. The bond was forfeited in 1921, but Congress had never before taken any action upon the several bills which had been introduced for Mr. Reno's relief.

Public, No. 334, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 26, 1935, to reenact section 463 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to define and punish crime in the District of Alaska and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district", approved March 3, 1899, and for other purposes.

This bill is aptly described in its title. By error in drafting a certain provision of the act concerning the collection of Federal taxes in Alaska, section 463, above referred to, was repealed and so the reenactment of such section, while probably not necessary, became advisable.

Public, No. 465, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 2, 1936, to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$12,000, and for other purposes.

By the provisions of Public, No. 174, Seventy-third Congress, mentioned previously, the city of Skagway was authorized to issue bonds for any sum not exceeding \$40,000 for reconstruction and repair of its water supply system. Only \$30,000 of the bonds so authorized were actually issued, and \$2,000 of the issue was promptly called and retired, leaving \$28,000 outstanding. By the provisions of Public, No. 465, Seventy-fourth Congress, the city was authorized to issue an additional \$12,000 in bonds for street improvements with the provision that the total bond issue of the city under this act and prior acts of Congress should not exceed \$40,000.

Public, No. 483, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 21, 1936, to extend the facilities of the Public Health Service to seamen on Government vessels not in the Military or Naval Establishments.

By this act the facilities of the Public Health Service have been extended to seamen on Government vessels not in the Military or Naval Establishments. All seamen in the Merchant Marine are entitled to the Public Health Service but those benefits have in the past been denied to seamen on the Forest Service vessels, the Bureau of Indian Affairs vessels, and some other Government vessels in Alaska and elsewhere. Under this act those formerly excluded from the benefits of the Public Health Service are taken care of, which is only fair and just.

Private, No. 452, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved April 10, 1936, for the relief of Thomas F. Gardiner.

Thomas F. Gardiner is a respected old-time resident of Dillingham, Alaska. Some years ago he entered into a contract for the transportation of one of the superintendents of the Bureau of Education from Kanatak to Bristol Bay. Owing to unavoidable delays the superintendent left Kanatak before Mr. Gardiner arrived. Thereupon, the Comptroller General refused to pay the account. After much

correspondence with the Comptroller General, he finally recommended to Congress the passage of a bill granting to Mr. Gardiner \$200.50. Accordingly I introduced a bill to that effect and it was passed in due course. In my judgment, Mr. Gardiner was clearly entitled to a substantially larger sum but we were obliged to accept \$200.50 since it seemed hopeless to secure the passage of a bill for a larger amount.

Public, No. 538, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 1, 1936: To extend certain provisions of the act approved June 18, 1934, commonly known as the Wheeler-Howard Act (Public Law No. 383, 73d Cong., 48 Stat. 984), to the Territory of Alaska, to provide for the designation of Indian reservations in Alaska, and for other purposes.

Under the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act, which was approved June 18, 1934, economic aid is authorized to be given to the Indians of the United States to assist them in establishing cooperative enterprises for their own benefit and welfare. Through an inadvertent error made in conference between the House and Senate, Alaska was not included within certain provisions of the act. The measure above mentioned brings Alaska fully within the benefits of the Wheeler-Howard Act, and it seems bound to result in very large benefits to the Indians and Eskimos of the Territory. At the present time it is estimated that approximately \$600,000 will be available for the natives of Alaska to be used in cooperative business enterprises. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is now preparing to set up an organization in Alaska for the administration of the act.

Private, No. 488, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 4, 1936, for the relief of Edith H. Miller.

This bill is similar to Private, No. 90, Seventy-fourth Congress, above described. Arthur H. Miller, now deceased, was in the employ of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and it was agreed that the transportation expense should be paid when he was ordered to Alaska. The Comptroller General refused to pay the account in the sum of \$127.64. By this act, Mrs. Miller, the widow and sole heir at law of her deceased husband, has been paid the amount involved.

Private, No. 507, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 5, 1936, for the relief of Archie P. McLane and Hans Peter Jensen.

Archie P. McLane and Hans Peter Jensen, of Kasilof, Alaska, were sureties on the bond of a postmaster. The postmaster died and another person acted as postmaster for about 8 months thereafter without any formal appointment. Mr. McLane and Mr. Jensen paid the postmaster's compensation, but the Comptroller General refused to approve it. Accordingly they were obliged to pay the amount, \$143.55, into the Treasury. This act reimburses them in that sum, since the Government really had the benefit of the service of the acting postmaster and he was entitled to the compensation which he received.

Private, No. 526, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 6, 1936, for the relief of Anchorage Commercial Co., Inc.

The Anchorage Commercial Co., Inc., sold merchandise to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for use at Eklutna, Alaska. Some defect occurred in the preparation of the vouchers and so the Comptroller General refused to approve the account. It therefore became necessary to introduce and have passed the act above mentioned which appropriated for payment to the company the sum of \$307.21.

Public, No. 569, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 6, 1936, to authorize a survey of Lowell Creek, Alaska, to determine what, if any, modification should be made in the existing project for the control of its floods.

Lowell Creek is a steep mountain stream which flows through the town of Seward, Alaska. Some years ago a large flume was built to carry the waters of the stream through the town and thus avoid damage to the property of the town during flood periods. In the fall of 1935 a disastrous flood occurred, the flume became clogged, and the flood waters did much damage. The electric light plant which serves the town was flooded and was out of commission for several days. It now appears that some other

method will have to be found for disposal of the flood waters of the stream. The act above mentioned authorizes a survey to determine what method should be adopted to protect the town of Seward from the Lowell Creek floods, the survey to be made under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Public, No. 572, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 6, 1936, authorizing a preliminary examination of the Matanuska River in the vicinity of Matanuska, Alaska.

This is another flood-control project. A survey has been authorized with a view eventually of taking whatever measures are necessary to prevent damage through the floods of the Matanuska River.

Private, No. 575, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 21, 1936, for the relief of Holy Cross Mission Hospital.

Several years ago a man taking mail from the Alaska Railroad steamship *Nenana*, on the Yukon River, was injured. The master of the ship took him to Holy Cross Mission Hospital. The Comptroller General refused to approve payment of the account, and therefore it became necessary to secure passage of the act to pay to the hospital the sum of \$50, the amount of the bill.

Public, No. 626, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved May 28, 1936, to authorize municipal corporations in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes.

This act embodies another measure of self-government for Alaska, since it authorizes municipal corporations in the Territory to incur bonded indebtedness without securing in each case an authorizing act of Congress. Under the provisions of the act any municipal corporation may incur bonded indebtedness not to exceed 10 percent of the aggregate taxable value of the real and personal property of the city.

Private, No. 646, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 20, 1936, for the relief of Frank A. Boyle.

Frank A. Boyle, of Juneau, Alaska, while holding the office of United States commissioner at that place a number of years ago, sustained serious injuries in the course of his employment. The act above mentioned appropriates in full compensation for such injuries the sum of \$2,500.

Private, No. 683, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 24, 1936, for the relief of May Wynne Lamb.

During the influenza epidemic in Alaska in 1918, Dr. Frank W. Lamb, who was employed by the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, was requested by Governor Riggs to visit the lower Yukon and give whatever relief was possible to the natives of that place. Dr. Lamb unhesitatingly complied with the request and did render fine service for aid of the natives, but he, himself, contracted the influenza while serving them and after a few days' illness died. Since he occupied the position of an "officer of the United States" and not that of an "employee of the United States" his widow was held not entitled to compensation under the Employees Compensation Act. Accordingly, I introduced a bill which, if passed as written, would have given Mrs. Lamb the benefits of the Employees Compensation Act. The House Claims Committee deemed that the passage of the bill as written would establish a bad policy, and so the bill was amended in committee and provided for the payment to Mrs. Lamb as compensation for the death of her husband the sum of \$5,000. In this form the bill passed both House and Senate, and was approved by the President.

Private, No. 698, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 24, 1936, for the relief of the estate of Hans Ditmanson, deceased.

Hans Ditmanson was postmaster at Gulkana, Alaska, and, while occupying that office, died. The work was carried on by his assistant for some time before a new postmaster was appointed. The Comptroller General refused to approve payment of the account for the service performed between the date of the death of Mr. Ditmanson and the appointment of his successor. Accordingly, the passage of this act was necessary, reimbursing the estate in the amount involved, namely, \$99.73.

Private, No. 699, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 24, 1936, for the relief of the estate of Henry Copple, deceased.

This is another act to grant payment for services rendered between the date of the death of one postmaster and the date of the appointment of his successor; the amount involved being \$215.02, and the post office, Kotzebue, Alaska.

Private, No. 700, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 24, 1936, for the relief of the estate of Fred Wilkins, deceased.

This act is similar to the two last above mentioned and grants compensation for the services of an acting postmaster between the time of the death of the postmaster of Richardson, Alaska, Fred Wilkins, deceased, and the date of the appointment of his successor, the amount being \$121.38.

Public, No. 725, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 20, 1936, to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

This act extends to the Territory of Alaska the benefits of two agricultural-experiment station acts and one agricultural-extension act. These acts, as originally passed, embraced the 48 States only. Later special laws were enacted extending the benefits, first, to the Territory of Hawaii and, later, to Puerto Rico. Alaska was left out. Public, 725, grants Alaska a fair share of the benefits now enjoyed by the 48 States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The act was passed too late in the session to secure an appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, but under the act there is authorized for the year ending June 30, 1938, an appropriation of \$12,500. These authorizations increase from year to year until for the year 1947 and for each year thereafter Alaska may receive a total annual appropriation of \$37,500 for agricultural-experiment station work, and after the year 1940 a total appropriation of \$10,000 for agricultural-extension work. The enactment of this law has long been sought, but it was not until the closing days of the present session that it was passed.

Public, No. 750, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 22, 1936, to permit mining within the Glacier Bay National Monument.

Glacier Bay National Monument was created by an Executive order made by President Coolidge some years ago. Under the Executive order prospecting and mining were forbidden within the boundaries of the monument. Joe Ibach, and possibly others, had located claims prior to the making of the Executive order and those claims were valid, but it was found impracticable to work them in view of the restrictions set up by the creation of the monument. This act provides that in the area within the Glacier Bay National Monument in Alaska, or as it may hereafter be extended, all mineral deposits of the classes and kinds now subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States shall be, exclusive of the land containing them, subject to disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals and under such general regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Public, No. 836, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States.

This, the final law affecting Alaska passed at the Seventy-fourth Congress, provides retirement for the employees of the Alaska Railroad. In the past, with the exception of a very few who had civil-service status, the employees of the Alaska Railroad enjoyed no retirement benefits whatever, being in that respect under a disadvantage as compared with many others of the employees of the United States. The act in question grants to the employees of the Alaska Railroad the same retirement benefits that have been granted to the employees of the United States on the Panama Railroad and generally in the Canal Zone. In fact the act passed for Alaska is almost a word for word copy of the Canal Zone Act, having only such changes made therein as are necessary to apply the provisions of the Canal Zone

Act to the Alaska Railroad. The benefits granted by the Canal Zone Act are somewhat more generous than those granted by the Civil Service Retirement Act. However, in order to secure passage of the act it was necessary to follow the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who advised that the clerical employees of the railroad be granted the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act rather than those of the Canal Zone Retirement Act.

It seems probable that the clerical employees of the railroad will be brought within the classified civil service at a comparatively early date. At all events, it was necessary either to follow the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget or else give up all attempts to secure the passage of any retirement act for the Alaska Railroad employees. By passage of this act a number of the older employees of the railroad who have worked on the railroad from the early days of its construction will be able to retire, and thus employment may be given to a corresponding number of other persons. The act embodies a carefully worked out system for retirement. It applies to those who have worked at least 15 years on the Alaska Railroad. The retirement age is fixed at 62 years. Under the civil-service retirement system the operating employees of the railroad would not reach retirement age until 65. An employee of the Alaska Railroad who has reached the age of 62 years and who has worked 30 years on the railroad would be entitled to an annuity of \$1,125 a year plus such annuity as would be purchased with his own contribution of 5 percent of his earnings over the same period, plus also the sum of \$36 multiplied by the number of years he worked on the Alaska Railroad during the construction period between 1914 and 1923.

Another feature of this act which is likely to be highly beneficial is the provision of section 1 which grants proportionate benefits to part-time workers on the railroad, thus taking care of those who work year after year but are employed only for 4 or 5 months a year. No such provision was embodied in the Canal Zone Act since there was no necessity for it for workers in the Canal Zone, but in Alaska, where so much of the work is seasonal, it was deemed necessary to make adequate provision for seasonal as well as year-round workers.

This concludes the list of acts passed especially for Alaska and the people thereof since March 4, 1933, but it does not include many general laws applying to the whole United States but of much benefit to the people of Alaska. For example, several years ago I introduced a bill calling for the establishment of an Army air base in the Territory. This bill and other similar bills for the establishment of bases in other parts of the United States were considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and I appeared before that committee and made a statement with reference to the vital importance of the establishment of an air base in Alaska and the situation of Alaska with respect to the problems of national defense. As a result of the hearing, what is known as the Wilcox Act was finally passed. This act provides for the establishment of six air bases in various parts of the United States, including one in Alaska. The real importance of what was done for Alaska along this line was exemplified by recent appointment by the Secretary of War of three officers to make a detailed survey of the proposed air base in Alaska. From estimates formerly made, it seems likely that the cost of the establishment of this base will be in the neighborhood of \$9,000,000, and that at least 100 airplanes of various types will be stationed continuously in Alaska, and the Army pilots will be assigned to service there so as to give all of them experience in flying in the Territory.

The bill providing for annual leave for employees of the United States also is of definite benefit to the employees of the Government who reside in Alaska, particularly those on the Alaska Railroad. I appeared before the Civil Service Committee of the House having charge of the bill. The bill was so phrased as to cover all the Government employees in Alaska, including the employees of the Alaska Railroad as well as Government employees who work in the United States

proper. Before the passage of this act many of the employees of the Alaska Railroad were held not entitled to any annual leave whatever.

The list could be extended almost indefinitely—for example, the people of Alaska have had the benefits of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, probably the most outstanding achievement for the safety of bank depositors accomplished in our generation. As the act was originally passed, Alaska was omitted, but I was able to secure on the floor of the House an amendment including Alaska within the benefits of the act. The benefits of the Federal Housing Act and of the Home Owners' Loan Act were also extended to Alaska, though the latter appeared to be of little aid to the people of the Territory.

In discussing a number of the bills listed above, mention was made of the Public Works Administration. The National Industrial Recovery Act, containing the Public Works section, applied to Alaska as well as to other parts of the United States. Under the Public Works Administration, Alaska has been very materially benefited through the construction of roads, airfields, and other types of public works. The Public Works Administration has allotted to public-works projects in Alaska to date the total sum of \$4,463,233, most of which has been expended, and the remainder will be expended before June 30, 1937. In addition to these funds, \$998,973 has been allotted to the Territory with the primary object of providing relief to the unemployed.

Alaska, and particularly that part lying along the Alaska Railroad in the vicinity of Anchorage, has also very materially benefited through the establishment of the farm colony in the Matanuska Valley. This is important in and of itself and because, through the establishment of this colony, the road connecting the Matanuska Valley with Anchorage is now nearing completion. This road has been on the construction program for many years and some work was done upon it, but until the setting up of the colony at Matanuska it had not been possible to get sufficient funds to complete the entire road. In the summer of 1935, F. E. R. A. funds in the sum of \$671,500 were allotted for road building in the Matanuska Valley and between Anchorage and Matanuska. It now seems probable that additional sums will be allotted for road work in the same region during the summer of 1937, particularly to connect up the farms in the Matanuska Valley section.

Since Alaska contains approximately 35,000 miles of coast line and is entirely dependent upon sea-borne traffic for its commercial and economic existence, I asked for and obtained membership on the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and there found most attentive consideration for Alaska ocean transportation problems. The 1935 Rivers and Harbors Act authorized appropriations for all of the river and harbor projects in Alaska which had theretofore been examined and approved by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department. Under the rules of the committee no project will be considered unless and until it has been examined and approved by the Chief of Engineers. The passage of a recent appropriation act which carries an appropriation for rivers and harbors enabled the War Department to undertake the construction of the harbor projects at Petersburg, costing \$94,000; at Wrangell, costing \$56,000; and at Nome, where the expense is approximately \$40,000, as well as the removal of rocks in the rapids of the Egegik River, the cost of which is estimated at \$5,000. It now seems probable that the remaining approved projects for Alaska, namely, Cordova Harbor, \$295,000; Seward Harbor, \$85,000; Dry Pass, \$79,000; and Sitka Harbor, \$67,350, will be put into construction next year, though no definite assurance can be given to that effect. Kodiak Harbor is also in line for improvement, at an estimated cost of \$77,000, if the proposed cold-storage plant is constructed. The 1935 River and Harbor Act also provided for surveys of the following harbors of Alaska: Bethel Harbor, Douglas Harbor, Haines Harbor, Juneau Harbor, Kake Harbor, Metlakatla Harbor, ship canal across Prince of Wales Island, Sitka Harbor, Unalaska Harbor, Valdez Harbor, Skagway Harbor, and Homer Harbor on Kachemak Bay. The surveys of these harbors will be com-

pleted during the present summer, and such of them as are approved by the Chief of Engineers will thus be in line for incorporation in the next river and harbor act authorizing their construction.

The act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories, approved on June 8, 1936, also deserves special mention because of the definite benefits that it extends to Alaska. It authorizes appropriation of funds and allotment of the same among the States and Territories for development of training in agriculture, home economics, and trade and industrial subjects. The money to be allotted for the three general classifications named, according to the proportion of the farm population, the rural population, and the nonfarm population of the State or Territory bears to the total farm, rural, and nonfarm population of the United States. Because of the proportionately small population of Alaska, the funds authorized through this method of allotment would not be sufficient to have any real effect realized therefrom. However, to offset this situation which would face the thinly populated States and Territories, the act makes definite authorization for appropriations totaling not less than \$80,000 per year of Federal funds for each State or Territory, and this amount will require matching by only \$30,000 by the State or Territory.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I am under the deepest obligation to all of the Members of this body, not only for the courteous treatment which I have personally received at their hands, but also for their careful attention to the requirements of the Territory of Alaska. Not always did they see Alaska needs through my eyes, but at least I always felt certain that what Alaska asked for received careful thought in spite of the pressure of other legislative matters requiring attention of the Members.

CROP INSURANCE FOR FARMERS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no one engaged in any other industry who faces such uncertainty in his effort to make a livelihood as the farmer.

From the time seed is placed in the ground until the crop is gathered there is no assurance what may result. It may be abundance. It may be destruction. Sunshine and rain may follow each other with such proper relationship as to produce a bountiful return or failure of either or an abundance of either may bring irretrievable loss. It may be lightning, storm, hail, wind, or pest that in a few hours will bring destruction and loss to months of labor.

Surely some provision should be made through a governmental agency to provide some degree of help. The businessman in any other line of industry can procure through private agencies insurance at reasonable rates that will guarantee and save him against loss from any of the sources I have mentioned, but for the farmer all possibility of insurance against crop loss from these or other natural causes is impossible except at prohibitive rates and in many cases is not procurable at any price.

Having in mind how frequently losses of this character are experienced, and the consequent financial distress felt for years afterward, it seems to me that in all the effort that is being put forth to help the farmer some thought should be given to this form of relief.

Information published by the Department of Agriculture shows that the damage to wheat covering a period of 10 years amounted to a yearly reduction of 31 percent of what would have been the normal yield. The same situation could be shown to exist likewise with other staple crops. There is no other business that expects any such loss of production each year.

If conditions are to be improved, consideration must be given to those who face destitution and possible bankruptcy as a result of losing an entire year's production. If a farmer possessed insurance against sudden loss, then when it did occur there would be an immediate recompense instead of a piling up of unpaid interest and other overhead expense that would hang as a burden requiring years of effort before it could be removed.

I am in accord with the plan proposed in Senate bill 4626, introduced in the closing days of this session of Congress. It provides for the formation of a Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The corporation would have the power to sell policies of insurance on any growing crop of an agricultural commodity to the operator or owner of the farm on which the crops are produced. Such policies of insurance would, under the provisions of the bill, insure against unforeseen and extraordinary events not the result of misfeasance or nonfeasance causing losses to the insured. Such hazards as fire, hail, floods, severe drought, early and late freezes, and the like, would be included. The Federal Government could, if empowered by law to do so, work out an adequate and complete program of protection for American farmers.

I am strongly of the opinion that a plan of crop insurance could be made possible for all farmers of the United States that would give them security never before known, at a low cost, if legislation is passed that will enable the Federal Government to do so. With the experiences of the past farmers can readily recognize the advantage of such a program. Not only would it afford security against loss, but it would also make possible loans from bankers upon growing crops that in many cases are now impossible to obtain.

I realize that the plan is something new and for that reason the procurement of such legislation will not be easy. However, I believe it possible of attainment, provided, the farmers of our Nation individually and through farm organizations indicate an insistent desire for the establishment of such a plan. Encouragement is given to me in this thought because of the inclusion of a plank in the Republican platform recently adopted at Cleveland, Ohio, reading as follows:

We propose to give every reasonable assistance to producers in areas suffering from temporary disaster, so that they may regain and maintain a self-supporting status.

It is the duty of all political parties to give to the farmers of America every possible assistance, by legislation or otherwise, to the end that they may have security of price level for commodities that will insure a fair profit above cost of production, and, in addition thereto a Federal program of crop insurance to lessen the adverse results of natural hazards. The accomplishment of these purposes would do much to procure for the American farmer that measure of security and prosperity to which he is entitled.

UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM STILL UNSOLVED—RECOVERY DELAYED—NEW POLICIES NECESSARY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of unemployment still remains as the most serious obstacle to recovery. It is my opinion that it will never be solved until private industry is able once again to provide jobs.

For 3 years the present administration has battled with the problem. It has tried by every conceivable kind of public works to accomplish the purpose. Billions of dollars have been expended by the Government through C. W. A., C. C. C., W. P. A., P. W. A., and all the regular and emergency agencies of Government, but without any appreciable success. These governmental agencies and activities were started merely as emergency measures. They were intended to be only temporary—a sort of pump-priming proposition to get private industry started. In this they have failed utterly. What is the cause? What is a remedy?

The failure of these different efforts to respond or produce the results that had been intended is most disappointing. I am not one of those partisans who can glory in an opportunity to criticize or complain about the shortcomings or failure of an opposing political party in its administration of governmental affairs in times such as these. Conditions are too serious. There are too many of our people, Republicans and Democrats alike, who are in distress, and there is no need for me to take any small or petty view of the situation. I am always hopeful when I express any criticism that it will be constructive in character. I am conscious that when the sun of prosperity shines again, it will shine

alike on Republicans and Democrats and every other type and kind of political thought that may exist. It is therefore a problem in the solution of which we are all vitally interested regardless of our particular party affiliation.

That the situation is serious can readily be seen from the fact that, today, according to an estimate based upon a survey made by the American Federation of Labor there are approximately 12,500,000 unemployed persons in this country, who are able and willing to work. This only represents a reduction of less than a million after 3 years of effort and the expenditure of eight and one-half billion dollars, and, giving full credit to several hundred thousand employed by the Government agencies and projects already mentioned. There are between five and six million families on relief, more than 20,000,000 people. According to some authorities there are more people on relief now than 3 years ago.

It is impossible for the Government to extend its activities sufficiently to give employment to all those now unemployed. In fact, it is becoming increasingly difficult to provide sufficient worth-while projects to keep the present number employed. Furthermore, it is no permanent remedy for unemployment. It was never intended to be such. Unfortunately, when such type of work is completed there is at the present time no other place for the released worker to go except back into the ranks of the unemployed and the relief line.

It is likewise apparent by this time that such projects which do not provide work at the prevailing rate of wage do not aid recovery. The rate of wage paid on W. P. A. projects, which differs in various localities, is in no case sufficient to create real purchasing power. It is hardly sufficient to provide the actual necessities of life. At the best it only provides a hand-to-mouth existence. Such a condition is highly unsatisfactory. So long as the wage paid does not provide anything beyond life's bare necessities, it does not create purchasing power for those things or goods which in their manufacture require the labor of men. Hence, it is no aid to recovery.

I should like also to mention another feature of Government work projects which is becoming increasingly objectionable. I refer to the policy that is pursued in some instances of giving recognition for work only to those who are favorably identified with a particular political party. In many cases, active participation in promoting the success of that political party is required. Refusal to do so has meant dismissal upon one pretext or another.

I am not one who will object to recognition being given to loyal party workers in filling offices that come within the regular functions of government, but I do object to any political party or its representatives taking advantage of a person who is in need and on relief, with a dependent family, and make that individual affiliate with a political party not of his own choosing before work with which to provide bread for a hungry family will be provided.

President Roosevelt recently said, "We need freedom from economic control." The conditions I have referred to as existing in many Government-supervised projects indicate that we need freedom from political control. Such a condition is bad for America. It is indefensible. It is trading bread for votes. It is playing politics with human misery. That it does exist cannot be denied. Any political party that will be a part of such a dastardly scheme deserves the severest condemnation.

Time and again the unwilling victims of this political tyranny have expressed in private their resentment of such practices and the political party responsible for its perpetration. Time and again, while giving "lip service" to their political overlords, they have denied within their heart the right to be so driven, and with all such there is a firm resolve to assert their right of freemen when they enter the election booth and cast their ballot. In the fulfillment of this intention everyone is entitled to have the encouragement and support of honest citizens who think in terms of what is best for America.

It being apparent and generally acknowledged that the present work-relief projects are not a permanent or satisfactory solution of our unemployment problem, I should like to make a few suggestions that I am confident would result, at least, in a partial solution by supplying jobs of a permanent character at worth-while wages.

In the first place, millions of unemployed could be put back to work today in industry and agriculture if the present administration would permit our farmers and laboring men to enjoy the full benefits of the American market. This country is the best market in the world. The unemployed millions of industrial workers and farmers who are barely able to eke out a living under present conditions are under normal conditions the best potential customers for manufactured and farm products produced in this country. Unemployment will continue to increase and agricultural distress become more aggravated so long as the New Deal pursues the policy of giving our American markets to foreign farmers and cheap foreign labor. We cannot compete with foreign countries in production, for the reason that wages paid to labor in foreign countries are so much below that paid for similar work in this country, and because the standards of living are lower in foreign countries.

Prominent labor leaders have stated that if it were not for the importation of cheaply produced foreign-manufactured products now coming into this country from abroad there could be gainfully employed in private industry nearly 3,000,000 persons who are now out of work and on relief.

An analysis of the agricultural products imported into this country in 1935 from foreign countries will disclose that from 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 persons could have been employed in the United States in the production and processing of the imported farm commodities if the same had been produced here.

Thus, New Deal policies upon the basis of these estimates are directly responsible for a total of approximately 6,000,000 Americans who would have work if we change our policy and save the home market for our American farmers and laboring men.

I will next refer briefly to the great benefits that would result in promoting employment if the Government would start upon an extensive housing and slum-clearance program. For 2 years I, with others, have advocated the adoption of such a plan. It seemed for a while that the Wagner-Allenbogen bill would be passed at this session of Congress. But, at the last moment, it was not included in the President's "must" list of legislation and was consequently left unacted upon. I can assure you it was a great disappointment to many of us who had given the subject careful study over a period of years, and believe it holds the solution of putting several million unemployed building-trades workers, and others indirectly affected, back to work at their regular jobs.

Recovery cannot advance any further unless we have substantial recovery in the building industry. President Green of the American Federation of Labor has estimated that about 85 percent of the building-trades workers are unemployed, affecting 5,000,000, who depend directly or indirectly upon such industry. Carpenters, bricklayers, electricians, mechanics, and other skilled workers look for jobs in vain. Material-supply houses are ready and willing to go, but some unseen hand or influence withholds the necessary word.

Time and again the administration has announced it was ready to proceed. Millions of dollars have been appropriated first to one agency and then to another. Each started out with high hopes and great intentions. But, in each case activity soon dwindles down and gives place to inactivity. What little that has been accomplished is but a drop in the bucket. It has neither helped to provide housing, slum clearance, or employment for the unemployed on any worth-while scale.

We need now not only courage to formulate new policies but equal courage to discard some already adopted and found to be deficient. We must seek permanent remedies

for unemployment. We have experimented long enough. It is a time for action. The morale of the unemployed working man has held up under the strain of this economic depression in a most remarkable manner. It should not be carried to a point where it will weaken. His fortitude and courage should be rewarded. New policies and aggressive action should supplant those found by experience to be deficient.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, according to the statistics of the American Federation of Labor and other statistical organizations there are approximately 12,000,000 people unemployed in the United States today. There is not any necessity for this deplorable situation. The Federal Government should, without any hesitation, start a program of construction. All the slum districts and poor-houses in the United States and its possessions should be eradicated.

The Government should construct at least 5,000,000 homes, and these homes should be made of fireproof material, and should be sold or rented at a reasonable cost.

The Government should provide adequate pensions for the aged, widows with dependent children, disabled veterans, and all those who, because of a physical disability, are unable to obtain employment.

We should adopt the 5-day, 6-hour working week and every person should receive adequate compensation for their services no matter what kind of work he or she is compelled to do.

Sweatshops should be entirely eliminated.

Boys and girls should not be compelled to go to work until they have attained the age of at least 16 years.

Every boy and girl desirous of obtaining a high-school, college, or university education should be assisted by the Government if they are unable to pay for their education.

The Government should construct schools, hospitals, highways, tunnels, bridges, disposal plants, reservoirs, dams, canals, and other necessary projects. The reservoirs, canals, and dams should be used for the prevention of floods, droughts, dust storms, forest fires, and for other purposes.

Our rivers and streams should not be polluted with debris which is injurious to the health of the people.

The Government should own and control all public utilities and natural resources. Of course the Government should not confiscate these properties, but should purchase them.

No person should be deprived of water, gas, electric power, or other necessities if they are unemployed or for any other just reason. Dangerous places on the highways and grade crossings should be eliminated.

We should have uniform lighting systems and traffic regulations throughout the country.

All banking institutions should be nationalized. The people's money in the banks should be guaranteed. Only Congress should have the right to coin and regulate the value of money.

All chain-gang systems should be abolished. Dungeons in prisons should be disposed of and the inhuman treatment of prison inmates should be discontinued. Jails and prisons should always be kept in a sanitary condition.

The laws governing our people should be national and not State.

State senates and also the United States Senate should be abolished because they are unessential. When the Supreme Court of the United States declares that a law is unconstitutional, a two-thirds vote of the Members of Congress should be required to decide the question involved.

Appropriations should also be made for reforestation, soil erosion, airports, parks, playgrounds, development of our natural resources, the saving of the farm lands, and also for the development of medical, surgical, dental, biological, astronomical, geological, and all other arts and sciences which will promote the welfare and happiness of mankind.

The money which would be appropriated to carry out the construction program herein mentioned would be returned to the Government with interest.

End poverty in the United States.

MY REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1935, pursuant to the mandate of the people of the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, given at the ballot box, I stood on the floor of this House and took the oath to well and faithfully discharge the duties of a Representative in Congress for the term ending January 3, 1937. It was a very happy occasion for me when I thus entered into this field of service for my fellow citizens, and I freely express my gratitude for the honor bestowed upon me. I deeply appreciate the responsibilities and obligations of the trust that my people have placed in me.

Now that the second and final session of the Seventy-fourth Congress is nearing its close, I feel it my duty to stand on this same floor and report to my people on the work that I have done as their Representative in Congress. Let me begin by acknowledging the considerate cooperation of my people. I fully realize that the record would not be complete if it neglected to give grateful recognition of the advice, the counsel, the support, and interest of my constituents. I have welcomed and shall continue to welcome the thoughtful aid of my constituents in the discharge of my duties.

Since I have come to Congress, I have furnished my district with a newspaper column, in an effort to keep the people continuously informed of what is taking place in their Nation's Capital. Every citizen is entitled to know what is going on in his Capital, and I thank those editors who cooperated in passing this material on to their readers.

Before a bill is considered by the House of Representatives, it is first introduced and then referred to the committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter. There are about 50 standing committees of the House of Representatives that initially handle all proposed legislation. These committees study the bills referred to them, and bills reported to the House from committees are placed on the appropriate House calendar for consideration.

I am a member of three committees in the House of Representatives—namely, the Committee on Education, the Committee on Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

In my work as a member of the House Committee on Education, I secured help for our Nebraska school system. I helped secure appropriations for vocational training, and through several speeches, called attention to the help needed by those ready to pursue their education in colleges. I likewise fought for keeping the real schools, the rural and town schools, open.

From a report of the United States Office of Education, I learned that a number of large factories are moving their facilities to the Southern States, chiefly because of their desire for an abundant supply of cheap labor. In these factories, workers are trained on production without pay for 6 to 12 weeks, and then transferred to the pay roll at learners' wages. The goods manufactured in this manner are then sold on the open market, coming into direct competition with other manufactured goods paying standard wages. I learned that the superintendents of the factories and foremen have been appointed as teachers and paid at the expense of the taxpayer. And, in addition to all this, the good name of the public school was used to cloak such schemes for commercial gain. After learning about this practice, I offered the following amendment to the Deen Bill, H. R. 12120: "A bill to provide for the further development of vocational education":

SEC. 6. No part of the appropriations herein authorized shall be expended in industrial-plant training programs, except such industrial-plant training be bona-fide vocational training and not a device to utilize the services of vocational trainees for private profit.

My amendment was unanimously accepted by the members of the Committee on Education, was incorporated in the bill, and is now a part of the act approved June 8, 1936.

The purpose of this section is to protect the taxpayers' money from use in the promotion and maintenance of sweatshops.

As a member of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I succeeded in blocking a move by contractors and builders to alter the Nation's Capitol Building, thus saving over \$3,000,000 to the taxpayers of the United States.

Likewise, as a member of this important committee, I was successful in stopping the destruction of historic buildings and the removal of historic trees, with resultant preservation of valuable historic architecture for present-day Americans.

On April 8, 1936, I sponsored the planting of a white-pine tree on the Capitol Grounds, in memory of the late J. Sterling Morton, the father of Arbor Day, former Secretary of Agriculture, and distinguished Nebraskan.

As a member of the House Committee on Insular Affairs, I assisted in stopping an effort on the part of foreign importers to remove the 3-cent excise tax on coconut oil coming into our country from our offshore islands. This tax removal, if successful, would have meant a loss of over \$245,000,000 to the American farmer and producer.

When I discovered that blackstrap molasses was being imported into the United States and blended into alcohol, I fought against this cheap importation, which was coming into competition with the product of our American grain farmer, who, in the days preceding prohibition repeal, had been promised the market for his grain in the manufacture of alcohol. Accordingly, I introduced H. R. 10933, a bill making it unlawful to sell certain spirits containing alcohol produced from materials other than cereal grains, and for other purposes, and so forth. This bill was accorded a hearing by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in the House and succeeded in making a favorable impression upon the membership of the subcommittee.

As a member of the Insular Affairs Committee, I, along with other Members of the House and Senate, was selected to go to the Philippine Islands to attend the inauguration of the new Commonwealth, and while there was made an honorary colonel in the Philippine Volunteers. While in the islands your Congressman was the single member of the official party to place flowers on the graves of Americans who are buried there.

During this trip to the Philippines, China, Japan, and Hawaii I made a careful study of labor conditions in these foreign countries, with the result that on my return to the United States, and during the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, I made addresses on the floor of the House against the cheaply made foreign goods which, when imported into the United States, come into direct competition with American-made products.

During my term in the House of Representatives I was a member of the prairie States farm group, composed of Members from the farming States. As part of my work in this group I labored for a lower rate of interest for farmers and was the first signer of the petition to force the Frazier-Lemke farm-mortgage refinance bill to debate and vote under the discharge rule of the House.

As a member of this group I was selected chairman of the subcommittee which worked on cereal-grain protection and I became the author of the cereal-grain bill.

During the Seventy-fourth Congress I consistently fought against all useless expenditures in an effort to safeguard the taxpayers' money.

By a speech on the floor regarding the importation of foreign products and resultant curtailment of consumption of domestic commodities, I brought to the attention of the House the importance of Nebraska as one of the chief hay-producing and hay-marketing areas of the world.

During the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress I was the first of the Nebraska House delegation to make a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, and was several times called upon by the national broadcasting chains to address the radio world.

Also, during the first session, your Congressman introduced the idea of installing a loud-speaking system in the House Chamber, that the proceedings of the House might be more easily heard and understood by visitors and Members alike.

Due to the fact that I thought the Army and Navy were costing the taxpayers too much money during peacetime, I suggested that administration of the Army and the Navy be combined for economy and for the sake of efficiency. On account of that suggestion, I received the commendation of President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University.

I have been opposed to the patronage system of employment now used in the post offices of the United States and, therefore, with Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, I introduced a bill in the House to take the post offices out of politics and to place the Post Office Department upon a basis of efficiency and economy.

Not only was I opposed to the patronage system being used in post-office employment but also in appointments of cadets and midshipmen in the United States Military and Naval Academies. Therefore, I made all my appointments to these two schools following competitive civil-service examination, based on the merits of the candidates regardless of party politics.

I was placed on a committee to work out a program for farm-to-market roads. I was associated with Congressman BERT LORD, the father of the idea, and with him and the rest of the committee I personally interviewed President Roosevelt and other high officials, with the result that for the first time some of the relief money was brought to the rural areas and many millions of dollars were spent in actual farm-to-market road work.

This resulted eventually in placing farm-to-market roads as a permanent feature of the Federal highway system administered by the Bureau of Public Roads with authorization for direct, specific appropriations in lieu of merely administrative allocations from lump-sum emergency appropriations.

Until appropriations for the permanent set-up become available, another idea developed by this committee is being followed, to wit, that farm-to-market road improvement shall be a part of the relief program, financed out of emergency relief appropriations.

Your Congressman succeeded in securing additional funds for Nebraska works projects to keep unemployed men busy on meritorious projects, such as, for instance, the river revetment project at Niobrara, Nebr.

I fought against the hog processing taxes on the ground that the producer was paying the bill. My arguments met with the favor of farmers and many in the Department of Agriculture, but the powerful interests succeeded in keeping the \$2.25 per 100 pounds processing tax on hogs for the duration of the A. A. A.

In the interest of the Nebraska farmer, I introduced a bill to allow debt-burdened farmers to repay their feed and seed loans, bushel for bushel, in kind.

One of my first acts after coming to Congress was to introduce a bill directing the appointment of a commission by the President to make a study of the "farm dollar" to the end that there might be discovery of the material factors contributing to the disparity between the prices commanded by agricultural commodities and the prices of commodities which must be purchased from the proceeds of the sales of agricultural commodities, with resultant impairment of the purchasing power of the so-called "farm dollar", and recommendation of curative steps.

I have assisted in legislation which carries the consent of the United States to the construction, operation, and maintenance of bridges across the Missouri River at Niobrara, South Sioux City, and Decatur.

I have introduced bills for the relief and assistance of the Indians resident in the district, and my service to them has been both legislative and departmental.

I thank the people of the Third District of Nebraska for their kindness in allowing me to serve as their Representative in the Congress of the United States. I have endeavored to please my constituents by working hard, earnestly,

and honestly, to render fair and impartial service to everyone regardless of partisanship. Likewise, regardless of partisanship, I voted for those measures which, in my opinion, would benefit Nebraska people, and against those things would I felt would have a different result.

A MESSAGE TO YOUNG VOTERS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a time in our history as a Nation when it was more necessary for young men and women to study and give serious consideration to the conflicting forces striving to fix and determine our present and future policies of government.

The intensity of effort as well as the fundamental theories of government that are under discussion challenge attention. No young man or woman can afford to treat lightly the seriousness of the issues involved. To do so would show a lack of interest or concern as to the kind of government under which it will be necessary for them to live in the years that are ahead.

There are some individuals who express fear for the future. I am not one of such. I have an abiding faith in the conscience and good sense of our citizenship. My confidence is increased as I consider the fine type of intelligent young men and women who are coming into political activity.

Political parties use every endeavor to attract the attention of the young voter; they seek to interest them in the party welfare and gain their support for party principles and candidates. It is well that they should do so. Party virility is increased by the new ideas, independence, and aggressiveness so characteristic of youth.

As a result of the depressing conditions that have existed for the last few years, it is not hard to realize that many a young man and woman will ask: Is it all worth while? What is the use?

They see distress, failure, discouragement, dissatisfaction; an unparalleled economic condition resulting in paralysis of business, finance, industry, and agriculture, creating widespread unemployment, destitution, and need. Again they say, What has the future for us? My answer is: Today, as I look into the future, I can see a new order of things. The present may be dark and discouraging, but the light will break as surely as the rising sun comes to us after a night of darkness. The spirit of America is not dead. It lives and will rise again to a new and more glorious day. But we must have the vision that will enable us to recognize that new conditions create new obligations and the necessity for the application of new and different policies of government. We must have not only the vision as to the necessity but also the courage to do things which a few years ago would have been unthought of because contrary to accepted theories of what is a proper field of governmental activity. Nor should we be deterred from this course through fear that to depart from what has been to what should be is in any way detrimental to our well-being as a nation. New conditions require new remedies.

Constitutional objections, made by some, to increased activities by the Federal Government in promoting the welfare of our people, overlook the fact the Constitution is a living, not dead, instrument of government. It has survived because the interpretation of its powers and restrictions has been wisely considered in the light of changing conditions.

The intent and purpose of the framers of the Constitution to confer wide power in the effort to form a more perfect Union is made clear and emphatic by the broad and strong language used in the preamble to the Constitution. It says:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

These words are fraught with meaning. They constitute the master phrase of the Constitution. They represent the ideals and the dominating thought of the framers of the Constitution as to the fundamental purposes of our Government. All that follows in the several provisions of the

Constitution as adopted gathers importance as means to accomplish the aims and purposes set forth in the words of the preamble.

Well, planning "to promote the general welfare" is not new in America. The greatest plan for social well-being that the world has ever known is the Constitution of the United States, and America's first "brain trust" was that little group of 55 men who put that plan on paper. When they signed that document of experiment they joined the immortals.

A few words about these illustrious men might be appropriately spoken at this time when "brains" and "youth" are subject to attack by those who are interested in the maintenance of the old order of things. Of those 55 men, 24, or nearly half, were college graduates, several with highest honors—truly a remarkable record when we consider the conditions prevailing when they were in their "teens" and "twenties"—more than a century and a half ago; 6 of their number were, had been, or were to become college professors, 3 college presidents, and 7 founders or trustees of colleges.

And then, as to their age, we think of them as old men of grave demeanor, venerable with experience and wisdom. But what are the facts? Only 13 of the 55 had passed their fiftieth birthday; 22, or nearly half, were under 40; Madison, the "Father of the Constitution", was 36; Hamilton was 30; 1 of the Nation's fathers had reached the ripe old age of 26; and 3 more were tottering around in their "twenties."

These men, averaging 43 years young, wrote the Constitution of the United States. These young men when they wrote the Constitution deliberately "planned" to meet a great emergency. We must do the same. Our struggle today is not to overthrow their work. It is to keep their work from being overthrown. It is to redefine and recapture the benefits and liberties they intended to guarantee in perpetuity to every American. Today we are at one of the great turning points in human affairs. We are experiencing a travail of soul in our struggle to "establish justice" and "promote the general welfare", but America will triumph, and with the victory will come a more genuine sense of justice, a greater recognition of rights of individuals, a more certain guarantee of opportunity for all, a new order that will make for the youth of today a future filled with possibility of achievement.

Young men and women face the future with a responsibility resting upon them to give their best endeavor to promote the future welfare of their country.

Active participation in public affairs is the duty of all. How can this obligation be most effectively fulfilled—by acting singly and alone or in unison with others?

The division of the American people into political parties is the result of many years of trial and experiment in government. Experience has proved that two parties are necessary for good government.

Political parties were created not by law but by necessity. Some method of ascertaining the will of the majority on important governmental policies had to be found. Thus parties came into existence as the instrumentality by which the people could express their conviction on declared principles and programs.

For more than a century our Government has been carried on by party machinery. Ours is a government of parties.

Some individuals pride themselves on independence of party obligations, yet thoughtful consideration of what party solidarity has accomplished for the general welfare, which could not have been accomplished by independence of party action, is not only a sufficient justification for our American system of party government but also a clarion call to the young men and women to identify themselves with party activity.

No student of the history of the different political parties in America can help but be impressed with the record of the Republican Party.

For 56 years out of the seventy-five-odd years of its existence it has controlled and directed the destiny of our Nation. During this period only 3 Democrats have been elected President while 11 Republicans have filled that office. Truly, it may be said that the history of the development of the United States, since the Civil War, has been synonymous

with the history of the Republican Party and its accomplishments.

During this long period of service issues have frequently arisen that vitally affected the welfare of our Nation. Conditions were ever changing, the welfare of our people demanding new policies to meet the ever-progressing movement of a great Nation as it forged ahead to become the most outstanding Nation in the world. The Republican Party faced each new issue with courage, fortitude, and intelligence, and solved each upon the theory that the welfare of our people must ever be paramount.

It was in the spirit of service to "human rights" above "property rights" that the Republican Party was born, and that made possible the freedom of all within our borders regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and that guaranteed the right of suffrage to all.

It was recognition of the "public interest" as above "private property rights" that through the Republican Party found expression in the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, the Hepburn Act, the Mann-Elkins Act, the Interstate Commerce Act, the Transportation Act, and numerous other acts supplementing the original acts for the purpose of bringing great aggregations of wealth under governmental control in the interest of the public welfare.

It was recognition of fundamental principles promoting the general welfare that brought forth, through Republican activity, the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, the amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators, and the submission of the child-labor amendment to the States for ratification.

It was likewise under Republican leadership that joined the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific by the cutting through of the Panama Canal—one of the greatest single steps of progress ever taken in the history of the world.

In the promotion of world-wide peace, this Nation, under Republican Party leaders, has taken the lead among the nations of the world. The names of Hay, Root, and Kellogg will ever be outstanding for the fine, high quality of service they rendered to the cause of international peace.

In warding off foreign encroachments in this hemisphere, avoiding entanglements in foreign politics, expanding commerce, maintaining a high standard of living by protecting American industry, agriculture, and labor, building up the Navy and the merchant marine, improving waterways and harbors, restraining monopolies, cultivating pan-American friendship, limiting naval armament, establishing the Federal Budget, protecting workers from an influx of unskilled foreign labor, refusing to cancel foreign debts, renouncing war, promoting treaties to insure world peace, reducing the public debt, keeping the Government out of business, and in all other policies, both domestic and foreign, the Republican Party has constantly aimed to advance the interests of the United States and to provide for the welfare of its people.

While the Republican Party was in no way responsible for the present depression, yet as soon as the depression fell upon the country the Republican President secured an agreement between capital and labor to maintain the standard of living. Next he launched the country on an extensive construction of public buildings, and thereafter prevented further immigration by an Executive order; organized a national committee to relieve unemployment; prevented an international financial collapse through the moratorium; organized a credit corporation to strengthen banking institutions; provided financial help for industry, railroads, and banks by the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; increased credit facilities by liberalizing the laws affecting the Federal Reserve System; recommended measures to relieve depositors in closed banks, also home-mortgage bank system to aid home owners; aided the farmers through extended mortgage loans and additional funds for livestock and seed planting; and established the national credit by the decision to balance the Budget through increased revenue and drastic governmental economies.

These are not all of the accomplishments of the Republican Party during its history, but they form ample proof of

the splendid leadership of the Republican Party in national affairs.

The Republican Party is the party of the future as well as the party of the past. As it was dedicated at birth to "human rights", as it remained true to that ideal of government in the past, so in the changing scene of today it will be true to its original purposes and give expression thereof in the attitude it assumes toward present issues and the policies it recommends as a solution of our economic distress. It is the party through which young men and women can find the greatest opportunities for making progress as public leaders. As it dominated the past, so it challenges the future and calls to its colors with an irresistible appeal the young men and women of America.

BADGERING THE SCHOOL TEACHER

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th of June came the news in all the newspapers of Washington City that Representative THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, had sent out a questionnaire to all the 2,900 school teachers of the District of Columbia, involving their religious beliefs, their academic freedom, and casting suspicion on their loyalty as American citizens.

Even with knowledge of the shameful Blanton "red rider", it was difficult for me to believe such a proceeding as this had actually taken place. I waited until the second day, only to find the newspaper reports fully confirmed, and Mr. BLANTON admitting he had actually written and sent out the questionnaire. Thereupon, I presented the following resolution and asked that it be considered as privileged under the rules of the House:

Whereas the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has directed a letter to each and every school teacher in the District of Columbia seeking certain information, of which the following is an exact copy:

THOMAS L. BLANTON,
17th District Texas
Secretaries:

Member of
Committee on Appropriations

Louise Kennedy Marx.
Ruby Saylor Whipkey.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1936.

As chairman of the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill, to obviate a hearing and to save you the time and inconvenience of coming before us in person, I request that you kindly give us the following information, filled in by you in the blank spaces provided therefore, and signing same, and return promptly in the inclosed addressed envelope, requiring no postage, namely:

Please state: Your present position? School? Salary?

Do you believe in any of the doctrines of communism?; if so, which? Do you approve of communism being given any favor or support in the schools?

Do you believe there is a God? Do you believe in some form of religion?

Are you a subscriber to the Social Frontier? Were you asked to subscribe? If so, state by whom?

Are you a member of the N. E. A.? Since when? Who suggested joining?

Have you a copy of Conclusions and Recommendations? Have you read same?

Have you a copy of Counts' Dare the School Build a New Social Order? Have you read same? Do you approve of same?

Do you approve of Dr. George S. Counts' writings? Do you approve of Dr. Charles A. Beard's writings? Have you been to Russia? Did you attend school there?

Have you read Boy and Girl Tramps of America by Thomas Mineham? Do you approve it? Are you in favor of high-school girls reading it? Would you read it aloud?

Have you read Made in Russia? Do you approve of it? Do you approve of Scholastic as a school magazine for high-school students? Do you know why the school committee's recommendation to eliminate it from the Washington public schools has been held up? If so, why?

Very truly yours,

(Signed) THOMAS L. BLANTON.

My answers above are correct:

Position

Address

Whereas this was done as chairman of the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill; and

Whereas a franked envelope requiring no postage was inserted in the letter for the purpose of the teacher's reply; and

Whereas the use of the language "to obviate a hearing and to save you the time and inconvenience of coming before us in

person, I request that you kindly give us the following information" would lead the recipient to believe that a failure to answer the questionnaire would result in the issuance of a subpoena hauling the teacher before the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill; and

Whereas this constitutes a thinly veiled threat that a subpoena might be issued; and

Whereas the subcommittee does not have authority to force the attendance of anybody at a hearing; and

Whereas the action of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in directing this letter to the teachers in the aforementioned manner might lead some to believe that the subcommittee and the House of Representatives were joining with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in demanding this information in this threatening manner; and

Whereas the spread of this belief might tend to greatly lessen the dignity of the House of Representatives and violate the integrity of this House by assuming an authority which had not been delegated to him: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House deprecates the action of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], which was not authorized by the House of Representatives nor by any competent agency thereof, and that his action shall not be construed as being an act authorized by the House of Representatives nor any competent agency thereof.

The resolution was read, and, upon objection of a Member that the motion was not privileged, the Speaker sustained the objection. No discussion of the matter was possible, and the House denied the opportunity of uttering a protest against this outrage.

This resolution is, in fact, a very mild protest, in view of the offense committed by this outrageous questionnaire. Had the gentleman from Texas wanted to do the considerate thing, he would readily have admitted his mistake, corrected it by an apology, and wiped the matter out. Unfortunately, he did not see it that way, regardless of the opinion of the House or of the public sentiment concerning his acts.

Let us note that Mr. BLANTON sent this questionnaire on his official congressional paper. It was sent in a franked envelope, and a franked self-addressed envelope for return of the questionnaire was enclosed, and attention of the school teachers called to that fact. Thus it had every outward appearance of being an official act and was intended to convey that impression to the teachers. Now read the statement preceding the questions and note that Mr. BLANTON stresses the fact that he is chairman of the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill. Bear in mind that the District bill carries the money to pay the salaries of the school teachers of the whole District of Columbia.

The implication is clear. Next, note the concealed threat "to save you the time and inconvenience of coming before us in person." In short, the implication to the teacher must have been: Unless you fill out this questionnaire about your religious beliefs, your right to teach boys and girls under you the plain facts of history, the political tendencies and developments of our times, unless you shrive yourself of the suspicions of Mr. BLANTON, of Texas, of any and all knowledge of Russia or the political ideas of the Russian people, your salary and your right to teach school in the District of Columbia will be placed in jeopardy. If you do not answer the questions in a way satisfactory to Mr. BLANTON, you will be hauled before an inquisition that will subject you to 'suspicion of treason'."

I have no quarrel with the head hunters of the Communist variety whom the recent controversy has paraded before you. Personally, I have always questioned the results of their tactics, inasmuch as it seems to me that suppression or persecution of a political belief, whatever that belief may be, always results in more benefit than harm to the movement. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTIANSON] has discussed that question with fine intelligence, and if you did not hear him; I invite you to read his remarks in the RECORD of June 18, 1936, Seventy-fourth Congress, on page 9980.

I have in my district in the great State of Illinois one of the largest teachers' colleges in the country where annually approximately 2,000 young men and women enroll to prepare themselves as teachers. Their interest in the problems of the past as well as those of the present is ardent, genuine, and admirable. Their ability to study, to learn, and to teach, when they have acceptably completed their work, has never

been questioned. Certainly no one in an official position with the authority granted him by his position has ever attempted an inquisition, indictment, or suppression of them. We in southern Illinois would not stand for that. I have taught school. I have known many hundred school teachers personally. I never knew one in my life whose patriotism was not at least equal to that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

One of my greatest regrets is that I have been unable to do more toward giving the school teachers of Illinois a great reward for the noble sacrifice many of them have made the last few years in order to keep the schools open for every girl and boy in our State. If you gentlemen have not had occasion to look into this chapter of the story of our national life the last few years, I invite you to do so. It will warm your hearts with admiration for a body of public servants who have never been given the reward that society rightfully owes them.

My interest in the schools and the teachers of my own State has naturally led me to observe with admiration the modern, and highly efficient school system we have here in the District of Columbia. To me that is something in which every Member of Congress who shares any pride in national education ought to rejoice. The Congress has full legislative authority over the District of Columbia, including the schools, and under the many years of encouragement of this body, this magnificent school system has been developed. Up to last year no Member of Congress has ever had the hardihood to interfere with it.

This policy of trustfulness and helpfulness is in keeping with the best traditions of our great country. Thomas Jefferson set out very simply the vital fact that a democratic republic can succeed only in proportion to the scope and extent which general intelligence is developed through the universal education of its citizens. This is peculiarly true because in a republic every public policy must be expressed through political action. The educators of America clearly understood from the beginning that only through academic freedom can the highest state of mental development be attained and the greatest usefulness given expression. The whole search after truth must depend on untrammelled freedom of the men and women who carry it on. Science could not have grown into the tremendous usefulness it has attained without the greatest possible freedom of its teachers and students. Out of this thought the school systems of our States has grown throughout the 150 years of our national existence. The colleges and universities which have grown into such great importance in serving the country have from the start very properly and very consistently insisted on the entire freedom of their teachers. The poorest paid, but greatest and most vital of all professions is teaching school. We must keep it free as it always has been.

I have at no time engaged in personal criticism. I do not now, but to pass over without protest a mistake so vital as this questionnaire which the gentleman from Texas presumed to send out would have meant to condone the act, would have been to stultify myself personally, and would be a failure on my part to fulfill the duty which I owe to the great office I have the honor to hold. To permit the further exercise of an espionage already begun would in the end destroy the spirit of this great corps of 3,000 highly trained, broadly educated, thoroughly prepared builders of youth in the District of Columbia. I cannot join the few friends of Mr. BLANTON in believing he is in any wise infallible. Nor can I agree with them that having done some good, he should be permitted to do much harm without just criticism. It would be the very worst thing we can do to sit supinely by and permit any man in this body to embarrass the public school system of the District of Columbia, whatever may be his motive—whether, indeed, any motive beyond misguided interest could prompt such action.

Let me repeat that the public-school system of Washington is recognized as one of the best in the world. It is properly so held, and whatever is done here by the Congress is reflected in the school systems of our many States. And

what we do as the sponsors of this great school system will be noted as the attitude of the United States Government toward education in its broadest sense. So far the Congress has wisely left the building of this school system to the teachers, to the educators, to the thinkers. This has been done throughout the Nation as well as in the District of Columbia.

There is, indeed, and, in fact, no possible excuse for the sending out of this thoroughly vicious questionnaire—whatever be the motive. Not one of the three gentlemen who so praised the author of it for a moment ever implied that Mr. BLANTON had any authority for doing such a thing—that he had any power to carry out his threat; that he in anywise represented this House. He knew and they knew that he had no authority, no power, no mandate from the House. He knew and they knew it was a presumption seldom equaled in public or private life. If you remove from consideration the psychological red herring now being exercised overtime by all our perspiring politicians—that of communism—not a single one of this trio would dare to justify his act. It is the world-old game of justifying one folly by charging a worse one. They overlook the fact that the questionnaire itself grossly outrages the third paragraph of article VI of the Constitution, which says:

But no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

Now, let us repeat some of these questions—set them out alone—and see how they look.

Do you believe there is a God? Do you believe in some form of religion?

Read those two questions over again. Read the third paragraph of article VI of the Constitution again. Ask yourself if that is not a religious test, what would constitute a religious test? It may occur to you to wonder why a Congressman should have the effrontery to attempt to require a religious test here in this twentieth century. Let me call to your attention the question Congresswoman NORTON asked Mr. FISH, of New York. I quote from the RECORD:

Mrs. NORTON. I just want to ask one question. Has the gentleman any evidence that communism has ever been taught in the schools of the District of Columbia?

Mr. FISH. Absolutely none whatever.

In short, no one charges, no one ever has charged, no one can truthfully charge that there is, or ever has been any teacher in the District of Columbia teaching communism to his pupils.

The whole questionnaire has as its basis nothing more substantial than the suspicion in Mr. BLANTON'S mind that some teacher might be teaching communism. And he accepts the naive conclusion that if such there be that the BLANTON questionnaire will bring forth the culprit.

Equally unfortunate are the questions about the political beliefs of the teachers. Mr. BLANTON seems to glory in showing his own great knowledge of the bad books and bad magazines of alleged communistic lore. He furnishes a list that will naturally stir the curiosity of most normal-minded boys and girls.

This whole situation in this questionnaire is but the culmination of the "red rider", which has continued to disgrace this Congress for the past year. The school teachers of the District of Columbia are compelled by law to sign this statement each month before they can draw their salaries:

I, _____, a teacher of the District of Columbia schools, hereby state that I have knowledge of the provision appearing in the act of Congress approved June 14, 1935 (Public, No. 138), as follows:

"That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism." and further state, without reservation and for the purpose of obtaining payment of salary otherwise due me, that I did not at any time during the period _____ to _____, 193____, in any school of the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, teach or advocate communism.

This is known as the "red rider." It was sponsored as an amendment to an appropriation bill by this same Mr. BLANTON. It is charged that this was put into the appro-

priation bill "when nobody was looking." Be that as it may, it is certainly true that Mr. BLANTON, through the use of dilatory parliamentary tactics, has prevented the consideration of a bill to repeal that infamous provision. He and his cooperatives are aware that when that question comes before the Congress this "red rider" will be wiped off the statute books. Only through the misuse of the rules of the House has consideration of it and a vote on that question been prevented.

To show the idiocy of such a law it is only necessary to point out that if a teacher of current events should call the attention of his class to the fact that the Government of Russia, in an attempt to get away from the mistakes which communism has so far made—it is now proposing a constitution somewhat along the lines of our own—it would be questionable, at least, whether that teacher could draw his salary the next month. If that teacher should then proceed to instruct his class that all democratic government should, and usually does, grow out of the experience of the people governed, as Thomas Jefferson so well pointed out should be the case, and should the teacher express the opinion that the great Russian people would likely in due course work out their own salvation, even though it might not be exactly like our own, that teacher would lose another month's salary for teaching communism.

To students of politics, as all Americans should be—and outside the District of Columbia are—political intolerance is as deadly to political progress as is religious intolerance to growth of religion. Here is a censorship already established "over the mind of man", over academic freedom of the school teachers of the District of Columbia, the fruit of BLANTON'S "red rider." He now seeks a religious censorship through his most obnoxious questionnaire.

The "red rider" implies a suspicion that the teachers of the District of Columbia are teaching communism. It is an insult to the character and American patriotism of these men and women. It is a disgrace to the Congress that this "red rider" has not been repealed at this the first session of Congress after its questionable method of enactment. It insults the integrity of the members of every board of school directors and board of education in our land. The wisdom and patriotism of these unpaid thousands of public-spirited men and women have contributed largely to the success of the greatest school system in the world. They have not needed and would not have tolerated the interference of the politicians of the country in the building of this Nation into the best-educated people on earth.

This is the center of the Nation educationally. The question involved in the Blanton questionnaire and in the Blanton "red rider" is a national question. It involves the freedom from political influence over the schools of the whole country. It involves the academic freedom of all educational institutions. It reaches out and touches every teacher in every school in the United States. Both the "red rider" and the Blanton questionnaire should be known to and considered by every teacher and educator, every man and woman with a progressive mind, who knows what academic freedom has done for the world.

I am interested in only one thing insofar as the conduct of the gentleman from Texas is concerned. That is, he shall not, with my consent or acquiescence, place the school teachers of the District of Columbia on trial without at least producing a warrant to justify his actions.

I serve notice on Mr. BLANTON that the "red rider" must go, and that there shall be no more "questionnaires."

I serve notice on Mr. BLANTON and any supporters he may have, that any attempt to continue the present political interference in the schools of the District of Columbia, or to extend that influence, will meet with every possible resistance of which I am capable.

He shall not insinuate a charge against the teachers or members of the school board without stating it clearly, so its truthfulness may be put to the test.

He shall not establish any inquisition before which to bring any school teacher, without the full authority of this House legally granted.

He shall not be permitted to further bluff and bulldoze the teachers under the pretense that his membership in this body gives him any right, power, or authority further to persecute them, without denunciation of his pretension on the floor of this House.

He shall not apply any religious test without challenge of his right or any man's right to do that thing forbidden by the Constitution.

THE NEW DEAL AND ITS ALTERNATIVE—RESTORATION, RELIEF, AND RECOVERY VERSUS REFORM AND CHAOS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, when the gavel falls today upon this session, it marks the end of the Seventy-fourth Congress and the last of the New Deal sessions, four in all.

The people of this country will now have before them for approval or disapproval the strange, fantastic perversion of their Government, known as the New Deal.

They will be called upon in November to pass judgment upon what has been done and what is proposed to be done under the New Deal. A mere recapitulation of the outstanding features of the New Deal would fill a large volume. I shall not attempt this recapitulation.

But it is my duty, as I see it, to point out to my countrymen the dangers that await them in case the Government of the United States is perverted further by New Deal objectives and theories. In order to throw light upon the future we must consider what has been done and undone, and what is unmistakably intended.

First and foremost, let us bear in mind the situation that confronted this country when the New Deal became the rule of government, and what remedies the New Dealers attempted to apply. Let us separate, if we can, genuine efforts from false political propaganda. Let us make allowance for unforeseen contingencies which forced changes of policy and made campaign pledges worthless. Let us follow the course of the New Deal through these four eventful sessions to the present hour, so that we can make an accurate forecast of what is to come, based upon what has been done and what is declared to be the coming New Deal program.

In a single word, the United States in 1933 was suffering from the consequences of the World War, which threw the whole world into acute distress. Ten million active men had been killed and additional millions disabled. More than \$250,000,000,000 of the wealth of nations had been destroyed. Normal relations were disrupted and commerce ruined.

All patriotic Americans deemed it necessary to stand by President Roosevelt in taking heroic measures to lift the United States out of the depression. Like other Members of Congress, I was proud to sink partisanship and support the President. With practical unanimity, although with rising doubts, Congress enacted the laws desired. You all know what these laws were.

The two chief objectives were relief and recovery. Relief was twofold—relief of unemployment and relief of agriculture.

Unfortunately for the New Deal, and unfortunately for the prestige of Congress as a maker of laws, the two ambitious projects adopted for recovery of industry and relief of agriculture were declared unconstitutional and invalid. But in the meantime the people of the United States—the individual millions—were busily at work extricating themselves, and the country as a whole went forward. Industry seemed to do better after escaping from the rigors of the N. I. R. A., and agriculture suffered no setback when the A. A. A. was scrapped.

Early in the New Deal history we discovered that the President of the United States was not satisfied with attempting to accomplish relief and recovery. He adopted strange theories of "reform", originating God knows where, and aimed at God knows what. Mixed in with these reform projects was an insatiable lust for power. It was difficult to determine whether reform or power was the chief objective. No doubt the President believed that the reforms he had in mind could not be accomplished unless he was granted unprecedented power. At any rate, he demanded practically unlimited power, and in order to obtain it he em-

ployed tactics which destroyed the confidence of many men in Congress who had theretofore supported him.

As the New Deal program unfolded it was seen that the lust for power, the determination to effect vast experimental "reforms", and discreditable political methods (including debauchery of the civil service) were accompanied by astounding absence of any sense of responsibility for the safeguarding of public money against waste, extravagance, and graft.

The solemn decisions and warnings of the Supreme Court, responsible under God for faithful enforcement of the Constitution ordained by the people as their supreme law—supreme over Presidents, Congresses, and courts—were flouted and derided by New Dealers. The country was dismayed by the unmistakable purpose of the President to execute his program of experimental "reforms" in spite of these decisions and warnings. He sent bills to Congress which were intended to circumvent the Constitution and the Supreme Court; and the obedient majority passed these bills over the protest of those who now saw all too clearly the deadly consequences that would follow adoption of the President's program.

Along with the passage of these disloyal and destructive laws came renewed demands for stupendous sums of money, to be spent at the discretion of the President, ostensibly for relief and recovery, but actually to carry forward his mysterious program of "reforms." Congress handed over the purse of the Nation to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Now we have reached the time for judgment—the day of reckoning is nearly at hand.

What do we find? We find that most of the important New Deal laws have been thrown upon the ash heap. We find a sinister and vindictive determination to punish all American industry under the pretense of punishing malefactors. We find a fixed purpose to fasten experimental "reforms" upon the people at a time when they are struggling to get upon their feet. We find them staggering under a crushing load of debt and taxes at the very time when all their energies are spent in trying to recover, when their resources are low and their businesses deranged by unwise laws and threats of direct competition by the Government itself. We find billions spent without reducing the number of the unemployed or putting into effect any plan for employing them except by further spending of public money. We find decision after decision by the lower courts, based upon Supreme Court decrees, all pointing to the inevitable invalidation of laws which the New Deal is vainly attempting to execute.

In a nutshell, we find the American people heroically striving to recover, and that their greatest handicap and most dangerous antagonist is the New Deal government, which professes to be trying to aid them.

The people need certainty of values in their daily transactions and commitments. They are struggling against the uncertainty of values. No one knows what the dollar will be worth tomorrow. Who dares to make a long-term contract which would furnish employment for men now maintained by public money?

The people need certainty in the honest transaction of their business—certainty against Government competition and arbitrary bureaucratic interference with honest trade.

The people need certainty in Government policy. They have enough to do now, without being subjected to experiments that would involve added taxes and changes in their system of living and doing business.

The people need certainty as to the absorption of the unemployed by normally operating industry, agriculture, and commerce. They are given uncertainty.

The people need certainty—reasonable certainty—as to the taxes they must pay. They are not only given uncertainty, but are under notice that debts, taxes, and deficits will go higher in order to finance the mysterious "reforms" that are planned by the New Deal.

The people need certainty against disastrous foreign competition in their own market. They have uncertainty and growing competition that injures industry, labor, and agriculture.

The people need certainty and stability in government. They have uncertainty and instability, manifested by persistent attempts to evade the Constitution and plain declarations that the Constitution must be upset if necessary to accomplish experimental reforms.

The sublime paradox of the New Deal, the crowning triumph of absurdity, is that both the promises and the acts that broke the promises were made in the name of the public welfare. The promise of economy and the frenzied squandering of billions—both for the public welfare. The promise of sound money and the adulteration of the dollar—both for the public welfare. The promise of adherence to the civil service and the filling of tens of thousands of jobs by political hirelings—both for the public welfare. The promise of lopping off useless agencies and the creation of more than 40 larger and more extravagant ones—both for the public welfare. The promise of a breathing spell for bedeviled American industry and the declaration of war to the knife—both for the public welfare. The promise of obedience to the Constitution and the frantic appeal to Congress to disregard the Constitution—both for the public welfare. The promise that \$4,880,000,000 would restore employment, and the demand for \$1,500,000,000 more, with no decrease in unemployment—both for the public welfare. The promise that there would be no new taxes, and the new law imposing \$800,000,000 in taxes—both for the public welfare.

Is it any wonder that industry has failed to employ more men while it held its breath, wondering what would happen next? Is it any wonder that the people have been bewildered by the wild gyrations of their government? The only certainty that the people have had during this paroxysm has been the certainty that any promise made would be broken. By discounting administration promises 100 percent in advance some men have got near the truth and the facts.

There it stands, sir, the record of the New Deal. In all the annals of our country, there is no parallel to the wreckage piled up by the New Deal—the wreckage of invalid laws; the wreckage of financial and economic stability; the wreckage of Federal finances; the wreckage of futile efforts to abolish unemployment; the wreckage of public and private confidence in the President's promises and pledges; the wreckage of protection against the waves of pauper-labor imports that drive down the American standard of living; the wreckage of individual and teamwork enterprise, destroyed by bureaucracy armed with usurped power.

On this gigantic pile of wreckage it is proposed that we shall plan and build for the next 4 years. What a foundation upon which to build the hopes and labors of the American people.

Apologists of the New Deal ask: "What alternative do you propose? How could the Republican Party do any better?"

The reply is to be found in the Republican platform and the Republican candidate for President of the United States. The platform declares and the candidate personifies the Republican program in one word: "Restoration."

First of all, we would restore the stability of the Government by removing all danger of subverting or violating the Constitution. We would restore the people's confidence in their Government by stabilizing its finances, abolishing extravagance and graft, reducing its expenditures, and avoiding new and costly experiments. We would reassure every honest businessman that he will be unmolested by the Government, by crooked competitors, or by foreign monopolists of his market. We would restore confidence in the independence of Congress, to the end that fair and wise laws shall be enacted that will encourage industry, agriculture, and labor to recover and prosper. We would restore confidence in the Presidency by squaring performance with promises. We would restore confidence in the minds of millions who combine their efforts in honest teamwork by organizing and operating corporations.

It was teamwork that won the independence of the United States. It was teamwork that established the Union. It was teamwork that devised and ordained the Constitution. It was teamwork that saved the Union. It was teamwork that won the War with Spain and the World War.

By restoring the security of honest men honestly cooperating through corporations, labor unions, farm co-operatives or otherwise, the Republican Party would restore employment and prosperity.

As against the program of the New Deal, which arraigns one set of citizens against another and the Government dictating to all, the Republican Party proposes to restore the simple and practical rule of cooperation between the Government and the people. By the teamwork of Government and people, all striving for restoration of confidence, stability, and prosperity, the havoc wrought by the New Deal can be wiped away, the trend toward ruin stopped, and the threat of new wrecks removed.

That, sir, is the alternative offered by the Republican Party.

LONDON OR ROOSEVELT IN 1936?

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican and New Deal conventions are over. Landon and Knox are the candidates of the Republican Party, and Roosevelt and Garner are the candidates of the Democratic Party. Both platforms have been adopted. The Republican Party boasts of the most progressive candidate and platform in its history since the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

The Democratic platform was necessarily a defense of the administration policies as followed during the last 3½ years and of its abandonment of the platform of 1932, upon which the President was elected. We now look forward toward the election, and political prophets are beginning to predict results. These predictions are usually biased and influenced by the desire of the person making them to have his party win. He tries to instill confidence into the adherents of his party by making his party's chances to win look as favorable, and the opposite party's chances look as unfavorable, as possible. He knows that lack of confidence means lack of morale, and lack of morale is always a great factor in determining who gets the most votes.

Occasionally political landslides occur. Politicians and those who have failed to keep in touch with public sentiment are surprised. The people themselves and those who have analyzed before the election the forces that have brought about the landslide are not surprised. They knew what was likely to happen.

Let us analyze the forces that brought about the Democratic landslide of 1932. Let us take a political inventory of those forces as they existed in 1932. Let us see whether there is enough change in sentiment to affect the results and whether anything has occurred to bring back to the folds of the Republican Party the millions of voters who, for some cause or another, deserted that party and joined what they thought was the Democratic Party but what proved to be a New Deal party. Let us determine from the facts what forces the Republican Party has in 1936 that it did not have in 1932 and try to reach some conclusion based upon these facts.

LEADERSHIP

The first factor in any campaign is leadership. Without casting any reflection on the quality of past leadership, the Republican Party will have in the coming campaign in John Hamilton the most dynamic and forceful leader it has had in recent years. Mr. James Farley, the New Deal leader, had everything pretty much his own way during the past 2 or 3 years. He kept saying things about the Republican Party and its leadership, and not much was said in reply. When the new chairman, Mr. Hamilton, took the helm Mr. Farley began his usual broadcasting of political wahoo and immediately attacked the red-headed leader of the Republican Party. When the old Tammany cluck got through with the brown leghorn game rooster from Topeka, he found his feathers scattered far and wide; found himself ready for the bathtub as far as bareness was concerned, and does not know yet just what happened to him. Already we hear New Dealers who formerly praised Farley criticize him. They say that, like the proverbial parrot, "he talks too much." So far as leadership is concerned, even the new dealers admit that Hamilton is just a little too much for Farley.

VETERAN VOTE

There are 4,000,000 World War veterans in the United States. These veterans, together with their wives, fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers, have a potential voting power of from eight to ten million votes. In 1932 they were extremely antagonistic toward Mr. Hoover and the Republican Party. Hoover had vetoed their pet measure, the bonus bill. Justly or unjustly, he was accused of having driven their comrades, the bonus marchers, out of Washington with tear gas and bayonet. During the 1932 campaign, if you wanted to get into an argument without support from anyone, all you had to do was to go to a veterans' clubroom and start to defend Mr. Hoover and the Republican Party, and the fight was on. This group of voters constituted a force which in itself was able to and did bring about Democratic victory in 1932—a force that can in itself bring about Republican victory in 1936.

Where does the veteran group as a class stand in the campaign of 1936? On the one side, we have Mr. Roosevelt twice vetoing the bonus. Time and again Mr. Roosevelt used language, and especially in his veto messages, which was highly antagonistic toward the veteran. This was particularly noticeable and uncalled for in his message when he finally signed the bill restoring the pensions of the Spanish-American War veterans. Not only is he being charged with vetoing the bonus but he is being charged with having taken \$600,000,000 a year out of the disabled veteran on the plea of economy and then spending extravagantly and wastefully twenty or thirty billions of dollars. The veteran is peeved, to say the least. Go to any veterans' clubroom today and try to defend Mr. Roosevelt. Chances are 10 to 1 that some veteran whose pension was cut will leap to his feet and give you a mouthful to carry away. And what has the Republican Party to offer for 1936? On the Republican side the veteran is given his first opportunity of voting for a comrade and veteran for the Presidency of the United States. Not only has he a chance to cast his vote for a comrade for President but he also has his opportunity of casting a vote for a comrade for Vice President. Between Roosevelt and Landon there can be no doubt where these potential eight or ten million votes are going. Landon will carry the veteran vote by a tremendous majority.

And how about the thousands of Spanish War Veterans? They still feel that Roosevelt owes them the pension he took away from them by the economy bill. On the Republican side is Knox, a Rough Rider, who followed Teddy Roosevelt in going over the top at San Juan Hill. The Spanish War veteran will go unanimously for Landon and Knox.

NEWSPAPER SUPPORT

In 1932 it is estimated that the Democratic Party and Roosevelt had the support of 67 percent of the newspaper circulation. Today it is estimated that from 75 to 80 percent of the newspaper circulations, particularly in the Northern and pivotal States, are against Roosevelt and the New Deal party. A great many of these newspapers have been hammering the administration and its policies from day to day and from month to month during the past 2 years. This force cannot be ignored. It is a power in creating and crystallizing public sentiment. No man has ever been elected to the Presidency on any ticket in the face of such tremendous opposition on the part of the public press and no man ever will.

PUBLIC-UTILITY STOCKHOLDERS

Three million public-utility stockholders have been and are being told daily that the President is creating unfair competition in the power field, and that such unfair competition will ultimately destroy their investments. In hundreds of thousands of cases, this means their bread and butter. They see the T. V. A. and other power dams being built with public moneys, 50 percent of which is charged to flood control, national defense, and what not and not charged against the investment. The other 50 percent is borrowed at the low rate of interest made possible by Government credit. They see these public dams operating tax

free without paying their share of the burden of public taxation. The property the Government purchases is taken from the tax roll, reducing the valuation of the taxing unit, and increasing the rate and therefore increasing the amount the other taxpayers of that tax unit have to pay.

On the other side, when they get their balance sheets from their company, they find that they have to furnish 100 percent of the capital, pay commercial rates of interest on all moneys borrowed through bonds or preferred stock, and are expected to pay dividends to their stockholders. They see the tax item year after year showing the tremendous amount paid in taxes to township, county, school district, village, State, and other public treasuries. These 3,000,000 stockholders know that their company cannot exist in the face of this sort of competition and that, if it continues, their investment will and must ultimately be destroyed. The law of self-preservation makes them cast their vote against the New Deal and for the Republican Party. These 3,000,000 stockholders with wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, fathers, mothers, and so forth, constitute another potential 6,000,000 votes. They are scattered, as a rule, through the pivotal States of the North, whereas those supporting the President's power policies are, as a rule, either in the Democratic States of the South, through the Tennessee Valley area, or in the Western States where the electoral votes per State are small. Where can these investors go for protection except to the Republican Party?

THE BUSINESSMAN

In 1932 the Republican Party could not raise a wooden nickel in most of the cities from the American businessman. Why, had not Roosevelt charged the party and Hoover with extravagance? Did not he promise business a 25-percent reduction in governmental expense and accordingly a 25-percent reduction in taxes? Did not Roosevelt say the depression was caused by high taxes, waste, and extravagance of the Republican Party and its leadership? Did not he say that the large public debt and a failure to balance the Budget meant bankruptcy and ruin? The Republican Party could not raise enough money to pay the postage in a reasonably effective Presidential campaign. And what does that same businessman say today? He has been taxed, re-taxed, and taxed again. The public debt has climbed to unprecedented heights. Every session of Congress since the present administration took the helm has passed a tax bill on top of the last tax bill. Perhaps the most alarming of all is the bill passed by the present Congress which forces the distribution of surpluses.

You remember the Biblical story about the famine in Egypt; about the dream of Pharaoh of the seven lean kine and seven fat kine, of the 7 years of surpluses followed by 7 years of starvation? You remember the policy followed by Pharaoh on the advice of Joseph in filling the granaries during the fat years so they might eat during the lean years. The business heads of American corporations in the past have followed the advice of Joseph. During the fat years prior to 1929 the wise businessman filled his financial granary with surpluses. During the lean years since 1929 he fed his stockholders and employees out of those financial granaries. It is estimated that 50 percent of the dividends paid by corporations to stockholders, big and small, have been paid out of the surpluses placed in the financial granaries during the prosperous years. The automobile industry today is leading the way back to recovery in spite of desperate handicaps, such as the recent tax bill, with moneys placed in the surplus during the fat years. General Motors alone is spending \$50,000,000 this year for new plants and equipment out of the surpluses set aside during those years. Two thousand employees will be placed at work in one city in Michigan where work is needed most by the building of a new factory. According to the report of the Secretary of Labor, we spent \$2,000,000,000 in 1934, employing 500,000 men in a public-works program. In other words, it costs \$4,000 to keep one unemployed person at work 1 year. If this be true, then it would take \$8,000,000 to keep these 2,000 people employed in a public-works program each year. All this is being done by

General Motors with money placed in its financial granaries during the fat years, to be drawn out during the starvation years.

What would have happened had the present tax bill, which will soon become law, and which takes 42 percent from surpluses, been in force and effect during the past 15 years. The American businessman knows that there would have been no surplus. The financial granary would have been empty. We would have wasted our substance during prosperous years to starve during lean years. The American businessman knows all of this. He knows what the principles of sound business are. He knows the advice of Joseph to Pharoah was sound and the policy of the present administration in destroying and making impossible the filling of the financial granaries during fat years to be used during lean years will mean bankruptcy and ruin. He knows that the first lean year and the first substantial loss of his company will mean insolvency unless there is a surplus to offset that loss. Go down the street and ask the average businessman what he thinks of the present administration. The answer you will receive universally over the Nation is the same. "Four years more of this", he tells you, "and there won't be any more business." "If there is any business, the Government and not the owner of the business will run it." One of the biggest assets of the Democratic Party in 1932 was the businessman, big and small. Fear and the law of self-preservation has driven him into the ranks of the Republican Party. He will be found there working desperately for Republican victory because Republican victory is his only chance of self-preservation.

THE FARMER

After 3½ years chasing will-o'-the-wisps the farmer is beginning to realize that no policy based upon a philosophy of scarcity is sound. The recent Soil Conservation Act is conceded by administration officials to be merely an attempt to carry out the unsound policies of the unconstitutional A. A. A. The administration farm policy reads something like this: "We are going to raise \$400,000,000 (one-half of the amount raised by the recent tax bill) to pay the farmer for taking out of production 50,000,000 acres of land. By doing so we are eliminating farm-crop surplus and increasing the price the farmer received. The farmer, having more money, will buy more of the city's manufactured goods, thereby creating more employment." All of this sounds good until we begin to ask: "What are you going to do with the men who plowed, harrowed, planted, cultivated, and harvested these 50,000,000 acres of land that now will not be plowed, harrowed, cultivated, and harvested? What are you going to do with the man who worked in the warehouses that stored the crop harvested on these 50,000,000 acres of land? What about the railroad men employed in transporting this crop to markets in the cities and the thousands of men who found employment in the distribution of this crop?"

Have not you created more unemployment on the farmer's end than you have created employment on the manufacturer's end of the production line? Undoubtedly this accounts at least in part for the fact that after 3½ years of boondoggling and of spending the most tremendous sums in the history of the country we have still eleven or twelve million men on the unemployed lists, a number which is larger than when Mr. Hoover went out of office 3½ years ago. The farmer is beginning to realize all of this.

Four years ago he would not believe, and you could not convince him, that Mr. Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture, meant what he said in his pamphlet, "America Must Choose."

He refused to believe that the time would or could come in free America when, as Mr. Wallace said, "Every plowed field will have a license nailed to a post." Today he is willing to believe that will be done which has at least in part already been done. He has been conservative as a rule. The mortgage he has been struggling to pay and the interest he has been compelled to pay for years make him realize

as no other citizen realizes that this gigantic public debt must be paid. Not only must that debt be paid but the annual interest must be paid with money earned by the sweat of some taxpayer's brow. While he is scraping and saving pennies to enable him to pay his yearly taxes and interest on his mortgage, he sees all around him extravagance and waste. Men are being paid wages far above the wages he can pay on his farm. He tries to employ help only to find that no one will help him, and when they do, they ask the same wages the Government pays with his tax money but which he cannot pay. They will not leave Government employment with short hours and large wages to work for him at long hours with such pay as he can afford. As one relief worker put it recently, "Why should I get up at 5 o'clock in the morning, milk your cows, work 10 hours, then milk some more cows and do more chores, when I can work 40 hours a week for the Government and get more money?" Four years ago the farmer would not listen to the Republican Party when he was told that the depression was world-wide. Today he listens. Furthermore the northern Republican farmer is at heart a tariff protectionist. It was the Republican tariff policy that kept him in the ranks of that party for years. Today he sees himself placed in competition with cheap foreign labor by the reciprocal tariff policy of the administration. On the one hand, he is being told by the administration that he will not be hurt; on the other, he sees millions of dollars of competitive farm products coming into the country and knows that he is being hurt. With a western liberal candidate who understands the farm problems as few men do the Republican Party will get its share of the farm vote in America.

THIRD PARTY MOVEMENT

Four years ago Father Coughlin was supporting Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. Sunday after Sunday his voice was heard over the air by millions. "Roosevelt or Ruin" was his thundering battle cry week after week as he attacked Mr. Hoover and the Republican Party and supported Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. Today those same listeners hear that same voice thundering over the air, "Roosevelt and Ruin." His attack on the Republican Party has been lost in his attack on Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal Party. The third party is his party. His followers will come from the ranks of the Democratic Party of 4 years ago because that is where they were 4 years ago. The Republican Party cannot lose support it did not have. A prominent man, Democratic Member of Congress, recently stated in my presence that it would mean 50,000 votes in his district alone. If, he stated, Father Coughlin opposed Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party in the coming election it would mean defeat. While the third party may not elect many of its members to office it will in many instances hold that balance of power which means election or defeat to old-party candidates. The Father Coughlin adherents, having added their support to the Democratic Party 4 years ago, that support must be deducted from the strength of the Democratic Party of 4 years ago, regardless as to where it goes.

DISSENTION WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Those who study politics do not minimize the strength of Governor Smith, Bainbridge Colby, and others who walked out of the Democratic Party. The real Jeffersonian Democrats are dissatisfied to say the least. A remark one hears repeatedly is that this is not the Democratic Party but the New Deal Party which is in power. This is not a democratic but a socialistic form of government we have. Some will stand aside, say and do nothing, hoping for but not daring to do anything to bring about the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt. This feeling is particularly evident in the Democratic South. The doctrine of State rights is a religion with the South. They see that doctrine cast aside and see the New Deal Party doing everything possible to bring about a strong centralized government. They know that this means an abandonment of the cherished States' rights doctrine over which the Civil War was fought.

One must indeed be blind to say that this will not affect results and especially in New York with its 47 electoral votes.

PROHIBITION

In 1932 prohibition was a fundamental issue. Hundreds of thousands of Republican voters cast their vote for Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party because they were not satisfied with the Republican plank on that issue. Today the issue is settled. That voter is satisfied and will without doubt be found back in the ranks of his old party.

CANDIDATES AND PLATFORM

The Republican Party is going into this campaign with the most progressive platform under the most progressive leadership in its history since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. That platform and leadership ought to satisfy the most progressive Republican. Knox followed Teddy Roosevelt not only over San Juan Hill, but he followed him through the Progressive campaign of 1912. Landon has demonstrated his progressive leadership in the part he took in writing the most progressive platform in the history of the party.

RESULTS OF THE ELECTION

A careful and close analysis of the forces that are responsible for victory and defeat point in no uncertain terms to a Republican landslide in 1936. The politician will claim victory for his side because he tries to instill confidence in his followers, and lack of confidence means defeat. The analyst, considering cold facts, will not be surprised at the outcome when he considers the facts. To verify this a recent Washington press dispatch carried the confidential report of Emil Hurja, who has been the New Deal administration's political analyst. He has been Farley's chief statistician and first assistant. Naturally his report would be as optimistic as possible to satisfy his chief, and yet, according to the Hurja report, the New Dealers can lay claim legitimately to only 222 electoral votes, which is 44 less than enough to insure reelection of the national ticket. The press report says that Hurja's figures would have created something less than the sensation they did had he not in the past been so uniformly correct.

In addition to the 222 electoral votes he is now claiming, Hurja has itemized approximately 100 more votes, by States, out of which he reports the New Dealers have an even chance of gaining the necessary 44 for victory. The 222 votes claimed as certain for Roosevelt by Hurja include 113 votes in the solid southern block. Hurja's list of doubtful States from which it is hoped the New Dealers will be able to gather in 44 votes, include California, Minnesota, Maryland, Oklahoma, Missouri, Wisconsin, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Iowa. Taking Hurja's figures and estimates, and giving the Democratic Party the 222 votes plus an even break in 100 doubtful electoral votes, which would be 50 votes, then according to Hurja's own figures Roosevelt would be elected by six electoral votes. Certainly not a vote which would justify Mr. Farley's recent utterances as to the number of States they will carry. However, when this estimate was made the third party was not in the field. With Mr. Lemke, from North Dakota, running it will be conceded that both North and South Dakota will either be carried by Mr. Lemke and the new party or the split in the Roosevelt ranks will throw those two States into the ranks of the Republican Party. Among the States with the larger number of electoral votes to which Hurja at this time makes no claims save to list them as "bad news" for Farley are: New York, 47 votes; Massachusetts, 17; Michigan, 19; Ohio, 26; and Pennsylvania, 36.

When you take into consideration the fact that the Hurja report is based upon election returns and figures obtained prior to the nomination of Landon and Knox, and the adoption of the most progressive platform in the history of the Republican Party; when you take into consideration the further fact that the veteran vote could not have been considered in those reports, his analysis, which practically predicts defeat for the administration, must be considered exceptionally optimistic.

CONCLUSION

Can Roosevelt be elected?

First. With eight to ten millions of veteran votes as a class against him, including the Spanish-American War veterans.

Second. With 80 percent of the newspaper circulation opposed to him.

Third. With three to six millions of public-utility stockholder votes opposed to him.

Fourth. With the businessman against him.

Fifth. Without the solid support of the farmer the Nation over.

Sixth. With the opposition of Father Coughlin and the new third party, who were for him 4 years ago.

Seventh. With dissension within his own party and with the opposition or half-hearted support of men like Governor Smith, Governor Ely, Bainbridge Colby, and many more leaders, all of whom, with the possible exception of Governor Smith, supported him in 1932.

Eighth. With prohibition not an issue.

Can he win against the most dynamic leadership, with the most progressive platform and candidates since the days of Theodore Roosevelt?

The answer is an emphatic "no." The political analyst will say that the above means an overwhelming defeat for the New Deal party and a landslide back to the Republican Party in 1936.

My prediction is that there will be an exodus of New Dealers out of Washington next January like the children of Israel leaving Egypt, and they will not be on their way to the promised land.

THE COLORED CITIZEN ADVANCES UNDER THE ROOSEVELT NEW DEAL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal administration's recognition for the past 3½ years of a large number of distinguished colored citizens by appointment to positions of trust and importance in the Federal Government at Washington has demonstrated beyond question that merit and not color has been the rule of President Roosevelt, the members of the Cabinet, and the Congress.

Under the last national Republican administration there were only six Negro citizens who held positions of a superior nature in the Federal Government, through either Presidential or Cabinet officer's appointment, to wit: Municipal Judge James A. Cobb; Hon. Arthur G. Froe, recorder of deeds; Attorney Perry W. Howard, Department of Justice; Attorney William Houston, Post Office Department; William Jackson, Department of Commerce; and Karl Phillips, conciliator in the Department of Labor.

The official record reveals more than 40 outstanding places to which colored citizens have been appointed by the Roosevelt New Deal in order that they, too, might have a place at the head of the table in determining the policies of the present administration in its unprecedented plan and program for social justice and security to all alike, regardless of race, creed, or color.

These persons and the positions now held by them in the Federal Government are alphabetically listed below:

- Allen, L. R., statistician, Works Progress Administration.
- Anderson, Anthony H., junior engineer, Rural Resettlement Administration, Newport News, Va.
- Atkins, James A., field assistant, Educational Department, Works Progress Administration.
- Bethune, Mrs. Mary McLeod, director, Colored Activities, National Youth Administration.
- Bond, Max, supervisor of recreation and training, Tennessee Valley Authority, Wheeler Dam, Ala.
- Bailey, Walter T., architect, participating in a Chicago housing project.
- Brown, Edgar G., C. C. C. adviser on Negro affairs, and special assistant to the director of Emergency Conservation Work.
- Clarke, Thomas H. R., deputy recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.
- Davis, John A., research assistant, Department of Labor.
- Duke, Charles S., planning engineer, Rural Resettlement Administration.
- Edwards, Mrs. Thyra J., assistant to rehousing supervisor, P. W. A., Chicago.
- Evans, Joseph H. B., adviser on Negro affairs and administrative assistant to the Rural Resettlement Administration.

Ferguson, Arthur, junior engineer, Inspection Division, Public Works Administration.

Gammon, John, R. R. A. community and project manager.

Hall, Charles E., specialist in Negro statistics, Department of Commerce.

Hamilton, Bertram, special assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Harsh, F. W., Jr., land purchaser, Chicago Housing Project, Public Works Administration.

Hastie, William H., assistant solicitor, Department of the Interior.

Houchins, Joseph R., assistant business specialist of Negro Affairs Division, Department of Commerce.

Hubert, Giles A., project analyst, R. R. A. (Summer leave of absence to study cooperatives in Europe.)

Hunt, Henry A., assistant to the Governor, Farm Credit Administration.

Jackson, Sydney M., Special Chief Clerk at Large, Post Office Department.

Jones, Dewey R., associate adviser on Negro affairs, Department of the Interior.

Jones, Eugene Kinckle, adviser on Negro affairs, Department of Commerce.

King, Dr. Louis E., junior historian, National Park Service, Gettysburg, Pa., C. C. C. Camps.

Mann, Theophilus M., legal staff, Public Works Administration Regional Office, Chicago, Ill.

McKissack & McKissack (architectural firm), Consultants, Nashville Housing Project (Tennessee).

McNeill, William C., R. R. A. Junior Engineer.

Melby, John A., architectural draftsman, Department of the Interior.

Millender, LeRoy (St. Louis), foreman Rural Resettlement Administration.

Moron, Alonzo, Commissioner of Public Welfare, Virgin Islands. Oxley, Lawrence A., chief, Division of Negro Labor, Department of Labor.

Prescott, J. Parker, associate supervisor in management branch, P. W. A. Housing.

Reed, R. R. (Chicago, Ill.), assistant executive secretary, Code Authority for Funeral Industry.

Reid, Ira DeA., director Negro white-collar survey, W. P. A. (Administration Department of the Interior).

Reid, Orleans, Jr., field planner, R. R. A.

Roberts, Lewis R., community project manager, R. R. A., Bricks, N. C.

Robinson, Hilyard R., architect, Department of the Interior.

Scott, Hon. Ormand J., judge of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, Presidential appointment, confirmed by the United States Senate unanimously.

Smith, Alfred E., Federal Emergency Relief Administration, administrative assistant Works Progress Administration.

Smith, C. V., resident engineer in charge, R. R. A., Newport News, Va.

Stanton, Robert, R. R. A. Field Service.

Tandy, Vertner R., consultant to Robinson, Williams & Porter (architectural firm), Langston Terrace Project, Washington, D. C.

Thorne, Frank, rehousing assistant, Housing Division, Public Works Administration.

Thornton, William F., assistant engineer, R. R. A., Washington, D. C.

Thompkins, Dr. William J., recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia. Presidential appointment, confirmed by the United States Senate.

Vaughn, Ralph, architectural draftsman, Resettlement Administration, Department of Agriculture.

Wilkes, Charles, community project manager, R. R. A., Mound Bayou, Miss.

Wilson, John, one of principal architects, New York City housing project.

Weaver, Dr. Robert C., adviser on Negro affairs, Department of the Interior.

Williston, O. M., landscape architect, Langston Terrace Project, Washington, D. C.

This list does not include 132 colored educational advisers in the C. C. C. in more than 30 States of the Union, colored case workers, administrative assistants in the W. P. A., P. W. A., N. Y. A., and A. A. A. in the States, nor secretarial, stenographical, clerical, or subclerical appointments (of which there have been several hundred colored) in the Federal Government at Washington, D. C., during the Roosevelt New Deal administration.

Something of the character, participation, and success of these New Deal policies are graphically reflected in the figures below of the Civilian Conservation Corps popularly known as the C. C. C., as to what the Civilian Conservation Corps is doing for colored youth under the emergency-conservation work.

Approximately 35,000 young colored men and war veterans, one-tenth of the total C. C. C. enrollment, are engaged

on work projects throughout the country; \$700,000 a month is allotted by colored C. C. C. boys to their parents and dependents back home; 150,000 colored C. C. C. boys have served in the corps and many have gained from 7 to 15 pounds in weight during the past 3 years; 132 colored college graduates are serving C. C. C. camps as educational advisers; 25 colored Medical Reserve officers and chaplains of the United States Reserve Corps are on active duty in the Nation's C. C. C. camps; 300 colored typists are assigned to C. C. C. headquarters of the commanding officers and supervisory forces; 1,200 colored cooks are steadily employed in C. C. C. mess halls; 10,000 colored C. C. C. enrollees in the past 3 years have completed courses in first-aid through cooperation of the emergency conservation work and the National Red Cross.

To summarize the report of Mrs. Bethune, director, colored activities, to the President on the National Youth Administration, we find 28 colored leaders are members of the State N. Y. A. advisory committees, North and South. An equal number of colored assistant State directors and trained college men and women of the colored race are filling high executive positions in New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, Tennessee, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, Georgia, Colorado, California, and Texas; which State programs have had the largest participation of young colored men and women.

The National Youth Administration is helping approximately 26,000 colored youth to continue in school through payments for part-time work under supervision of school authorities. These young people range in age from 16 to 25. There are approximately 5,000 of these colored students in the undergraduate class and 70 graduate college students in both the strictly Negro institutions and the leading universities. The average monthly rate per college student is \$15, while the graduate students receive from \$25 to \$30 monthly. Those students of high-school classes are being paid a maximum of \$6 per month.

Of the \$50,000,000 expended by the N. Y. A. organization during the past year, it is conservatively estimated that the financial benefits to the colored youth is about one-tenth of the amount set aside.

It is important to note here that recent surveys reveal that the educational facilities, length of school term, and salaries of colored teachers in the South have been advanced more than 30 percent since the Federal Government stepped into this program and the advent of the Roosevelt New Deal.

The physical equipment and health benefits to the colored race and the Nation as a result of the erection of new school buildings, playgrounds, swimming pools, gymnasiums, auditoriums, and recreation centers under the P. W. A., F. E. R. A., and W. P. A. programs are incalculable to present and future generations. Millions of dollars in wages have come to colored workmen and great stimulus has been given to the heavy industries and business has picked up generally through purchases of materials by the Government for this emergency construction. In production plants, steel mills, and factories, thousands of Negroes have again been gainfully employed.

It is estimated that nearly 30,000 otherwise unemployed colored school teachers have been given work in all parts of the country. Better salaries in the South, as well as the North, have been reported. It should be noted that the minimum salary rate approved by Administrator Hopkins for all W. P. A. workers has meant payment of a much higher scale of wages for the hundreds of thousands of colored persons on State and Federal projects. A far larger number of colored citizens have been employed under the Federal Government's emergency public-works program in capacities commensurate with their specialized training than heretofore in private industry.

Hundreds of research technicians, administrative officials, supervisors, skilled workmen, foremen, and other white-collar workers of the Negro race have had equal opportunity under the Roosevelt administration.

Nearly \$2,000,000 was specially earmarked by President Roosevelt for surveys on the occupational opportunities for Negroes, State vocational and educational aid, and a Nation-wide household workers' project to train the tens of thousands of persons on relief for gainful employment. Colored instructors and personnel workers, men and women, have been employed to prosecute this important job of training and placing competent household workers.

While projects beneficial to Negroes have been adopted in many States, I make special mention of an estimated expenditure of \$2,000,000 for a new colored high school and repairs and additions on 13 existing structures through the form of grants and Federal aid by the Public Works Administration in my own State, Missouri. This, of course, was only the Government's share, the State and cities adding a much larger amount to the total cost of the improvements.

The new city hospital in St. Louis sought for the past decade by colored citizens of St. Louis, my home city, has been completed through Public Works Administration financial support.

Reports received by H. A. Hunt, Negro assistant to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, indicate not only colored farmers are receiving this important Federal service but that they are paying back and meeting their obligations promptly and fully. It is important, also, to note that without exception the annual conference of the local and State associations are attended by the farmers in the South of both races. The local borrowers from the F. C. A. automatically become members of the association.

Credit unions under the jurisdiction of the Farm Credit Administration, not only appeal to rural communities but also to urban sections, and here, too, the participation of colored citizens in such group organizations as the railway clerks, waiters, school teachers, et cetera, are general, and many colored officers are represented on the governing boards of these organizations in all sections of the country.

It should be apparent to all that this brief summary shows beyond question that the Roosevelt administration has done more for the Negro in 3½ years than the Republican Party did since its inception. The Negroes of this country will not be misled by the efforts of Republicans to misrepresent the unprecedented recognition of the Negro during the present administration.

PRESERVE THE CONSTITUTION—A DEFENSE OF TRADITIONAL AMERICAN LIBERTY AND INDIVIDUAL OPPORTUNITY BY THE MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker in extending a welcome to the delegates and visitors attending the Democratic convention in Philadelphia, our old historic city displayed the true cordiality and hospitality that have become synonymous with the name of Philadelphia. Without a trace of partisan feeling, the people of the city, a vast majority of whom are Republicans, did all in their power to make comfortable and happy the visit of the Democratic sojourners in our midst.

Following a dinner tendered to the Governors of the States by the City Administration, a celebration was held at Independence Hall, the birthplace of the world's grandest political documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, where the mayor of the city, the Honorable S. Davis Wilson, delivered an address emphasizing the sacredness of the Constitution under which America has grown great, and urging upon his hearers the necessity in these distressful days of preserving those eternal principles of constitutional liberty to which it gives eloquent expression, and which are now so insidiously assailed as outworn and old-fashioned from so many un-American sources. In this, while the mayor vigorously and without political bias enunciated principles that are inseparable from those of the Republican Party which elected him, he was also as a Republican mayor expressing his adherence to doctrines that are likewise essentially and eminently American. Although Philadelphia is enthusiastically devoted to its Republicanism, I feel that many of the Democrats visiting us would also like to retain the text of the

address to which the mayor of Philadelphia gave utterance on that occasion, and it therefore follows in its completeness.

ADDRESS OF MAYOR S. DAVIS WILSON, OF PHILADELPHIA, AT THE RECEPTION TO THE GOVERNORS OF THE 48 STATES, CABINET MINISTERS, SENATORS, AND MEN OF NATIONAL LEADERSHIP, PRECEDING THE OPENING OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION AND HELD IN INDEPENDENCE HALL WITH A NATION-WIDE BROADCAST, MONDAY EVENING, JUNE 22, 1936

My fellow countrymen, where, with greater force, with greater meaning, or with more genuine fervor could Americans participate in an assemblage of such distinguished Governors and National leaders than in this hallowed spot, Independence Hall? In a world held in the grip of doubt and confusion because of the conflicts of the day, we of America should pause for a moment and be deeply conscious within our very souls of the freedom and the liberty inherent in the fabric of our great Nation, the early concepts of which first saw the light of day at this very spot upon which I now stand.

In the complicated industrial, economic, and governmental affairs of our country today, strong and often violent differences of opinion are disturbing our minds. It is gratifying and a source of the highest hope that at the very root of these differences with respect to matters of policy and philosophy of government the motivation behind those who are for and against the vital issues of the day, is a jealousy and a zeal for that trusted freedom and liberty of action which have always represented the foundation stone of American greatness. The spectacle of great nations across the sea, struggling under aged rivalries and hatreds, points the way for America. Here in Independence Hall the courage and the vision of the founders of the Republic charted out the course of a free Nation, destined for all that we have become.

In the midst of our struggle for a return to economic security and material well-being, let us not be unaware of the blessings that our system of government and our mode of life continue to sustain. Let us ever be vigilant to protect our institutions and our basic system of government so that whether it is given over into the hands of one party or of another party, we shall not swerve from tried and true precepts which have stood the test of time and marked the growth and the wealth of the greatest Nation on earth.

I am happy to receive the Governors of most of the States of our Union here at the shrine of liberty. No man enters and gazes upon this ancient bell, sanctified with the sacrifices and the bloodshed of those who died that we might live and grow, without becoming deeply aware of his part in the pattern of this great country. It seems to me that the very circumstances of this occasion reflect more eloquently than any word could express the wondrous consummation of the dreams of men, of the pioneers who braved this forest to chart out a course which generations have followed.

Here on this hallowed spot, against the power and the domination of a crowned head of Europe, a little handful of great men announced their defiance of a rule that would deny them freedom. With a wisdom that has remained the marvel of man, they framed the greatest document ever conceived—the Constitution of the United States. Through years of struggle that witnessed stalwart courage, dauntless enterprise, and endless sacrifice, we come to the present moment when, through the wonder of science, it is made possible for all practical purposes to bring to this gathering, by the turn of a simple dial, the millions of men and women who constitute America.

I am moved to look upon this momentous occasion as one great all-inclusive meeting; one great outpouring of the hearts of 120,000,000 of people who must soon determine in which direction our Government must follow. In my mind's eye I see that awesome army facing America's most prized possession, our cherished Liberty Bell. The principles announced at the early town meetings in this city, where liberty was founded, tonight find their modern counterpart in the listening millions who await the sound that will go forth to you from this precious bell.

It is a happy augury that we are upon the eve of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution in Philadelphia. This is a preliminary celebration of that event. The actual celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution will occur next year, in 1937, and the principal celebration will be held in Philadelphia, here—in the very room in which we now stand, for it was in this sacred chamber that the Constitution of the United States was proposed and debated, and here it was adopted.

We of Philadelphia are very proud, in a reverent way, of the possession of the historic treasures which are bound up in and around this room and Independence Hall, but we are not selfish about it. There is so much that is awe-inspiring in the never-to-be-forgotten events which occurred here, which excites our deepest feelings of reverence and profound sentiments of humility, that there is no room for so narrow and base a thought as selfishness in the hearts of any true Philadelphian who is first and foremost a true American. We feel, therefore, that in the possession of Independence Hall, the Liberty Bell, and the many other shrines connected with the launching of our great Nation we are but trustees for all Americans the country over.

It is with this thought in mind that I propose a national committee to carry out our great constitutional anniversary celebration next year to be made up of people from one end of America

to the other, throughout its length and breadth, who desire to have a part in the Philadelphia celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

To that end I here and now cordially invite all who may be within sound of my voice in this Nation-wide broadcast to write to me, addressing me at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, and by so doing you will become a member of this national committee, so that the great constitutional anniversary celebration in Philadelphia in 1937 shall in truth be one in which the people of the whole country shall participate and all patriotic Americans have an active part.

The event is one the importance of which I cannot too strongly stress. It will mark the gratitude of Americans of today to the founders of our Nation for that great charter of a free people and the formation of a new idea in Government under which our Nation has grown and thrived as has no other in the whole history of the world. From a pioneering adventure of a few hundred men and women of intrepid courage and dominating determination who landed on a foreign shore inhabited by suspicious and unfriendly savages, landed in inhospitable primitive forests without any other means of shelter or of sustenance than they themselves should provide, we have grown in the short space of two centuries to a Nation unexcelled by any other in history.

Then, when the enterprise and thrift of these hardy pioneers, meeting and overcoming terrifying obstacles and opposition, had expanded the population along the eastern seaboard to several hundred thousand who were housed as comfortably and adequately as any in the Europe of that day; when business and commerce had been founded and built up, with budding institutions of learning and culture, and when men of professional status and genius equal to any then existing in the world had come to be a part of our life, the meanness and cupidity of a foreign government sought to check and control us to its profit and our loss.

It was at this critical juncture that the issue arose, whether to submit and curtail our national existence, to curb our expansion and submerge our national individuality and culture; or, to fight for independence and a right to develop along our own lines as a free people. These patriotic founders accepted the challenge and fought the War of the Revolution to a successful conclusion. Then they sat down in the peace they had won to form the Government under which they and their descendants should live.

The inspired wisdom of the patriotic men and the time gave birth to the Constitution of the United States, admired and commended, even studied and copied, by the statesmen of the world from that day to this.

Under this charter we have become a foremost power in the affairs of the world; a people approaching two hundred million in population and constituting a Nation of wealth, of material, artistic, scientific, cultural, commercial, industrial, and maritime development and achievement which have not been exceeded by any people in recorded history.

The Government under which we have attained this remarkable result is charted in that Constitution. The precepts which have made it possible for a young nation to progress and go forward to the extraordinary achievements the United States of America has to its credit in the short period of 150 years of endeavor were conceived by the writers of the Constitution and are embodied in that great instrument. These are precepts of government which assuredly have stood the test of time, and equally assuredly they are precepts to which all true Americans will adhere with loyal fervor to the end of time.

We wish all people well, including those of foreign nations, and we derive no satisfaction from the misfortunes of other friendly peoples. Yet we cannot fail to observe that the United States is one of the few countries of the world in which its original form of government has survived in the titanic political, social, and economic upheavals which have followed the World War. Here democracy sits enthroned upon foundations firm and secure. Let nothing undermine or uproot those foundations.

To have sustained for a century and a half the incalculable progress, to have attained the enlightenment in so short a time with which America has been blessed under the Constitution, is indeed the occasion for celebration. We are not without our troubles, of course, but it could only have been by Divine guidance that this great charter of liberty was framed. We find Europe threatened with war; we find millions upon millions of people dominated by dictatorships and suffering from exploitation, with its resultant waste and poverty. As I gaze upon this old bronze bell, strong, incorruptible, eternal, I see in it a symbol of the power and the sturdy strength of a people destined for still higher and greater things.

In the tapping of this bell, its voice and its ancient message must echo into the home of every citizen of this country and imbue him and inspire him with a consciousness of his public duty, of the necessity for realizing the part he must play in the future of our Nation. Yes, it might well echo its eternal message around the world, leaving in its path the same vision and strength that it has held for my fellow Americans for over 150 years. Its first ringing marked the deliverance of an entire people into freedom. It is like some permanent sentinel that has stood through the years. There is in it a stolid reminder of how temporal we

are and how inevitable it and its great symbolic truth will go on and on and on.

Let us then breathe in again tonight the spirit of this historic bell; let us rededicate ourselves to eternal warfare against all enemies of our Government; let us reaffirm our determination to carry out the duty which falls upon every American citizen—to guard this unique Government of ours and its basic principles.

We are only passing figures. We have no exclusive rights in the common heritage of liberty endowed to us from this very spot. We are merely trustees; we have merely borrowed for a little while the privileges and licenses that America extends to those who live within her borders. Indeed, more than a license and a privilege; a guarantee of full liberty of action, to worship God in one's own way, to live and breathe and have one's being as a free man. In the last analysis these are the treasures of life. From them can be and have been developed all that modern life has to offer. The danger has always been and always will be that we hold such priceless things too lightly. Before this great dedication ends let there be a reaffirmance of our allegiance to this bell, to this hallowed spot, to those principles marking a new epoch in our national affairs. With the tapping of this priceless heirloom of liberty, my last fervent hope is that a new and powerful consciousness of national unity shall enfold us all, leading us, under Divine guidance, into complete fulfillment.

THE INVINCIBLE JEW

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following copy of an address to be delivered by me under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, from Philadelphia, over the stations of the National Broadcasting System on July 4, 1936.

THE INVINCIBLE JEW

My fellow citizens, it is with genuine happiness that I have accepted the cordial invitation of my war comrades, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, to speak to the people of the Nation concerning the tremendous part that those of Jewish blood have played in the drama of American independence and of world progress. And it is eminently fitting that this message should go forth across mountain and river and prairie from this historic city whose Liberty Bell still enshrines in letters of bronze the injunction of Leviticus: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof."

For liberty is a word that is sacred to every human heart. It is the shibboleth of nations, the magic call from the angel's trumpet of resurrection, a ray of God's own uncreated light penetrating the shadows of this vale of darkness. Only he who has felt the lash of oppression can justly evaluate the blessings of that freedom without which all labor becomes painful, all bread is bitter, all drink becomes gall. Ask him upon whose brain tyranny has forged a shackle, upon whose tongue dictatorship has placed a bridle, upon whose ambition paternalism has set restraining bonds, and he will tell you that, under God, freedom is the sweetest word that the lips can utter or the thoughts contain.

It is not surprising, then, that the race which has contended with the idolatry and luxury of ancient dynasties, and through war, captivity, and reproach, has preserved for us the writings of Moses and David, the recitations of Job and the mingled wailings and thunderings and jubilant anticipations of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Prophets, should naturally be imbued with the very spirit of freedom and loftiest patriotism.

From the deepest recesses of Jewish history we hear voices raised in a patriotic ardor and triumphant fervor that vie in brightness with the song of Deborah and move across the heartstrings with the majestic sweep with which the hosannahs of Moses and of Miriam announced for generations yet to be the first national independence of a delivered people. Indeed, the lyric piping of the shepherd's reed upon the hilltops of the Holy Land, the joyous outburst of the music of youth and maidens as they danced in the Palestinian fields, the swelling octaves of full-hearted gratitude for the Divine bounty of the harvest—all resound with the love of Israel for freedom and for freedom's God.

It is impossible to exaggerate the effect on human liberty and on progressive action and cultural thought of the Jewish contribution as evidenced merely by the Hebrew Bible itself. For it is a truism to state that Genesis stands as the fountainhead of the literature of the world. The earliest writings that compete with it in antiquity are those recovered by recent research from the dust of Ninevah and the tombs of Egypt, but neither the Euphrates nor the Nile has given to us anything that can compare in manifold value or in spiritual grandeur with the Hebrew relic which affords us glimpses of ancient life more than a thousand years before Herodotus, the father of history, was born—and these are corroborated by every advance of knowledge from extraneous and collateral sources. And, in the history disclosed by Genesis, there is nothing of the pompous inscriptions of equal antiquity left in Egypt or in Babylon, but rather is it the ordinary, everyday life of the people, the sunshine and shadow of human hopes and fears, of loves and aspirations, the flesh and blood of beings who differ in no essential from ourselves, though separated from our time by the lapse of 40 centuries.

The essential unity of all history in its recognition of patriotic service is made manifest through the explorations of science, imparting newer dignity and value to discovery and crowning with fresh endorsement the historical records which form so great a portion of the Hebrew Bible. The treasures written into the Scriptures become ever more precious with each new modern identification of lost cities, characters, and customs, with deciphered hieroglyphics, papyri, and exhumed ruins, for the civilized world cannot separate its accepted conception of the history and dignity of man from the narrative, the philosophy, and the development of Biblical records. That which the most brilliant of statesmen, philanthropists, and poets have found to be an inexhaustible source of material from which to guide men to better living and a more exalted patriotism cannot be ignored in a proper expression of national life or individual sacrifice.

For through all the pagan centuries of tyranny and terror, of decadence and loathsome worship of a thousand marble deities, the Jew alone adhered to the doctrine of one Supreme God. Contrasted with the inane and frequently vicious beliefs of the heathen world, the religion of the Jew shone in indescribable splendor like a burst of sunshine illumining the clouds of a storm-swept sky above a sea of blood.

It was this faith in God which enabled Israel meekly to bear that persecution which is the badge of the race. Survey the centuries that have gone, explore the dark caverns of pagan ignorance where, ever ready to strike, lurked the coiled serpents of intolerance, cruelty, and crime, and you will find hatred and persecution of the invincible Jew. Because, 30 centuries ago, he scorned to abandon his belief in God, he was made the victim of the vilest fanaticism. For this was he driven captive into the land of Egypt. For this were his cities destroyed, his temples demolished, his altars desecrated, his garb defiled, his wounded butchered, his dead mangled. For this was his country devastated by Syrian and Babylonian despots and the lands of his bondage strewn with the whitening bones of his slaughtered children. But through it all, the Jew clung faithfully and lovingly to the horns of his altar, cherished his synagogue, and worshiped Jehovah, the God of his fathers. Through the oppressions of Egypt, the wanderings in the desert, the life in Canaan, the noblest ideas of liberty found a home in the pages of Scripture and these fostered the spirit of national independence which rendered the household of Israel, though often overpowered, indissoluble, and unconquerable.

Today the custodian of the Alexandrian library is mute and his records vanished. The names of the Pharaohs and of Titus have been effaced from the most enduring of marble and live only in the researches of historical scholarship, but the heroism and patriotism of Moses, of Joshua, of Deborah, and David have survived Babylon and Nineveh and Egypt and imperial Rome, as examples for all times and races that fidelity to country and to God embraces in its purest exercise every principle that can make a people great among the nations of the earth.

And when, into the Stygian darkness and slavery that covered the ancient world, there burst the radiance of Christianity, with its gospel of peace and love for our neighbor, and be this remembered by every Christian who today hears my voice, it was the purest and loveliest of Jewish maidens, the rose of Sharon, the lily of Israel, who became the mother of the founder of Christianity and the light of the teaching of the gentle Nazarene was caused to shine first upon the homeland of the Jew.

Enslaved upon the reedy banks of the Nile, the Jew returned centuries later to dominate the land of the pyramids. Led captive into Babylon, he broke his chains to sit in the councils of Cyrus. A mere wanderer in Spain, he became its financial overlord. A sojourner in France, he reached the pinnacles of learning and industrial supremacy. A social outcast in England, he achieved such distinction that even British oppression was compelled to reverse its historic proscriptive policy and admit him to complete rights as a subject of the Empire.

So, from land to land and from age to age, Israel, the graybeard of the nations, has moved on with the Sepher Torah in his arms. He has wandered over deserts and traversed oceans, he has been seared by the fires of hate and beaten by the storms of persecution, but as often as his weary heart and bleeding feet caused him to falter on his thorny road, the radiance of the Torah filled his soul with hope and reinvigoration.

But it remained for our America to accord to the Jewish people the most splendid of opportunity, the most extensive of individual freedom, America, the most luminous illustration in all history of unselfish devotion to the downtrodden and oppressed and forgotten of every nation and of every clime.

For here was opened a new and brilliant chapter in the annals of the Tribe of Judah. And how radiant with splendor is that story of Jewish patriotism and valor in America, let history answer. Let history tell you today of the men of Jewish blood who pledged their lives to the infant republic in those early days when Hayim Solomon, a Polish Jew, contributed to Robert Morris the amazing sum of \$300,000 for the cause of Washington and American freedom.

In our second war with England, as in the conquest of Mexico—that land which today denies spiritual and academic liberty to Jew and to Christian—Jewish names are inscribed in characters of living light, while in the Civil War, there were no fewer than 7,000 men of Jewish origin in the ranks of the Blue and the Gray.

So, too, when the battleship *Maine* sank in the Harbor of Habana, 15 Jewish sailors perished at their posts in the tropical

waters, while 2,500 of their coreligionists saw valiant service in the brief conflict which made America a power in international affairs.

It was, however, the fires of the World War which became the giant crucible in which were tested the loyalty and devotion of the Jew to the land of liberty. Nearly 200,000 Jewish boys, with 10,000 Jewish officers in Army and Navy, were enrolled in that mighty American military power which saved the allied nations from an otherwise inevitable defeat. Eleven hundred of these were cited for conspicuous courage on the field of battle, 11,000 suffered wounds for their country; over 3,000 young Jewish men fell among the poppies of Flanders and on the trampled hillsides of France, and today, among the white crosses row on row, that mark the untimely harvest fields of war, there is wrought in beautiful and eternal stone the six-pointed star of David as mute testimony to the shining sacrifice of those sons of Israel who loved America better than their own lives.

So, on this day of lofty purpose, we pause amidst our labors and duties and cares to pay tribute to the men of Jewish faith who with their blood have imparted a richer crimson to the glorious stripes of the unsullied banner of liberty and woven into its very fabric that instinctive passion for freedom that has illumined the soul of Israel from the dawn of the race; and, mindful of these, our own American dead, how much more exalted must become the sense of triumph with which American Jews celebrate the feast of Passover in commemoration of the deliverance of their fathers from the bondage of Egypt. Remembering our own struggle for freedom against alien misrule, how much more radiant in Jewish homes in America must be the glow of victory with which, in a spirit of dedication, are enkindled the festive and increasing lights of the feast of Chanukah, recalling the Maccabean champions of liberty; and, realizing that it is only through love for our Nation's Constitution and courts, for our laws and traditional ideals, that our America can retain her enviable position as the refuge of the persecuted and enslaved, how much deeper must be the sense of Pentecostal reverence with which is observed the feast of Shavuoth in memory of the time when the law was entrusted to Israel to preserve for generations yet unborn.

It is in this spirit that I, as a gentile, have gladly joined with the Jewish War Veterans of the United States to recall on this holy day the memory of those who have gone before us with the light of liberty, and who, like Jacob with the angel, have striven and have prevailed.

Within your hearts, men and women of America, I call upon you today to keep burning, like a Shekinah, the fire of love for our American land. Upon the doorposts of the Nation, I conjure you to set, like the Mezuzah, the indelible seal of the God who molds the character of nations and whose sustaining Providence alone can keep peoples happy, peaceful, and secure. From the gates of the temple of American liberty send forth today the clarion sound of the Shofar that all may be alert to the dangers that now confront freedom in America and the world, as we here, in this birthplace of American Independence, in a spirit of joyous memory and hopeful prophecy, devotedly consecrate ourselves anew to America's mighty and imperishable destiny in the sacred realization that

"The glory of the present is to make the future free,
To love our land for what she is, and what she is to be."

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock midnight) the House adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Enrolled Bills, subsequent to adjournment, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was signed by the Speaker on July 9, 1936, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 54:

H. R. 8875. An act to clarify section 104 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title II, sec. 194).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

The Committee on Enrolled Bills, subsequent to adjournment, on the following dates presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

On June 22, 1936:

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Cora Akins;

H. R. 3777. An act for the relief of the Herald Publishing Co.;

H. R. 3866. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Emanuel Bratses;

H. R. 6719. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 7736. An act to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument;

H. R. 8107. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Shreveport, La., and the opening of the Red River of the West to navigation;

H. R. 9191. An act for the relief of dependents of James B. Kiley;

H. R. 11688. An act providing for a change in the design of the 50-cent pieces authorized to be coined in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Union;

H. R. 12257. An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States Court for China to offenses committed on the high seas;

H. R. 12324. An act to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended;

H. R. 12395. An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12410. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 12455. An act to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12876. An act to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of resettlement or rural-rehabilitation projects; to authorize payments to States, political subdivisions, and local taxing units in lieu of taxes on such premises; and for other purposes.

On June 23, 1936:

H. R. 6773. An act to provide for an investigation to determine whether the water rights of the United States have been violated in the Clear Lake watershed, California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8555. An act to develop a strong American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10094. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269);

H. R. 12458. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Intracoastal Waterway throughout Broward County, Fla.;

H. R. 12796. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina", approved May 10, 1928, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 179; U. S. C., Supp. I, title 28, sec. 179); and

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such methods of control of grasshoppers as in his judgment may be necessary.

On July 11, 1936:

H. R. 8875. An act to clarify section 104 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title II, sec. 194).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, on the following dates approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 22, 1936:

H. R. 1397. An act to withdraw certain public lands from settlement and entry;

H. R. 4085. An act for the relief of Joseph Watkins;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Albert Gonzales;

H. R. 4707. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6702. An act for the relief of Annie E. Daniels;

H. R. 8321. An act for the relief of Julia Long;

H. R. 8322. An act for the relief of Merwin A. Kiel;

H. R. 8455. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9153. An act for the relief of Evelyn Harriett B. Johnstone;

H. R. 9484. An act to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 9485. An act to convey certain lands to Clackamas County, Oreg., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 10356. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey a right-of-way over certain lands situated in Solano County, Calif., to the State of California for State highway purposes;

H. R. 10630. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11262. An act for the relief of Brooks-Callaway Co.;

H. R. 11615. An act limiting the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

H. R. 11643. An act to amend certain provisions of the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 210-212);

H. R. 12305. An act to define the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 12395. An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12410. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 12624. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12848. An act to provide an additional place of holding terms of the United States district court in the eastern district of Kentucky and to amend section 83 of the Judicial Code, as amended;

H. R. 12896. An act to provide for the transfer of the surplus decommissioned lightship No. 82 to United States Ship Constitution Post, No. 3339, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Wars;

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a reentry permit to Tonio Mori Moto and his readmission upon application while such permit remains valid;

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution to carry out the intention of Congress with reference to the claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota against the United States; and

H. J. Res. 641. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of expenses incurred in an election contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Twentieth Congressional District of the State of New York.

On June 23, 1936:

H. R. 1392. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the island of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9654. An act to authorize the purchase by the city of Scappoose, Oreg., of a certain tract of public land vested in the United States under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218);

H. R. 10104. An act to authorize a study of the park, parkway, and recreational-area programs in the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10591. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report on traffic conditions, with recommendations for corrective legislation;

H. R. 10919. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11022. An act for the relief of Ethel Armes;

H. R. 11581. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12033. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights-of-way over public lands and reserve lands to the city of Los Angeles in Mono County in the State of California;

H. R. 12353. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925;

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to the late Haym Salomon;

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution amending section 5 of Public Resolution No. 6, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 4, 1935; and

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution to provide certain administrative expenses for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of Interior, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1936:

H. R. 2155. An act for the relief of Francisco M. Acayan;

H. R. 3866. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Emanuel Bratses;

H. R. 4364. An act for the relief of Andrew Johnson;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles F. Eikenberg;

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of May Wynne Lamb;

H. R. 5754. An act for the relief of Emma M. Pearson;

H. R. 5829. An act for the relief of Daniel J. Hagerty;

H. R. 6719. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 6951. An act for the relief of Thomas J. English;

H. R. 7642. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank W Trick;

H. R. 7818. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Hyde;

H. R. 7839. An act for the relief of C. E. Rightor;

H. R. 8373. An act for the relief of James Fitzgerald;

H. R. 8502. An act for the relief of Theresa Link, Wencel Link, Edward Block, and John Meyers;

H. R. 8521. An act for the relief of Elsie O'Brine;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley;

H. R. 8688. An act for the relief of Grace Schultz;

H. R. 8720. An act for the relief of Louis Manzumin;

H. R. 8799. An act for the relief of John N. Hunter, Edmund M. Cook, Fred C. Putnam, Merchants National Bank of South Bend, Ind., and St. Joseph Loan & Trust Co., of South Bend, Ind.;

H. R. 8841. An act for the relief of Estelle Mary MacDonald and Marilyn MacDonald;

H. R. 9313. An act for the relief of the estate of Hans Ditmanson, deceased;

H. R. 9314. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry Coople, deceased;

H. R. 9315. An act for the relief of the estate of Fred Wilkins, deceased;

H. R. 10044. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Fernand H. Gouaux;

H. R. 10101. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1935, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10168. An act for the relief of Arch A. Gary;

H. R. 10225. An act for the relief of W. D. Lovell;

H. R. 10439. An act for the relief of John B. Ricketts;

H. R. 10527. An act for the relief of Harris Bros. Plumbing Co.;

H. R. 11140. An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by further increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States;

H. R. 11379. An act for the relief of William H. Milton;

H. R. 11538. An act for the relief of the Orland reclamation project, California;

H. R. 11597. An act for the relief of L. A. Peveler;

H. R. 11926. An act to provide for a term of court at Durham, N. C.;

H. R. 12257. An act to extend the jurisdiction of the United States Court for China to offenses committed on the high seas;

H. R. 12758. An act to increase the pension to certain veterans of the Regular Establishment on the rolls March 19, 1933;

H. R. 12796. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the times and places for holding court for the eastern district of North Carolina", approved May 10, 1928, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 179; U. S. C., Supp. I, title 28, sec. 179);

H. R. 12799. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, N. C., known in history as the Lost Colony, and the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English parentage to be born on the American continent;

H. R. 12971. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 27, 1935 (Public, No. 73, 74th Cong.), authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Lighthouse Reservation, Mich.;

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution for the establishment of a game management supply depot and laboratory, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 532. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg in 1938; and

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such methods of control of grasshoppers as in his judgment may be necessary.

On June 25, 1936:

H. R. 2335. An act for the relief of Cora Akins;

H. R. 4900. An act to amend the naturalization laws in respect of residence requirements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5730. An act to amend section 3 (b) of an act entitled "An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy with respect to the categories of vessels limited by the treaties signed at Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, at the limits prescribed by those treaties; to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels; and for other purposes", approved March 27, 1934;

H. R. 6668. An act for the relief of S. John Hegstad;

H. R. 7727. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of George B. Marx, Inc.;

H. R. 7864. An act for the relief of Edward P. Oldham, Jr.;

H. R. 8107. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Shreveport, La., and the opening of the Red River of the West to navigation;

H. R. 8316. An act to modify section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to individual Indian money;

H. R. 8368. An act to enforce the twenty-first amendment;

H. R. 8597. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes";

H. R. 9078. An act for the relief of Bertha W. Lamphear;

H. R. 9191. An act for the relief of dependents of James B. Kiley;

H. R. 11331. An act to authorize the sale and conveyance by the Department of the Interior to the State of Minnesota of the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 3, township 159 north, range 35 west, fifth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 12002. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Lackawanna River with a view to the control of its flood;

H. R. 12007. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Penobscot River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12008. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Androscoggin River, in Maine and New Hampshire, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of the Federal Enameling & Stamping Co.;

H. R. 12490. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy; and

H. R. 12599. An act to provide more adequate protection to workmen and laborers on projects, buildings, constructions, improvements, and property wherever situated, belonging to the United States of America, by granting to the several States jurisdiction and authority to apply their State workmen's compensation law on all property and premises belonging to the United States of America.

On June 26, 1936:

H. R. 255. An act to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Eutaw Springs, in the State of South Carolina;

H. R. 6773. An act to provide for an investigation to determine whether the water rights of the United States have been violated in the Clear Lake watershed, California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9111. An act for the relief of Evanell Durrance;

H. R. 9185. An act to insure the collection of the revenue on distilled spirits, wines, and malt liquors; to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the law relating to the taxation of distilled spirits, wines, and malt liquors; to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act; and for other purposes;

H. R. 10094. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes"; approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269);

H. R. 11176. An act increasing the penalty for making false oaths for the purpose of bathing at the Government free bathhouse at Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 11180. An act to extend the boundaries of the Fort Pulaski National Monument, Georgia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11555. An act to authorize the striking of an appropriate medal in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman in the Walla Walla Valley, Wash., and the founding of the Waililatpu Mission;

H. R. 11688. An act providing for a change in the design of the 50-cent pieces authorized to be coined in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Union;

H. R. 12458. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the intracoastal waterway throughout Broward County, Fla.;

H. R. 13001. An act to eliminate unnecessary expense in the administration of estates of deceased and incompetent veterans, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 608. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1938, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrator.

On June 29, 1936:

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Albert H. Jacobson;

H. R. 3777. An act for the relief of the Herald Publishing Co.;

H. R. 3943. An act for the relief of D. E. Wooldridge;

H. R. 4641. An act authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan;

H. R. 7256. An act for the relief of Perry H. Callahan and Malcolm W. Callahan;

H. R. 7736. An act to provide for the establishment of the Whitman National Monument;

H. R. 8555. An act to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, to repeal certain former legislation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10279. An act for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 11123. An act for the relief of Edward A. Foote, Jr., and others;

H. R. 12220. An act to authorize the adjustment of the boundary of the Fort Marion National Monument, Florida, in the vicinity of Fort Marion Circle, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12324. An act to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended;

H. R. 12869. An act to liberalize the provisions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, to effect uniform provisions in laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to extend the Employees' Compensation Act with limitations to certain World War veterans and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12876. An act to waive any exclusive jurisdiction over premises of resettlement or rural rehabilitation projects; to authorize payments to States, political subdivisions, and local taxing units in lieu of taxes on such premises; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12494. An act to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on Lake St. Clair, Mich.

On June 30, 1936:

H. R. 12455. An act to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway, in the States of Virginia and North Carolina, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

On July 13, 1936:

H. R. 8875. An act to clarify section 104 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title II, sec. 194).

ANTIETAM CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 132, Seventy-fourth Congress, and pursuant to a special order agreed to on June 20, 1936, the Speaker appointed Mr. LEWIS of Maryland and Mr. PLUMLEY members on the part of the House of the United States Antietam Celebration Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

877. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the results of the Commission's study of the feasibility and advisability of the complete segregation of the functions of dealer and broker, in pursuance of section 11 (e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (Rept. No. 3074). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Federal Communications Commission (Report No. 3075). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the United States Department of the Treasury (Rept. No. 3076). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Federal Trade Commission (Rept. No. 3077). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the United States Veterans' Administration. (Rept. No. 3078). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the United States Department of the Interior. (Rept. No. 3079). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the United States Department of Commerce. (Rept. No. 3080). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 670. An act for the relief of Eliza Boykin; without amendment (Rept. No. 3081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2827. An act for the relief of Margaret Scott Bayley; without amendment (Rept. No. 3082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KRAMER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10570. A bill for the relief of A. Sereiskis (Maxwell A. Rittenberg); without amendment (Rept. No. 3085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 11338. A bill for the relief of Ruth Radin; without amendment (Rept. No. 3086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10443. A bill for the relief of Joseph Harris (Joseph Hersh); without amendment (Rept. No. 3087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 13021) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 13022) to establish and promote the use of uniform standards for the classification, grading, and marking of the fresh products of dressed beef and veal in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARLEY: A bill (H. R. 13023) granting a pension to Adele Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13024) for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13025) granting a pension to Mary Harriet Hook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13026) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

