

the fair and proper basis of compensation for postmasters of the fourth class and the fair and proper basis of compensation for carrying mail on star routes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THURSTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 627) reappropriating the unexpended balance of an appropriation for chinch-bug control and making the same available for chinch-bug control and for grasshopper control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MASSINGALE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 628) reappropriating the unexpended balance of an appropriation for chinch-bug control and making the same available for chinch-bug control and for grasshopper control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 629) proposing that Congress shall have power to make laws to regulate agriculture, commerce, industry, and labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCKEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 630) to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KVALE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 631) to limit (prohibit) outside activities of officers, teachers, and other employees in the public schools of the District of Columbia (receiving compensation at a rate in excess of \$2,000 per annum) in competition with persons in private occupations or professions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PALMISANO: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 632) to authorize further stay in pending proceedings under the immigration and naturalization laws against certain groups of foreign-born persons; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BELL: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 56) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Select Committee Investigating Old Age Pension Plans and Organizations, together with additional copies of the hearings held before said committee; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PATMAN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 57) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the special committee, appointed to investigate the lobbying activities of the American Retail Federation, of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 203, 74th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 12989) for the relief of Cristofaro Sapienza; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12990) granting a pension to Claude A. Hunter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12991) for the relief of the heirs and creditors of Charles W. Sumner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12992) granting a pension to James William Westerfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12993) granting a pension to Wanneta May Dempsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12994) for the relief of Nicholas Sevaljevick, now known as Nicholas Hornacky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12995) for the relief of William E. Burch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12996) for the relief of John S. Sherman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12997) granting a pension to Gussie Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: A bill (H. R. 12998) for the relief of U. S. Pratt and Della Pratt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 12999) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11107. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Housing Association of Metropolitan Boston, Inc., endorsing the passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen bills providing for housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11108. Also, petition of the town of Hadley, Mass., approving Federal aid and maintenance for projects in the New England flood-stricken areas; to the Committee on Flood Control.

11109. Also, petition of the city of Cambridge, Mass., endorsing passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11110. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the Kingston (N. Y.) Council, No. 124, of the Sons and Daughters of Liberty, urging upon Congress immediate passage of the Reynolds-Starnes immigration restriction and alien deportation bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

11111. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of Federal legislation requiring the marking of articles made of imitation leather; to the Committee on Labor.

11112. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of Federal legislation requiring the marking of articles made of imitation leather; to the Committee on Labor.

11113. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the American Gold Star Mothers of the World War, Inc., New York City, urging the passage of the Copeland joint resolution (S. J. Res. 115); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, June 15, 1936)

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

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate conferees or conference committees may be privileged to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is entered.

HOUR OF MEETING AND ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, yesterday a unanimous-consent agreement was entered that when the Senate assembled on today it should proceed to the consideration of unobjection bills on the calendar, beginning with No. 2218. I ask unanimous consent that that order be postponed until tomorrow, and that when the Senate completes its labors today it take a recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF SENATOR DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, OF FLORIDA

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, before taking the formal order which it is customary in the Senate to enter of record I desire to make a brief statement.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER has been a Member of this body for many years. During the period of his service he has exemplified exceptional diligence and notable ability. Even after his health had become somewhat impaired he was so persistent in the performance of the tasks assumed

by him that he labored daily an excessive number of hours. He was prompt in his attendance upon committees and almost always in the Senate when this body was at work. During my time here there has never been one more beloved than Senator FLETCHER, nor has there been in the service of his State and Nation one more conscientiously devoted to high standards of duty and of service. I know that all his colleagues are deeply grieved at his departure.

Mr. LOFTIN. Mr. President, it is with profound regret and a keen sense of personal loss that I have to announce the passing of my distinguished colleague, Florida's senior Senator, DUNCAN U. FLETCHER. He was truly known as Florida's grand old man. His death is a great loss to the Nation, but an even greater loss to the State of Florida.

On Monday of this week I endeavored to persuade him to give up his attendance upon this body and go to his home, because I felt that he was not physically able to be here; but he refused and remained here, steadfastly performing his duty to the last. In my judgment, he died as he wanted to die, in harness.

I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 323) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 323

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, late a Senator from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolution, the Vice President appointed Mr. LOFTIN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. GLASS, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. BULKLEY, and Mr. CHAVEZ as the committee to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. LOFTIN. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18, 1936, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Again, our Heavenly Father, we wait in Thy presence to pray. The touch of Thy mercy is as gentle as the morning light. For every encouraging hope and prospect we give Thee praise and thanksgiving. In all that we are and do may we prove ourselves worthy of Thy bountiful gifts. May Thy manifold blessings be used unselfishly. Be with us, blessed Lord, that we may think clearly, feel deeply, and labor wisely. Moved by an intense spirit of devotion, keep us close to the feelings and needs of our fellow citizens. Let the light of Thy truth kindle our desires and direct our ways. We entreat Thee to teach us the best way to see, the best way to reason, and the best way to act in serving society and the state, and Thine shall be the praise forever. Through Christ. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

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.; and

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Addie I. Tryon and Lorin H. Tryon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4424. An act to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the development of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes;

S. 4490. An act for the relief of F. W. Elmer; and

S. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to modify and extend the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1934, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2127. An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended;

S. 3257. An act to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act;

S. 3488. An act to provide for an examination and survey to determine the best utilization of the surplus waters of the San Juan River and the Animas River, and to determine the feasibility and cost of storing such waters and of diverting them to the Rio Chama and the Rio Grande.

S. 4132. An act to amend section 4b of the National Defense Act, as amended, relating to certain enlisted men of the Army;

S. 4462. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa; and

S. 4654. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1923.

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. 11581) entitled "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."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 54, 56, and 57 to the foregoing bill, further insists upon its amendments to said bill numbered 5, 7, 11, 16, 17, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58, 64, 65, 66, 75, 78, 79, 84, 85, and 86, agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GLASS, Mr. COPELAND, Mr. KING, Mr. NYE, and Mr. KEYES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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. 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.

POSITION OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS ON ADMINISTRATION
LEGISLATION

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, the eminent keynoter at the late Republican national convention, has returned from the wars, and his masterly speech has been officially embalmed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. [Laughter.]

Press reports say that our friend from New York [Mr. SNELL] was surrounded at the Cleveland convention by almost the entire Republican membership of the House, who cheered him to the echo. I have received much pleasure and satisfaction in the last few days in checking over the Records to see just how the Republicans in the House, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], have been voting during the Roosevelt administration.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may be given permission to extend my remarks and to include the names of Republican Members of the House who, on about 40 outstanding, crucial roll calls, so wholeheartedly supported the Roosevelt administration, which they now seek to condemn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEDICATION OF THE GEORGE ROGERS CLARK MEMORIAL

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing therein an address delivered by the President of the United States at the dedication of the George Rogers Clark Memorial on last Sunday.

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

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if that is the speech he made last Sunday?

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is the speech delivered at the dedication.

Mr. RICH. On last Sunday. Instead of going to church he delivered that memorial speech. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday morning, June 14, 1936, there was held in the city of Vincennes, Ind., the dedication of the George Rogers Clark Memorial. This ceremony was of widespread interest, not only to all the States of the old Northwest Territory but to the people of all other sections of the Nation. At this dedicatory service the principal address was delivered by the President of the United States. Knowing that the broadcast of the address of the Chief Executive made an impression upon all who heard, and believing that the full text should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and acting upon the unanimous consent given by the House of Representatives, I insert the address, which was as follows:

ADDRESS OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Events of history take on their due proportions when viewed in the light of time. With every passing year the capture of Vincennes more than a century and a half ago when the Thirteen Colonies were seeking their independence, assumes greater and more permanent significance.

The first grave danger as the War of the Revolution progressed lay in the effort of the British, with their Indian allies, to drive a wedge from Canada through the valley of Lake Champlain and the valley of the Mohawk to meet the British frigates from New York at the head of navigation on the Hudson River. If this important offensive in 1777 had been successful, New England would have been cut off from the States lying to the south, and by holding the line of the Hudson the British, without much doubt, could have conquered first one half and then the other half of the divided Colonies.

The defeat and surrender of General Burgoyne at Saratoga is definitely recognized as the turning point of the Revolution.

The other great danger lay thereafter, not in the immediate defeat of the Colonies but rather in their inability to maintain themselves and grow after their independence had been won. Records show that the British planned a definite hemming-in process whereby the new Nation would be strictly limited in area

and in activity to the territory lying south of Canada and east of the Alleghany Mountains. Toward this end they conducted military operations on an important scale west of the Alleghanies, with the purpose, at first successful, of driving back eastward across the mountains all those Americans who before the Revolution had crossed into what is now Ohio and Michigan and Indiana and Illinois and Kentucky and Tennessee.

In the year 1778 the picture of this western country was dark, indeed. The English held all the region northwest of the Ohio, and their Indian allies were burning cabins and driving fleeing families back across the mountains south of the river. Three regular forts were all that remained in Kentucky, and their fall seemed inevitable.

Then, against the dark background, stood forth the tall young Virginian, George Rogers Clark. Out of despair and destruction he brought concerted action. With a flash of genius, the 26-year-old leader conceived a campaign—a brilliant masterpiece of military strategy. Working with the good will of the French settlers, and overawing the Indians by sheer bravado, he swept through to Kaskaskia and other towns of the Illinois country.

But the menace of the regular British forces remained. Col. Henry Hamilton, the British commander of the Northwest, had come down from Detroit and seized and fortified Vincennes. Fort Sackville, where we stand today, made Clark's position untenable. His desperate resolution to save his men and the Northwest by a midwinter march and an attack by riflemen on a fort manned by the King's own regiment and equipped with cannon marked the heroic measure of the man.

It is worth repeating the story that the famous winter march began at Kaskaskia with a religious service. To Father Pierre Gibault and to Col. Francis Vigo, a patriot of Italian birth, next to Clark himself, the United States is indebted for the saving of the Northwest Territory. And it was in the little log church, predecessor of yonder Church of St. Francis Xavier, that Colonel Hamilton surrendered Vincennes to George Rogers Clark.

It is not a coincidence that this service in dedication of a noble monument takes place on a Sunday morning. Governor McNutt and I, aware of the historic relationship of religion to this campaign of the Revolution, and to the later Ordinance of 1787, have understood and felt the appropriateness of today.

Clark had declared at Kaskaskia that all religions would be tolerated in America. Eight years later the Ordinance of 1787, which established the territory northwest of the Ohio River, provided that "no person demeaning himself in a peaceable and orderly manner shall ever be molested on account of his mode of worship or for religious sentiments in the said territory."

And the ordinance went on to declare that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." It seems to me that 149 years later the people of the United States, in every part thereof, could reiterate and continue to strive for the principle that religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind.

Today religion is still free within our borders; it must ever remain so.

Today morality means the same thing as it meant in the days of George Rogers Clark, though we must needs apply it to many, many situations which George Rogers Clark never dreamt of. In his day among the pioneers there were jumpers of land claims and those who sought to swindle their neighbors, though they were poor in this world's goods and lived in sparsely settled communities. Today among our teeming millions there are still those who by dishonorable means seek to obtain the possessions of their unwary neighbors. Our modern civilization must constantly protect itself against moral defectives whose objectives are the same but whose methods are more subtle than their prototypes of a century and a half ago. We do not change our form of free government when we arm ourselves with new weapons against new devices of crime and cupidity.

Today, as in 1787, we have knowledge; but it is a vastly wider knowledge.

During the past week I have traveled through many States; and as I have looked out in the daylight hours upon the countryside of Tennessee and Alabama and Arkansas and Texas and Oklahoma I have tried to visualize what that countryside looked like a short century and a half ago. All of it was primeval forest or untilled prairie, inhabited by an exceedingly small population of nomadic Indian tribes, untouched by white man's civilization.

In most of this vast territory, as here in the Middle West, Nature gave her bounteous gifts to the new settlers, and for many long years these gifts were received without thought for the future. Here was an instance where the knowledge of the day was as yet insufficient to see the dangers that lay ahead.

Who, even among the second and third generation of the settlers of this virgin land, gave heed to the future results that attended the cutting of the timber which denuded the greater part of the watersheds?

Who among them gave thought to the tragic extermination of the wildlife which formed the principal article of food of the pioneers?

Who among them had ever heard the term "submarginal land" or worried about what would happen when the original soil played out or ran off to the ocean?

Who among them were concerned if the market price for livestock for the moment justified the overgrazing of pastures, or a temporary boom in the price of cotton or corn tempted them

to forget that rotation of crops was a farming maxim as far back as the days of ancient Babylon?

Who among them regarded floods as preventable?

Who among them thought of the use of coal or oil or gas or falling water as the means of turning their wheels and lighting their homes?

Who among them visualized the day when the sun would be darkened as far east as the waters of the Atlantic by great clouds of topsoil borne by the wind from what had been grassy and apparently imperishable prairies?

Because man did not have our knowledge in those older days, we have wounded Nature and Nature has taken offense. It is the task of us, the living, to restore to Nature many of the riches we have taken from her in order that she may smile once more upon those who come after us.

George Rogers Clark did battle against the tomahawk and the rifle. He saved for us the fair land that lay between the mountains and the Father of Waters. His task is not done. Though we fight with weapons unknown to him, it is still our duty to continue the saving of this fair land. May the Americans who a century and a half from now celebrate at this spot the three-hundredth anniversary of the heroism of Clark and his men think kindly of us for the part we are taking today in preserving the Nation.

LEE ROBERTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the files eight honorable discharges filed with the bill (H. R. 10151, 71st Cong., 1st sess.) granting a pension to Mr. Lee Roberts, who wishes to use them in connection with an application for promotion as warrant officer.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman advise the Chair whether or not there were any adverse reports?

Mr. MAY. There were no adverse reports by the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

CAN WE AFFORD EDUCATED CHILDREN?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, when the wheels of industry ceased to turn, when the channels of commerce became clogged, and the doors of our banks were closed, the Federal Government was awake and alert to put power to wheels, unclog the channels, and reopen the doors.

When the schools of the children were closed and stood as monuments to the inability of the parents and communities to keep them open, the Federal Government found it necessary to spend through relief funds more than \$21,000,000 in relief wages to over 100,000 teachers to keep the schools open for nearly 3,700,000 children.

SHARE PROSPERITY WITH POSTERITY

In other ways the Government found education a great means of relieving unemployment.

For emergency educational programs the Government has spent since 1933 approximately \$120,000,000 for employment of unemployed persons qualified to teach, and over \$125,000,000 for the repair and improvement of school buildings that had become dilapidated before and during the depression.

For new school buildings, grants through P. W. A. amounting to over \$128,000,000 have been made.

The Federal Government has recognized the important place of education in the recovery. It must recognize the permanent place of education in creating prosperity. We must share our prosperity with posterity.

DEMOCRACY AND OPPORTUNITY

The essence of American democracy is to keep the doors of opportunity equally open to every child.

The opportunity to go to school, to learn, to know and understand the world he lives in, to be taught the history, traditions, purposes, and aspirations of his country, to become the master of a vocation, are the inherent rights of every American child.

It is the duty of the Nation to help create this kind of equality of opportunity.

Is there need for the Federal Government to assist States and communities to provide equality of opportunity? The answer is obvious.

CLOSED SCHOOLS A MENACE TO THE NATION

In 1935 there were over 42,000 schools without sufficient funds to operate a normal school term.

In these schools there are nearly three and a half million children and 102,000 teachers.

These schools have always been in the bread line of education and have during the last few years been faced with starvation.

At least one-eighth of the Nation's school children are facing the closed doors of opportunity.

POORLY PAID TEACHERS HANDICAP CHILDREN

When the richest nation on earth permits 7,000,000, or nearly a third, of its school children to be taught by a quarter million of teachers who receive less than \$750 per year—30,000 teachers received less than \$450—there is need for an awakening of civic pride in the discharge of obligations to children. Education is the debt of each generation to the next.

No nation can long survive that refuses to pay it.

CHILDREN WITHOUT SCHOOLS

With 2,740,000 persons of school age for whom there are no schools and who do not attend school at all, and another 2,745,000 who are attending school in temporary structures, there is need for national attention to the problem of building more schools and of enlarging and improving those we have.

GIVE YOUTH ITS CHANCE

The youth of America must be given a better opportunity in the future than in the past.

Too many of their schools have been poor, frail things, unable to give them the learning opportunities they need.

The youth have a right to expect that society at least afford them the opportunity to learn—to learn what they need and want, not just what is traditionally offered in many of our schools that are without funds to do more than they have.

What with the increase in crime among the young is to be done?

The appalling unrest among our young people and the increase in law violations is an indication that these young people are not trained to make the adjustments required by society.

Is there any hope of improvement if the educational system is permitted to stagnate and run behind the march of time? I think not.

Education is no doubt not the only remedy, but it is true that no other remedy can become effective without education.

WHY FEDERAL INTEREST IN EDUCATION?

The economic and social development of the United States has made Federal participation in the support of education more and more necessary.

In the early days, when our communities were largely agricultural and the wealth of the country much more evenly distributed than at present, it was natural that our public schools should be supported by local districts.

With the invention of machinery, the development of our industrial system, and the concentration of wealth in cities and certain areas of the Nation, it was inevitable that great differences in the ability of communities to support schools and in the quality of schools offered should arise.

Furthermore, the economic interdependence of communities and States and the rate at which our population has moved around has made it evident that education is much more than a matter of local concern, or even of State concern.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

The interest of the Federal Government in education is not new.

Since 1802 it has granted lands for the support of public schools totaling more than 241,116 square miles, which is nearly six times the area of Ohio and would have made 49 States the size of Connecticut.

Since 1862 it has made grants for the support of State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.

In 1917 it embarked on a great program of vocational education.

These grants have not only shown the interest of the Federal Government in education; they have been the means

of stimulating and aiding the States to establish and maintain schools, colleges, and kinds of training in keeping with the needs of the people.

EDUCATION AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

It is right that the Federal Government should promote the general welfare through bearing a fair share of the cost of schools.

The very character of our democratic government demands a trained and educated citizenry.

A citizen of Ohio is none the less a citizen of the Nation.

He votes not alone in his county and his State; he votes on national issues and for officers of the Federal Government.

In time of war and national peril he belongs to the Nation, mind and body; not to his family, community, or State.

His loyalties and sentiments must be not merely local but national.

EDUCATION AN ECONOMIC NECESSITY

Not alone from a political point of view must the Federal Government be interested in the education of all the children and future citizens.

It is a matter of vital economic importance that we have an educated people throughout the Nation.

The wealth of any nation must depend largely upon the character of the land and of the people.

The abundance of natural resources is a gift of God; the moral fiber, intellectual power, and the skill of the people are dependent upon the training received by each generation of children.

KNOWLEDGE PAYS DIVIDENDS

The production of wealth depends upon the knowledge, skill, and energy of the people as applied to the development and use of natural resources and the use of capital.

Knowledge and skill are the only factors in our economic life that can be increased indefinitely, and upon their increase depends, in the last analysis, all economic growth and progress.

The economic welfare of the Nation depends directly upon the productive capacity of our people and upon their qualities as consumers.

The schools give training that is absolutely necessary to the development of efficient producers and that raises the standard of living and desires of our people, thereby making them better consumers.

Schools, therefore, are the first line of our economic defense, and as such are a necessary object of support for the National Government.

EDUCATION AND THE INVESTMENT OF MONEY

It is sound economics for the Federal Government to invest part of our national income in education.

Economists are fairly well agreed that one of the fundamental causes of depression, and especially of the last one, is too great return of current income to investment and new means of production.

The new factories ruin the market for the factories already operating and many of them become bankrupt.

The debts made for new investment take from production too much for interest and fixed charges and leave too little for wages.

We become long on production and short on consumption.

Having conquered our frontiers and become a creditor of foreign nations rather than a debtor, and no longer being faced with the necessity for excess production of goods to be used for the payment of foreign debts, it becomes a sound policy to avoid overinvestment in new means of production by devoting a larger share of our current income to cultural purposes, more schools, larger opportunity for adult education, more recreational facilities, more and better public-health services.

The Federal Government is the best agency for collecting the revenue and spending it for these purposes.

EDUCATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the major problems of the Nation is to find a cure for unemployment.

The cure will probably come from many sources, but regardless of what these sources are, one thing is certain: The

most practical way to provide employment for persons displaced by machines is to utilize the field of personal and public services.

That is, we need and can use more people in the fields of education, health, recreation, the fine arts, and the like.

These personal services—services that require no significant amount of mechanical power and raw material—are the only potentially unlimited field for human labor.

More and more the Federal Government must divert national resources into this field. Expenditures for education is one way to do that. More people should be employed to conduct nursery schools and kindergartens, to teach music, art, handicrafts, physical education in our elementary schools, to teach in high schools that need to be established to provide for the 6 out of every 10 rural children who do not have a high school to attend. The investment of Federal funds in education is, therefore, a sound and necessary economic policy.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN

The Federal Government must be concerned with the problem of making adequate provision for the children who are no longer needed in industry. In the pioneer days the services of children were needed in the home and on the farm. Through the work they did under the supervision of their parents they received much of the training they needed, and schools as an agency of education were not needed to the same extent they are under modern conditions. In the early days of the development of our industrial system there was a demand for the labor of children and young people. There has, however, for two reasons, gradually developed a strong sentiment against the employment of children under 18 years old.

CHILDHOOD NO TIME FOR INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

In the first place, enlightened people believe that the routine, blind-alley employment of children and young people in industry is detrimental to their mental, physical, and moral development, and that the period of childhood and youth should be spent in receiving the best training for full development into useful and happy adulthood. Early employment is believed to be a violation of the fundamental rights of children in the "pursuit of happiness."

NO NEED FOR CHILDREN IN INDUSTRY

In the second place, the increase and improvement of mechanical production has made unnecessary the employment of children and youth.

For example, from 1890 to 1925 the physical volume of industrial production in the United States increased 174.5 percent, primary horsepower increased 256.1 percent, but the number of persons employed increased only 89 percent.

As a result of these changes the number and percentage of children 10 to 15 years of age employed in gainful occupations have decreased rapidly since 1910.

From 1910 to 1920 the number decreased from 1,990,000 to 1,061,000, and by 1930 had dropped to 667,000.

In 1910, 18.2 percent of all children 10 to 15 years old were gainfully employed; in 1920, only 8.5 percent; and in 1930, only 4.7 percent. The percentage of persons 16 years old gainfully employed decreased by nearly one-third from 1920 to 1930; the percentage of persons 17 years old employed decreased nearly one-fifth. But in the age groups above 20 there was an increase in the percentage of employment.

NEED FOR MORE AND BETTER SCHOOLS

In the light of the decreased opportunities for employment of children and youth, and of the increasing undesirability of such employment, there is small wonder that school facilities have had to be rapidly expanded.

Unless we are willing to revert to primitive modes of farm living or to stop the rearing of children, or to let children grow up in a state of vandalism, we must support schools—schools that offer much more than the traditional three R's.

To say that the Federal Government has no economic responsibility for this situation is to fail to see the economic unity of the Nation and to deny the existence of our national life.

WHAT ABOUT THE FARMER'S CHILDREN?

The Federal Government has of necessity been interested in improving the economic conditions of farmers and rural people.

Aside from the mere increasing of the income of farmers, the Federal Government must become more and more interested in the opportunities offered to rural children.

It is from the farms that the increase in our future population will come, and on the farms and in the villages that large numbers of future urban dwellers are being reared.

These conditions occur because of the differences in the birth rates in rural and urban areas.

In seven large cities, the population of which consists chiefly of American stock, the birth rate is 40 percent short of the rate required to maintain a stable population; in all cities having over 100,000 population the deficiency in birth rate averages over 20 percent, and in the smaller cities the deficiency averages about 8 percent.

FARMERS PRODUCE MOST CHILDREN

On the other hand, our farmers and their wives are rearing children at the rate of 50 percent more than required to replace the farm population, and the rural nonfarm population rears children at the rate of 30 percent greater than the number required to replace themselves.

When we couple these facts with the fact that taxable wealth and income are largely concentrated in the cities and industrial areas of the Nation, and with the fact that much of our social income can be reached and distributed only by the Federal Government, it becomes readily apparent that the Federal Government cannot in fairness leave the whole cost of education to the rural communities and the farmers.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS

There is no sound reason why the farmers of the Nation should be compelled to bear unassisted the whole cost of educating the future population of the cities and other States and of supplying free of cost the future employees of business and industry.

The equalizing power of the Federal Government must bring about a fair distribution of the wealth of the Nation to educate the children of the Nation.

COST OF RURAL MIGRATION TO CITIES

The rearing of children who migrate to cities is an expensive proposition for the rural people.

It means that they have fed, clothed, provided medical care, and sent to school about 60 percent of the young people who started to work in the industries, stores, and offices of the cities.

It has been reliably estimated that during the decade 1920-30 the contribution of rural to urban areas resulting from the migration of persons over 15 years old to cities was \$35,000,000,000.

The cost of rearing and educating these migrants was about \$14,000,000,000, the transfer of wealth through the inheritance and settlement of estates was about \$3,000,000,000, and the payment of interest and rent from rural to urban dwellers was about \$18,000,000,000.

In view of these facts it becomes the duty of the Federal Government to use its financial power to distribute funds to the States so that farmers and rural dwellers can be assisted in the education of the children who will of necessity leave the farms and villages.

MONEY IS NOT WHERE THE CHILDREN LIVE

Among the geographical areas and regions of the United States it is an observable fact that the richer the area the fewer the children in proportion to the adult population.

Thus we have in this Nation the anomalous situation of having the most of the wealth in one place and most of the children in another.

POOR COMMUNITIES HAVE MANY CHILDREN

For example, in the Nation as a whole when divided into six levels of economic ability—based on income-tax returns, radios, and domestic telephones—it is found that the excess ratio of children to women of child-bearing age running from poorest to richest is for the different levels as follows: In the poorest areas the excess number of children is 62.5

percent, in the next to the poorest areas the excess is 41.1 percent, in the third to the poorest areas the excess is 18.4 percent, in the fourth from the poorest areas the excess is 3.9 percent, in next to the richest areas the deficiency is 10.3 percent, in the richest areas the deficiency is 24.5 percent.

MANY CHILDREN—LITTLE MONEY FOR SCHOOLS

Expenditures for schools run in exactly the opposite direction—the richer the area the more for schools. Among the States the situation is the same. For example, in New York the rate of producing children is only 84 percent of the rate required to replace the population, while in North Carolina the rate is 153 percent.

Contrast this fact with the fact that in New York expenditures per pupil for schools is \$137.55 as compared with only \$42.85 in North Carolina. These data were for 1930. Since that time, during the period of the depression, expenditures per pupil in New York have increased while in North Carolina they have decreased nearly a third. So far as schools are concerned there is a tendency for the rich to become richer and the poor poorer.

The Federal Government should take necessary steps to change this disastrous policy by paying to the States its fair share of the cost of educating the future citizens of the Nation.

SCHOOLS AND FEDERAL TAXES

In view of the inevitable development of the system of taxation in this country, there are good reasons for demanding that the Federal Government make its contribution to the support of education.

It is unavoidable that through the development of our economic system, the increase in the corporate form of wealth, and the concentration of taxable wealth in the industrial centers, the Federal Government should more and more become the tax collecting and distributing agency.

Tax resources formerly left to the States are rapidly being assumed by the Federal Government. In fact, many tax resources are becoming more and more difficult for the State to handle, and unless they are taken over by the Federal Government differences in rates in different States tend to create unequal conditions of competition and to disturb business.

RETURN OF FEDERAL TAXES TO THE STATES

The time has come, therefore, when the States must demand a return of some of the Federal tax collections to be used for schools. Unless it is returned the revenue is forever lost for the support of education. For example, my own State of Ohio paid into the Federal Treasury in 1935 the sum of \$164,079,273 and received back in various subsidies \$123,112,513, of which \$60,000 was for the State university and \$554,039.74 for vocational education and rehabilitation.

Under the terms of a bill I am introducing Ohio will receive an allotment of \$4,950,681 the first year and increasing to \$14,852,043 the fifth year and thereafter. These funds will give Ohio a fair return of taxes collected and will permit necessary improvements in the school system without resorting to the increase of taxes on real estate and farms which are already overburdened, and without piling up the duplication of State and Federal taxes.

I AM OPPOSED TO ANY FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

I wish to make a clear-cut distinction between the allocation of funds for the support of education and the control of education. The traditions and principles of American government make the control and management of our schools the exclusive function of State and local governments. It is firmly believed that democracy will thrive best if the schools are controlled by local boards of education. I am in wholehearted accord with this principle of government. The Federal Government should not control our schools. What I am advocating is that the Federal Government bear its fair share of the cost of education, that it face squarely the economics of the situation and take such action as will bring about a fair and equitable distribution of opportunity for all our people.

Never will the Federal Government control education unless the people want it to do so.

Control of education is wholly a matter for the people to determine through their representatives in Congress.

It is entirely possible and feasible to draft a law providing for Federal assistance to the States and denying all types of control to all Federal agencies and all officials.

The bill I have introduced carries such provision in the most specific terms, as note section 11.

EDUCATION MUST BE FREE FROM ALL FEDERAL CONTROL

This act introduced today shall be construed as intending to secure to the several States and Territories control of the administration of this act within their respective jurisdictions and to preserve State and local initiative in the operation of schools.

No provision of this act shall be construed to delimit the States and Territories in the appropriation of funds for the support of schools received through the benefits of this act; nor to restrict or define the kind of schools or the character of the educational programs to be supported by the respective States and Territories; nor to grant to any officer of the United States or to any of its agencies, departments, or offices any power or authority to approve or reject the educational programs in the States and Territories; nor to confer upon any officer of the United States or of any of its agencies, departments, or offices any power or authority to supervise or in any way exercise management and control of the educational programs of the States and Territories, it being the purpose of this act to leave all supervision, management, control, and choice of educational means, processes, and programs to State, Territorial, and local governments.

PRINCIPLES AND PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill I have introduced is a companion bill to one introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. The provisions of these bills are identical.

The Senator and I are agreed upon the following statement of the purposes and provisions of these bills: They propose to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education. They provide an initial appropriation of \$100,000,000 and an increase of \$50,000,000 annually until a maximum of \$300,000,000 is reached. It is thought that such gradual increase in funds will give ample time for the States to make sound plans for the expansion and improvement of their schools and will be a wiser course than the immediate appropriation of the full sum needed.

There are certain provisions in these bills to which I wish to direct attention.

First. They provide for appropriations to the States to be used by them for schools. The manner in which the funds received shall be used for the maintenance of a program of public education is left wholly to the respective State legislatures.

Second. All control, administration, and supervision of schools and educational programs is reserved strictly to the States and forbidden to all Federal officers and agencies. (See sec. 11.)

Third. The basis of apportionment of funds to the States and Territories is the number of persons 5 to 20 years old in each State and Territory.

This method of apportionment is based upon the principle that the Federal Government should provide for the support of schools in all the States somewhat in proportion to the Federal interest in the education of the entire population. Admitting that the Federal interest is, at this time, not subject to accurate measurement, it can be safely asserted that the amount provided in this bill does not exceed the Federal Government's fair share of the cost of educating the citizens of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the parents of this Nation have a right to expect the Federal Government to use its resources to help them create opportunity for their children. Now is the time for that expectation to be fulfilled. The further postponement of the Federal Government in meeting its obligation will mean a lost future for millions of the Nation's youth.

Let the Congress heed the call of Young America. In a democracy it is either educate or perish. As citizens of the richest nation on earth we can afford to educate our children. Let us keep the door of opportunity open for the coming generation.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DISTRICTS OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2456) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WALTER, RAMSAY, and GUYER.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. When a Member asks to take up a bill by number, is it not customary that the bill be read so that the Members of the House will know what the bill is?

The SPEAKER. That is the usual practice.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me it ought to be continued.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the title of the bill read for information?

Mr. RICH. I would like to know what the bill is. Before we grant unanimous consent we ought to know what is going on here. Nobody knows what is going on in this House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

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

S. 2456. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to address the House for 2 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the programs and platforms of the two old parties. I would like to place in the RECORD information on the history, platforms, and programs of the Farmer-Labor Party. This will take only a small amount of space compared to material put in the RECORD about the other political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks along these lines.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he can give any assurance that the people behind the platform he is now sponsoring are going to carry it out if they do adopt it.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. RICH. Because, you know, the Democratic administration has not carried out the platform they adopted in 1932.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. When the regular order is demanded it is the rule of the House that a Member shall not extend his statement after the Chair announces that the regular order is demanded. In so doing the Member is out of order.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, under the ruling of the Chair I suppose it is to be taken for granted that the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be stricken from the RECORD. If they are not I want to object, because he was speaking out of order, speaking after the Chair had cautioned him, as is his custom all the time.

The SPEAKER. The remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other gentleman who interjects remarks into the RECORD after he has been called to order by the Chair upon a demand for the regular order, are not entitled to be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The Chair never did put the request of the gentleman from Minnesota; the Chair overlooked putting that request to the House.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the manner indicated.

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

There was no objection.

FARMER-LABOR PLATFORM, 1936

I take pleasure in presenting the 1936 platform of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party. The 1932 platform and the 1934 platform and analysis appear in my speech of August 17, 1935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 13516, entitled "A National Labor Party—Eventually, Why Not Now?" In the primaries of June 15, 1936, the Farmer-Labor Party nominated a complete slate of State and congressional candidates. I am placing the votes of these candidates in the appendix of this speech.

PLATFORM FOR AN ECONOMIC ORDER OF ABUNDANCE

The Farmer-Labor Association in convention in March 1936 hereby renews its pledge to use its every effort to bring about an economic system in both State and Nation that will function for the general welfare of the entire people, enabling all to be assured of the fullest opportunity to provide for their material needs during their working years and to enjoy adequate protection in sickness and old age as a right—not as charity.

The Farmer-Labor Association of Minnesota recognizes that the United States has the most wonderful resources, great factories and machinery of production and power, with millions of capable workers and farmers ready and able to produce food, clothing, and shelter in great abundance for all. At this time, when all could live in prosperity and happiness, we find that there are millions of working men and women in poverty, want, and degradation and hundreds of thousands of farmers, businessmen, and professional people who have become poverty stricken and bankrupt.

We favor reforms in taxation and finance in order that the cost of government be borne by those best able to pay. Production control and work relief can do but little in alleviating present distress and are only justified as temporary expedients to meet an emergency. The program of the present system constitutes a planned poverty; we advocate and demand a system of planned plenty. To effect a cure for economic ills, changes must be fundamental.

Natural resources and monopolized industries essential to our national life and well-being must ultimately be collectively owned and democratically controlled and operated, to the end that democracy shall prevail in our industrial as well as in our political life.

No lasting recovery from the depression and no permanent prosperity can be achieved unless the homes and property of the farmers, the wage earners, the professional people and small-business men are fully protected, and the opportunity to own homes and property is restored to the masses by production of plenty.

To achieve these ends we propose and recommend:

Amendments to United States Constitution

1. An amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to pass laws eliminating child labor, regulating working conditions in industry, regulating agricultural and industrial production, providing security against old age, unemployment and sickness and providing for government ownership of monopolistic industries and banking, except independent banks which stock is locally owned and who are financing independent merchants and farmers.

2. An amendment to the Constitution of the United States reducing the term of office of Federal judges from life to a term of not more than 10 years.

Legislation by Congress

I. Financial Assistance

Insuring individual ownership of farms and farm homes by refinancing the farmer at a low rate of interest (Frazier-Lemke bill).

Extending government credit to farmer, worker, and consumer cooperatives for the purchase of plants for the processing and sale of their products at a fair price based upon the cost of production.

II. Production for Use

Providing for the governmental operation of idle productive industrial units by the unemployed for the production of goods for the use of the unemployed.

III. Neutrality Policy

Insuring the neutrality of the United States in any foreign war by prohibiting the sale and delivery of goods or the making of loans to nations engaged in any foreign war.

IV. Prevent Discriminatory Rebates

Making illegal the granting of price rebates and advertising credits by manufacturers to chain stores in discrimination against independent merchants and asking for further appropriations for

the investigation of these and other unfair trade practices against independent merchants.

V. Education of Youth

Providing adequate funds for a youth program designed to give our youth an opportunity for education and work. (Benson-Amle bill.)

VI. Government to Own Munitions Plants

Providing for Government ownership and operation of plants for the manufacture of armament and munitions of war.

VII. Conscription of Wealth in War

As a further means of preventing war we demand the conscription of wealth in the event of war.

VIII. Pensions for Widows and Orphans of War Veterans

Providing pensions for the widows and orphans of war veterans.

IX. St. Lawrence Waterway

Ratifying a treaty with Canada for the building of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterway.

X. Farm Market

Giving the American market to the American farmer.

XI. Adequate Housing

We favor the immediate establishment by the Federal or State Government, or both, of a housing program providing adequate and helpful housing at reasonable rents and employing building tradesmen at trade-union rates.

XII. Banking

That Congress exercise the exclusive and constitutional power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

XIII. Social Insurance

That we fight for the passage of the Frazier-Lundeen social-security bill.

XIV. Civil Rights

The Farmer-Labor Association being strongly opposed to dictatorship, calls upon the people of the United States to fight against the activities of those who advocate the establishment of a despotic dictatorship and tyranny in the United States and it is the duty of the people to protect and fight for our Democratic form of Government and for the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and lawful assemblage.

Legislation by State

I. Conservation

We advocate conservation of soil and forests; reforestation of depleted reserves; conservation of water supplies.

II. Banking

We advocate a reduction of the legal and contract rate of interest.

III. Agriculture

We advocate an adequate and effective license tax on oleomargarine and all butter substitutes sold and used in the State of Minnesota.

We advocate an extension of the mortgage moratorium law.

IV. Old-Age Pensions

We advocate a generous old-age-pension law.

V. Labor

We advocate an amendment of the State constitution giving the State the right to establish minimum wages in industry and maximum hours of employment.

We advocate a law providing for State-fund workmen's compensation.

We advocate substantial increased benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act for permanent partial disability.

We pledge our support to all workers in their struggle for higher wages and better working conditions. We are against importation or use of thugs and strikebreakers in labor disputes.

VI. Education

We reaffirm our belief in equality of educational opportunity, and therefore propose the use of income taxes to decrease local school levies, payment of all special State aid in full, uniform budgetary procedure as opposed to straight-jacket expenditure-control legislation, creation of a more extensive program for youth between the ages of 16 and 21.

We oppose compulsory military training at all educational institutions supported wholly or in part by State funds.

VII. Party Designation

We recommend that all candidates for the State legislature be elected by party designation.

VIII. Taxation

We oppose the adoption of proposed constitutional amendment no. 2.

We are unalterably opposed to a general sales tax.

We advocate an improved chain-store tax for the benefit of the independent merchant and the consumer.

We advocate amending the corporate excess tax law to a flat 20-mill rate on all corporate excess.

We advocate an increase of money and credits tax to 5 mills.

We advocate an increase of the gross earnings tax on large telephone companies, farmers' cooperative lines excepted.

We advocate an increase of the railroads' gross earnings tax, of the occupation and royalty taxes on iron ore.

We advocate an increase on graduated net income taxes and on inheritance and gift taxes in the higher brackets, all of which would bring an addition of millions of dollars into the State treasury to relieve the unfair tax burden now carried by property.

IX. Cooperation

We advocate the formation of consumers' cooperatives, credit unions, cooperative banking and service organizations, including cooperative enterprises for health, housing, and rural electrification.

X. Civil Service

We advocate a civil-service law.

XI. Rural Electrification

Realizing the importance of power in modern industry and home life, we advocate the adoption of the power plan of the State planning board, providing for the creation of a State advisory power commission to make a survey of the actual and potential power capacity and need of the State; determining the cost of generation and distribution of power, setting up economic power districts into which municipally owned plants and rural electric cooperatives may form into leagues of municipalities for the generation and distribution of power and urging the removal of all legislative restrictions to the formation of such leagues of municipalities and cooperatives.

XII. Collective Bargaining

We pledge our full support to the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively.

XIII. Unemployed

We recognize the duty of the state to the unemployed and pledge the full resources and power of the state to the end that suffering and destitution among the unemployed and needy shall be eliminated.

A PARTIAL RECORD OF THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY SINCE 1931

The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party has never had a majority in either house of the State legislature, the closest it ever came to legislative control being in 1933, when a coalition of Farmer-Laborites and Liberals controlled the house of representatives, while the conservatives controlled the State senate. But even as a minority it has been able to force through many features of its program through sheer strength of public support.

TONNAGE TAX ON ORE

As early as 1921 the tonnage tax on iron ore was enacted, followed in 1923 by the ore-royalties tax. Both of these measures, bitterly fought by the Steel Trust, were won unquestionably through the efforts of the Nonpartisan League and the Farmer-Labor Party.

Since 1931, when a Farmer-Labor State administration came to office, the Farmer-Labor accomplishments have included:

MORTGAGE MORATORIUM

An emergency mortgage moratorium proclamation by the Governor, saving thousands of farms and homes at a critical time.

A State mortgage-moratorium law.

A State income tax, with revenue redistributed to the local school districts.

Vetoing of a sales tax by the Farmer-Labor Governor.

A chain-store tax.

AID TO SCHOOLS

A large increase of State aid to schools, and a revision of aid laws, giving the chief support to the hard-hit districts. As a result, no children have been denied education through closing of schools in Minnesota.

More equitable enforcement of tax laws, which is cleaning up a condition of mass tax dodging by wealthy groups.

Adequate relief appropriations, which have been forced through conservative legislatures, often with the need for considerable pressure.

Abolition of compulsory military training at the State university.

A homestead-exemption law, making a big reduction in the tax on the first \$4,000 of value of any homestead, thus giving the greatest proportional benefit to small farms and homes.

The consolidated primary ballot, protecting the voter by giving a really secret ballot.

A compulsory old-age-pension law.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

More important than any of these legislative measures is the support which the Farmer-Labor movement has given for the civil liberties of workers and farmers and their right to organize. In the end, it is probable that more farms have been saved through the efforts of such an organization as the Farmers' Holiday Association than were saved by the mortgage-moratorium law, and it is significant that the holiday is strongest in Minnesota, the Farmer-Labor State. Its national president, John H. Bosch, is a farm leader of Minnesota. The activity of rank and file Farmer-Laborites throughout the State has built the group in large part.

ASSISTANCE TO ORGANIZED LABOR

Labor associations, largely for relief, and W. P. A. workers in the State, particularly in the rural counties, have played an important role in protecting decent standards of life, and here again the influence of the Farmer-Labor movement has given backing and strength. Labor unions have shown an increase in membership and activity, some of which comes from the protection which unions have against hostile governmental activity from being affiliated with the Farmer-Labor Association. Although there have been some bitterly fought strikes in Minnesota in the last 4 years, in some of which the militia were mobilized, there has not been a worker shot by the militia in Minnesota, and the militia has been called to protect the workers, not to break strikes.

This support for the independent organizational activities of the farmers and workers has shown benefits in income and security which it might take a long time to win by the roundabout procedures of social legislation, and it is an indirect accomplishment of the Farmer-Labor movement.

FARMER-LABOR REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

In Congress the Farmer-Labor Party has been represented by three United States Senators, Henrik Shipstead, Magnus Johnson, and Elmer A. Benson; and nine Representatives, Paul John Kvale, O. J. Kvale, William L. Carss, Ernest Lundein, Knud Wefald, R. T. Buckler, Henry Arens, Magnus Johnson, and F. H. Shoemaker.

The Farmer-Labor delegation has played a leading part in the fight for progressive legislation in Congress. We have fought for the Frazier-Lemke farm refinancing bill, genuine, adequate social security, the veterans' adjusted service certificates bill, and other farm, labor, and veteran legislation. It was on the Lundein motion that the Patman bonus bill passed the House in 1934, paving the way for final victory in 1936. The Frazier-Lundein social-security bill is gathering more strength. It is recognized by thousands of farm and labor organizations as the only genuine, adequate social-security measure before Congress today. (See hearings on H. R. 2827, House Labor Committee, 1935, and hearings on S. 3475, Senate Committee on Education and Labor, 1936.)

ORIGIN OF THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY

The five Farmer-Labor Members of House and Senate today, and our able Farmer-Labor State administration owe their success to the pioneers that went before, to organized labor and organized farmers who built the movement many years ago. I am sure that Members of Congress and citizens generally are interested in knowing something of the origin of the Farmer-Labor Party.

BIRTH OF FARMER-LABOR PARTY NOVEMBER 1918

The first time the name Farmer-Labor appeared on the ballot in this country was in November 1918. There was no Farmer-Labor name on the ballot in the Minnesota primary election. Therefore, according to the law, it was necessary to secure the names of 2,000 voters on a petition for each of the Farmer-Labor candidates. Petitioners had to be favorable to placing Farmer-Labor candidates on the ballots, but they could not have voted in the June primary.

The difficulty was that most of those who were for the Farmer-Labor Party had voted for the Nonpartisan League candidates in the Republican primary. It took about 2 weeks to secure 2,000 names for each candidate. On October 5, 1918, the Minnesota Leader announced that three Farmer-

Labor candidates had filed for the November election. Over 2,500 names had been obtained on their petitions.

Because of the influenza epidemic the Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor, Dave Evans, was unable to campaign during the last month before election. However, the vote for the Farmer-Labor candidates was astounding. Throughout the campaign they were subject to mob insults. Meetings were broken up, cars were smashed, tires ruined, roads barricaded. Spoiled vegetables, eggs, and rocks were thrown at speakers. When the ballots were counted there was great surprise at the large vote polled by the first Farmer-Labor candidates.

Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor, Dave Evans, received 111,966 votes against 166,611 for J. A. A. Burnquist, conservative war Governor and incumbent (Republican). The Democrat, Fred E. Wheaton, was third, with 76,838 votes. Fred E. Tillquist polled 104,283 as the Farmer-Labor candidate for railroad and warehouse commissioner against 165,852 for the Republican and 68,991 for the Democrat. Tom Davis received 99,933 as Farmer-Labor candidate for attorney general against 180,877 for the Republican and 56,029 for the Democrat.

The Farmer-Labor Party was born in the travail of war. There were rumblings of a new party in Minnesota all during the war. Profiteering, patriotheering, wartime hysteria, and persecution aroused the fighting spirit of farmers and workers alike. Persecution of the common people brings forth leaders of the common people. This has always been so.

Outrages against the rights of free speech, free press, petition and assemblage kindled a fire of rebellion. Continuous persecution fanned the flame. The rebellion was one of ballots. In a peaceful and orderly manner farmers and working people determined to make their voices heard.

The election of 1918 was the culmination of many months' planning. Other methods of gaining control of the State government had been tried.

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE ENTERS MINNESOTA POLITICS—1918

It was in the spring of 1918 that the Nonpartisan League in Minnesota decided to enter the political arena.

On February 16, 1918, the first issue of the Minnesota Leader, official organ of the National Nonpartisan League in Minnesota, was published at 353 Jackson Street, St. Paul, with Oliver Morris as editor. Members of the league became paid-in-advance subscribers to all Nonpartisan League publications.

In the first issue it was announced that precinct caucuses would be held on February 22, 1918, at 2 p. m., to elect delegates to conventions of legislative districts. From legislative district conventions, delegates would be sent to congressional district conventions, and then to State conventions, as had been done in North Dakota. There was no attempt to form a new party at that time; the idea was to capture the machinery of the old parties by means of the primary. For the week ending February 9, 1918, 35 Nonpartisan League rallies were scheduled in Minnesota. About 35,000 in all attended these various caucuses of the league in the year 1918.

After these caucuses had been held, a State meeting was finally called for March 19, 1918, at St. Paul. Delegates from 48 counties attended. The platform adopted called for State-owned packing plants, elevators, and flour mills; State rural credits; a tonnage tax on ores; and State-owned pulp mills, based on the Nonpartisan League experience in North Dakota.

At this State convention, declarations were made against American industrial autocracy. The State administration in Minnesota—under Gov. J. A. A. Burnquist—was condemned for lawlessness. It was said that Minnesota was the only State that permitted and encouraged mob violence against organized farmers.

MINNESOTA OPPOSED TO WAR

Patriotes and profiteers were for America's entry into the World War, but the masses of the people were not. Minnesota's Representatives in Congress were not for the war.

Congressmen Charles R. Davis (Third District), Carl Van Dyke (Fourth District), Ernest Lundein (Fifth District), and Harold Knutson (Sixth District) voted against it.

All were reelected except Ernest Lundein, who represented the conservative Fifth District, the very center of war persecution and patriotheering.

It was at this convention in St. Paul, on March 19, 1918, that the Nonpartisan League's first slate of State candidates in Minnesota was endorsed:

For Governor: Charles A. Lindbergh, of Little Falls (Republican).

Lieutenant Governor: R. E. Crane, of Grand Meadow (Republican).

Attorney general: Victor Power (Republican).

State auditor: S. O. Tjosvold (Republican).

Secretary of state: Henry Holmes (Republican).

Treasurer: Thomas Meighen (Democrat).

Railroad and warehouse commissioner: F. E. Tillquist (Republican).

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Charles A. Lindbergh, father of the famed aviator and scientist, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, was the most distinguished Congressman Minnesota ever had. He had served five consecutive terms in Congress as a Progressive Republican. In my speech of June 24, 1935 (p. 10015 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), may be found more information concerning the record of Congressman Lindbergh.

Lindbergh was born in Stockholm, Sweden, January 20, 1859. His father brought him to Minnesota when he was a year old. He graduated from the law department of the University of Michigan. He was prosecuting attorney of Morrison County from 1891 to 1893 and practiced law in Little Falls, Minn., the county seat. He served five consecutive terms in Congress, 1907 to 1917. In 1916 he was an unsuccessful candidate for Senator. He was the Nonpartisan League candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket in the primary of 1918. He was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress from the Sixth District in 1920. He lost his race for the United States Senate in the special election of 1923. He was candidate for Governor on the Farmer-Labor ticket in 1924, but died before the primary.

The candidate for Lieutenant Governor, R. E. Crane, of Grand Meadow, was a farmer, a member of the legislature from Mower County. He was endorsed in his own county for the State senate but was drafted by the convention for Lieutenant Governor.

The attorney general candidate, Victor Power, was a lawyer who had fought the Steel Trust. He was mayor of Hibbing at the time.

The State auditor candidate, S. O. Tjosvold was a farmer active in organizing cooperative societies. He organized a telephone and power cooperative called Stony Run Power & Light Co.

The secretary of state candidate, Henry Holmes, was a farmer of Big Lake and a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives.

The treasurer candidate, Thomas Meighen, was a progressive Democrat, a small-town independent banker from Preston, who gave unselfishly of his time and his ability to aid the Farmer-Labor movement in Minnesota.

The railroad and warehouse commissioner, Fred E. Tillquist, of St. Paul, was active in the railroad brotherhood organizations.

RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS URGE LABOR FILE OWN CANDIDATES

The railroad brotherhoods' State legislative board, of which Tillquist was secretary and treasurer, had included in their 1917 report a statement urging labor to organize and put its own political candidates in the field. This statement cited the astonishing victories of the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota in the very first political campaign and added:

In a State like Minnesota, where labor is a more important factor, there is no reason whatever why it should not do in its own legislative districts what the organized farmers do in theirs, and as a result the workers of the soil and the workers in the industries will be in a position to have what legislation they desire, as there is no conflict of interest between these two. The average farmer is a

worker tied to the job, whilst the man in the industries is forced from time to time to seek one, but both alike are victims of exploitation.

When it comes to the election of a State ticket, representatives from organized farmers could meet with representatives from organized labor, and together they could agree upon nominating and electing such candidates as would carry out their will.

In Minnesota we have a nonpartisan law, but organized labor has never taken advantage of this. It has permitted other interests to put their candidates in the field and has simply divided its forces in voting for this one and that one who claimed to be friends of labor. The only real friend that labor can count on is itself. In times of strike, of industrial disputes of any kind, labor has to fight its own battles. It's so-called friends are not then forthcoming. How much better it would be if labor, realizing this, agreed upon some definite program enumerating specific legislation which it desired enacted, and then united upon those candidates pledged to carry out its wishes.

* * * It behoves us, therefore, in the State of Minnesota as organized workers to give consideration to this matter and, before another election takes place, to counsel together and line up with the workers of the soil, so that together we may be in a position to eliminate the middlemen, who are now parasites upon all classes of workers.

* * * Not by petitioning so-called friends to give them what they want, but through concerted action on their part to do for themselves that which they desire. Capitalists know no party. They get what they want from Republicans and Democrats alike. They finance both political parties, and as a result dictate the nominations. Those elected are of very necessity obliged to carry out the will of the powers that elected them. * * * It is to be hoped that we will in the future use the means afforded by the nonpartisan law in this State in such a manner as will truly reflect our interests in the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of the State.

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE AND RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS COOPERATE

The Nonpartisan League convention in St. Paul on March 19, 1918, did exactly what the railroad brotherhoods' State legislative board advocated in its 1917 report. It endorsed a slate of candidates for nomination in the primary election. At that same time it adopted a platform calling for State-owned packing plants, elevators, flour mills, rural credits, pulp mills, and a tonnage tax on ores.

GOVERNOR BURNQUIST AND WAR HYSTERIA

Gov. J. A. A. Burnquist was given an invitation to speak to the Nonpartisan League convention of March 19, 1918, but the war-mad Governor refused the invitation in a scathing letter, in which he referred to the "unpatriotic utterances of Senator La Follette at your last convention." Burnquist said that the last convention had put a stamp of disloyalty on the Nonpartisan League that could never be erased. He further stated:

Your present publicity agent lost the position he had at the time because he supported La Follette's unpatriotic ideas, and after his discharge by his employer he was employed by your Nonpartisan League.

And so Burnquist branded himself as a narrow and intolerant and cruel Governor, ruled by John F. McGee, chairman and czar of the public safety commission.

This statement well illustrates the air of persecution prevailing in Minnesota during the war. Patriotic American citizens—leaders of farm and city workers—were discharged from their jobs for opposing America's entry into the World War. Today these so-called great and wise American "patrioteers" dare not stand before an audience and defend their support of that colossal blunder.

Burnquist, in his letter refusing the Nonpartisan League's invitation to speak, said further:

Another of your leaders, Joseph Gilbert, called a director and manager, I believe, has been convicted by a jury because of his disloyal utterances. He, together with Mr. Manahan, an attorney of your organization, unpatriotically used a strike situation here to advance the political interests of the league. You (Arthur Le Sueur, to whom the letter was addressed), who appear to be the executive secretary, were an attorney who defended the murderers in the I. W. W. trouble on the range 2 years ago. (Minnesota Leader, Mar. 23, 1918.)

Governor Burnquist neglected to mention that the so-called I. W. W. murderers were acquitted from the drummed-up charge of which they were not guilty. (H. E. Gaston.)

ERA OF PERSECUTION

The last convention of the Nonpartisan League, to which Burnquist referred, was the producers' and consumers' conference held at St. Paul Auditorium in September 1917, ad-

dressed by fighting Senator Bob La Follette, Sr., whose statue now stands in the hall of fame of the United States Capitol.

From the first the Nonpartisan League had been called socialistic. It had met concentrated opposition both in North Dakota and in Minnesota, because of its militant fight against exploitation of farmers. The extreme persecution of Nonpartisan leaders in Minnesota began with the producers' and consumers' conference in St. Paul in September 1917.

This was a mass meeting to arouse sentiment in favor of protecting consumers from wartime exploitation. Government regulation and limitation of profits were asked.

PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS CONFERENCE, 1917

Meetings were called for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, September 18, 19, and 20, 1917, at St. Paul, Minn. The crop situation and the financial condition of the farmers were discussed. Speakers included President Ladd, of the North Dakota Agricultural College; President Waters, of Kansas; Congressman Baer, of North Dakota; Congressman George M. Young; Robert Bridges, chairman of the Seattle Port Commission; former Senator John L. McLaurin, of South Carolina; Carl Thompson, of the Public Ownership League; and a speaker from the Department of Agriculture.

SENATOR LA FOLLETTE'S SPEECH

Late in the evening of the last day Senator Bob La Follette drew a crowd of more than 10,000 persons. La Follette talked about the Nonpartisan League and the failure of the old political parties. He defended his vote against America's entry into the World War.

NEWSPAPERS MISQUOTE SPEECH

Senator La Follette made the statement:

We had grievances. Germany had interfered with the rights of our citizens to sail the high seas—on ships loaded with ammunition for Great Britain.

Newspapers widely quoted this statement, adding a "no" before grievances, so that La Follette was quoted as saying, "We had no grievances."

This misquoted statement from Senator La Follette's speech was given Nation-wide attention. One newspaper referred to the Nonpartisan League conference as a "war dance of disloyalty." Charges were made against La Follette in the Senate. Senator Frank B. Kellogg, of Minnesota, introduced a resolution to expel La Follette from the Senate. Finally the stenographic report of La Follette's speech was carefully read and it was discovered that an error had been made by including the word "no" before the word "grievances." The utterly foolish and vicious Kellogg resolution was voted down. Senator Kellogg voting against his own resolution. Senator La Follette was reimbursed in the amount of \$5,000 for expenses incurred, and so the resolution and charges collapsed.

PATRIOTIZING

From that time on Nonpartisan League meetings were broken up, leaders were roughly handled, tarred, and feathered.

DEMANDS OF PRODUCERS' AND CONSUMERS' CONFERENCE

Resolutions of the Producers' and Consumers' Conference were (p. 215, The Nonpartisan League, by H. E. Gaston):

Cheerfully acquiescing in the fixing of the price of wheat, the farmers ask that prices on other necessities be regulated to eliminate exorbitant profits.

That the reduction in the price of wheat be passed along to the consumer in cheaper flour and bread, failing which the Government should seize mills and bakeries and turn out flour and bread at cost.

That the Government make low-interest loans to farmers whose crops failed.

That the Food Administration cease paying commission to grain buyers and instead buy direct.

That a zone system of wheat buying be adopted to correct inequalities and injustices due to freight differentials.

That milling value of grain be made the basis of grade and price. That income and excess-profits taxes be increased.

That a Federal tax be levied upon unused land.

That in case of failure of the plan to tax away excess profits in war industries through lack of cooperation, the Government commandeer all such industries necessary to the conduct of the war.

That the Government operate the copper mines during the war, as requested by Butte miners' organizations.

That cooperative buying be encouraged.

That in all cases during the war in which strikes in war industries are not speedily adjusted the Government take over the industries.

That soldiers' pay be fixed at \$50 a month.

That the Government furnish cheap insurance to soldiers.

DECLARATION THAT SENT NONPARTISAN LEAGUE LEADERS TO JAIL

The Producers and Consumers Conference also adopted a preamble to the resolutions containing language which caused two Nonpartisan League leaders, A. C. Townley and Joseph Gilbert, mentioned by Burnquist, to be sent to jail after trial in Minnesota courts. Following is the so-called seditious language upon which these men were indicted:

The moving cause of this world war was and is political autocracy used to perpetuate and extend industrial autocracy. It is the struggle of political overlords to extend and perpetuate their power to rob and exploit their fellow men. Autocratic rulers who have robbed and exploited the fathers and mothers, now slaughter the children for the single purpose of further entrenching themselves in their infamous position, and securing and legalizing their possession of the fruits of others' toil and thrusting the world under the yoke of political autocracy, which is ever the shield and mask of industrial autocracy.

Our war is to extend the political democracy which we in the United States enjoy, in order that political democracy may be safe in our own land and that it may be used to accomplish its historic purpose—industrial democracy. (H. E. Gaston, The Nonpartisan League.)

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE CONVENTION MARCH 19, 1918

This was the background of the Nonpartisan League Convention of March 19, 1918.

James Clancy, president of the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, who was the Nonpartisan League endorsed and successful candidate for St. Paul councilman, called the convention to order on March 19. Speakers were Oscar E. Keller, a city councilman; Magnus Johnson, of Litchfield; Jules J. Anderson, of the Duluth Trades and Labor Assembly; and Mrs. Hulda Harold Bain, of California. Mayor V. R. Irvin refused the Nonpartisan League delegates the customary courtesy of welcoming them to St. Paul.

PRIMARY CANDIDATES ENDORSED

Some of the candidates endorsed at the March 19 convention withdrew for one reason or another; changes were made. The final slate as it appeared in June 1918 was:

Governor: Charles A. Lindbergh.

Lieutenant Governor: R. E. Crane.

Attorney general: Thomas V. Sullivan.

State auditor: S. O. Tjosvold.

State treasurer: Albert H. Fasel.

Clerk of supreme court: Herman Mueller.

Railroad and warehouse commissioner: F. E. Tillquist.

Frank M. Barton was endorsed for Congress in the Ninth Congressional District. Henrik Shipstead was endorsed for Congress in the Seventh Congressional District.

Labor organizations and the Municipal Nonpartisan League of Minneapolis had endorsed Ernest Lundein for re-election to Congress from the Fifth Congressional District. The administration of Mayor Van Lear was also endorsed by labor and the Minneapolis Municipal Nonpartisan League.

CHARLES A. LINDBERG'S SPLENDID RUN

In the 1918 Republican primaries, Charles A. Lindbergh received 150,626 votes to Governor Burnquist's 199,325. All Nonpartisan League candidates made a good showing, including those endorsed for Congress from various districts.

BITTER 1918 PRIMARY CONTEST

There was a bitter contest in the primary. Nonpartisan League speakers were rotten-egged, stoned, and mobbed. There were tarring and feathering parties. Lindbergh was led to jail and almost lynched. According to one authority—H. E. Gaston—there were 250 League meetings scheduled in Minnesota in the winter and early spring of 1918, and of these 40 had to be abandoned. A farmer near Hinckley, Minn., was making a speech at Turpville schoolhouse near Hinckley when an armed mob took him prisoner, carried him several miles, stripped and beat him, and covered him with tar and feathers. The men wore black masks. Two days

later this same farmer spoke to a crowd of 750 farmers and told of the death threat his assailants had made against "the first league organizer or speaker who comes back into the county."

THE COURTS AND THE WORLD WAR

Many protracted lawsuits were fought over the loss of civil rights and personal injury and insult. However, justice in the courts of Minnesota was a very variable quantity in the days of the World War.

In New Richland, Minn., a "war board" refused to permit the farmers to assemble for a meeting. A Civil War veteran, E. E. Verplank, who was 84 years old, invited the audience to move to his farm. They were pursued by the sheriff and the meeting was broken up under orders from the Governor's office. Officers of the law under Burnquist became lawless hoodlums.

Ortonville and Ernest Lundein furnish an interesting chapter, a perfect illustration of lawless officers of the law, for those who may care to read.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION

Incidents of this kind were common occurrences during the hysterical primary campaign of 1918. Judge John F. McGee, who headed the Minnesota public safety committee, was intolerant, narrow, dictatorial. He was merciless in the extreme. His control over the weak Burnquist was absolute.

In the 1918 primaries a large number of Nonpartisan League candidates for the State legislature won. The July 6, 1918, issue of the Minnesota Leader states that the Nonpartisan League had gained control of the Minnesota Legislature. The large vote polled by Nonpartisan League candidates in the primary encouraged league leaders to continue their activities.

PLANS FOR 1918 FALL ELECTION

After the primary election of 1918 the question arose as to what should be done in the fall. Some were of the opinion that best results would be reached by making endorsements of candidates already nominated in the existing parties. That would have led to the endorsement of a number of Democrats. The difficulty with that procedure was that many voters who were ready to leave the Republican Party did not approve of the Democratic candidates. Some of the Nonpartisan League leaders who had come to Minnesota from North Dakota were ready to fold up their tents and go back home. However, there were labor leaders who were determined to keep up the fight. Labor had not yet taken a leading hand in the movement. A. C. Townley, William Lemke, and John T. Thompson, Nonpartisan League leaders of North Dakota, were willing that further attempts be made to secure the cooperation of organized labor and put forth united effort in the fall election.

LABOR POLITICAL CONVENTION CALLED

In July 1918 the State Federation of Labor held its convention in Virginia, Minn. It was a very highly war-fevered convention. William Mahoney offered a resolution calling for a labor political convention. Many of the delegates were afraid to sign Mahoney's resolution for fear they would be labeled pro-German. However, the resolution was passed, and a call for a State labor political convention was issued for August 25. The call went to all unions in the State, urging them to send delegates to the convention, with a view to discussing a State election and the possibility of putting up a ticket.

In the meantime the State committee of the Nonpartisan League had met and decided to appoint a committee of seven to get together with organized labor during the labor political convention. The Nonpartisan League committee included A. C. Welch, of Glencoe; Magnus Johnson, of Kimball; Arny Grundyson, of Fisher; R. E. Crane, of Grand Meadow; D. N. Williams, of Courtland; O. O. Teuve, of Wrenshall; and K. Knutson, of Cottonwood.

During the session of the Nonpartisan League State committee a delegation of independent Republicans and Democrats had asked permission to address the meeting. They suggested that the league support a third new candidate for

Governor. This committee of independent Republicans and Democrats included Dr. William E. Leonard, of Minneapolis; Attorney Ray C. Smelker, of St. Paul; Carl H. Lewis, of Minneapolis; Mayor J. J. Reiter, of Rochester; and Attorney F. A. Pike, who has been special assistant United States attorney.

LABOR POLITICAL CONVENTION, ST. PAUL, AUGUST 24-25, 1918

There were 125 delegates from labor unions all over the State at the August 24-25 labor political convention. The convention passed a resolution to appoint a conference committee to confer with representatives of the Nonpartisan League, with a view to putting up a State ticket in the fall. William Mahoney was made chairman of the conference committee. The committee went into conference with five representatives of the Nonpartisan League.

Names were suggested as possible candidates for governor. Magnus Johnson, Tom Davis, and Dave Evans were among those suggested.

DAVE EVANS FOR GOVERNOR

Dave Evans, of Tracy, seemed to be the favorite candidate. F. A. Pike, Democrat, and attorney for the Nonpartisan League, favored Evans, and had telegraphed him to come to St. Paul for an interview. Evans was a hardware merchant of Tracy, Lyon County, Minn., a fine, splendid gentleman. He was a Liberal Democrat. He had been a coworker of Ignatius Donnelly in the Populist Party. He had been a Democratic candidate for Congress in 1904. He had defended the Nonpartisan League during the attacks made upon it in 1917 and 1918, and his house had been painted yellow. He had not opposed the war; in fact, it was said that he owned about \$15,000 worth of Liberty bonds at the time he was chosen to run for governor in the fall of 1918. He purchased more Liberty bonds than anyone else in Lyon County. Congressman John Baer, of North Dakota, was at one time barred out of Tracy by patrioteers. Evans invited Baer to his home where the meeting was held.

Evans was called before the committee for questioning; he was offered the candidacy for Governor, and accepted.

For attorney general the committee picked Tom Davis, an able, well-known, Minneapolis lawyer, who was especially popular among labor union groups.

For railroad and warehouse commissioner, F. E. Tillquist was chosen. Tillquist was a locomotive engineer for the Omaha Railroad. He was born on a farm in Chisago County, Minn. He was an outstanding, active member of the railroad brotherhoods' organization.

The recommendation of the committee to endorse these candidates was accepted by the labor political convention and a campaign committee was appointed. The president of the campaign committee was E. G. Hall, who was president of the State Federation of Labor. The secretary was George W. Lawson, who was secretary of the State Federation of Labor. Some of the other members were Ed. Corcoran, William Mahoney, and William Watkins. The necessary 2,000 names were secured on petitions for the Farmer-Labor candidates, and the response of the voters to the name Farmer-Labor was most surprising.

FLOYD B. OLSON FIRST FARMER-LABOR GOVERNOR

Each general election after 1918 there were Farmer-Labor candidates on the ballot. In 1930 the Farmer-Labor Party, electing its first Governor, Floyd B. Olson, became the first party of the State, and has remained so to this day. Floyd B. Olson has the unique distinction of being America's first Farmer-Labor Governor.

WORLD WAR ESPIONAGE ACT MODELED AFTER SEDITION ACT OF 1798

In the formation of the Farmer-Labor Party of 1918 history repeated itself. The Farmer-Labor Party was a protest against war persecution, ruthless enforcement of espionage laws, violation of constitutional rights of free speech and press, free assemblage, and petition. The Espionage Act of World War days was modeled after the infamous Sedition Act that Thomas Jefferson fought and repealed. Damages were paid to American citizens who suffered injustices under the Sedition Act of Jefferson's day.

The Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota has its roots in the American Revolution. America was born in a protest against exploitation. With new political parties this Nation had its birth. The Declaration of Independence is more than a protest against the tyranny of an eighteenth century British King. It is the living spirit of Americanism today. It is the lasting inspiration of a great American ideal—a free and equal people. The Declaration of Independence rings out in the words of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. Through the decades it has carried forward a patriotic protest against all kinds of exploitation. It repudiates legislation repressing the liberties of the people. It repulses usurpation of the people's power by the aristocracy of wealth. The only liberty it curbs is the liberty of man to exploit man, for "all men are created equal."

FARMER-LABOR PARTY FOUNDED ON AMERICAN IDEALS

The Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota was founded in the traditional American spirit. It is inspired by the Declaration of Independence. It carries forward in Minnesota the struggle of Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln for the liberty and happiness of those who toil. Without some consideration of these earlier struggles no real understanding of the Farmer-Labor Party is complete.

The Farmer-Labor Party is native American. It grew up with the Northwest. It has its roots in the soil of the Northwest. It came into being as the inevitable result of struggles that went before. It is the direct offspring of the Nonpartisan League. Its ancestors were the Progressives of 1912, Bryan Democracy of 1896, the People's Party of the nineties, the Greenback and Granger movements soon after the close of the Civil War, the new Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln, the early trade-union political parties long before the Civil War. The Farmer-Labor Party traces its ancestors to Thomas Jefferson and the American Revolution.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776

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. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it.

JEFFERSON DEFENDS PEOPLE'S LIBERTY

Twenty-two years after the Declaration of Independence was adopted Thomas Jefferson, its author, was persecuted for defending it. War hysteria produced repressive legislation. It violated the people's liberties. America at the close of the eighteenth century was on the verge of being dragged into the quarrels of Europe. Many Federalists were British sympathizers.

ALIEN AND SEDITION ACTS, 1798

President Adams' administration put through the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. The Alien Act gave the President the power to order all aliens he thought dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, or who he had reasonable ground to believe were concerned in treasonable or secret activities against the Government, to leave the country within any date he might set. If the alien refused to leave, the President had the right to imprison him. Apparently all persons whom this law would affect left the country voluntarily, and no one was imprisoned or deported under the act.

The Sedition Act, Jefferson declared, was "an experiment on the American mind to see how far it will bear an avowed violation of the Constitution" (S. E. Foreman, *Our Republic*, p. 179). A hundred and twenty years later this same act was drawn upon in framing the espionage laws during the World War. In both cases new political parties arose to protest the violation of constitutional guarantees. Those who opposed the Sedition Act of 1798 flocked to the new Jeffersonian Republican Party. The victims of the espionage law and Minnesota's reign of terror during the World War lifted the standards of the Farmer-Labor Party.

SEDITION ACT OF 1798

The Sedition Act of 1798 imposed a heavy fine upon any person conspiring to oppose any measure of government and upon any person publishing any false or scandalous or malicious writings against the National Government, Congress, or the President, and the measure was used to crush political opponents of the Adams administration. Jefferson took up the fight against this violation of the people's rights. The Constitution forbids Congress to pass laws interfering with freedom of speech or personal liberty. The Legislature of Kentucky passed the famous Kentucky resolutions, drawn up by Jefferson, declaring that the alien and sedition laws were contrary to the Constitution. The same kind of resolutions were passed by the Legislature of Virginia. Seven other States objected to the Alien and Sedition Acts.

These alien and sedition laws were passed under the pretext of curbing the activities of French sympathizers in the war between France and England. Actually, they were used to crush American enemies of the Federalist Party. The alien law was apparently aimed more at liberty-loving Irish immigrants than at the French. Irish immigrants flocked in large numbers to Jefferson's party. If Federalist President Adams considered them dangerous, he could deport them.

The sedition bill was used to crush the opposition press and silence criticism of the Federalists in power. Hamilton thought the law went too far. During the Presidential campaign of 1800 vicious attacks were made on Jefferson by the Federalist administration and the Federalist press. Finally property confiscated under these un-American acts was restored and damages paid.

JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRACY VICTORIOUS

When the votes were counted it was victory for democracy and the Declaration of Independence. The electoral vote at first was 73 for Jefferson, 73 for Aaron Burr, 65 for John Adams, 64 for C. C. Pinckney, and 1 for John Jay. According to the Constitution it was then necessary for the House of Representatives to ballot on the two highest candidates.

On the thirty-sixth ballot, taken February 17, 1801, 10 States voted for Jefferson and 4 for Burr. Delaware and South Carolina did not vote.

JEFFERSON FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Thomas Jefferson, in his inaugural address, said:

If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. (Claude G. Bowers, Jefferson and Hamilton, p. 509.)

BACKGROUND OF FARMER-LABOR PARTY

These early struggles of Jefferson and his followers form a part of the background of the Farmer-Labor Party. Jefferson's Republican Party was a new workers' and farmers' party. Jefferson was more than a liberal or a progressive. He was a radical. Later labor and farmer leaders follow the leadership of Jefferson. Into the Declaration of Independence Thomas Jefferson wrote immortal, fundamental principles, an everlasting inspiration for new and radical parties emerging from necessity as we march up the hills of time.

FIRST AMERICAN LABOR PARTY, 1828

There were labor parties in this country long before Minnesota was an organized Territory.

In 1828 the trades-unions of Philadelphia launched the first Labor Party in the United States. That was the year Andrew Jackson was elected President. When the Erie Canal opened in 1825 organizations in the United States were formed. Philadelphia and New York unionists in 1827 were struggling for the 10-hour day. They won. Once organized, they continued their activities. The 10-hour day was their immediate goal, but their platform included more than that.

LABOR AND OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

They fought for free public education and other social and economic reforms. They demanded that labor receive the fruits of its toil. The Philadelphia Labor Party of 1828 included in its platform this statement:

As freemen and Republicans, we feel it a duty incumbent on us to make known our sentiments fearlessly and faithfully on any subject connected with the general welfare; and we are prepared to maintain that all who toil have a natural and unalienable right to reap the fruits of their own industry; and that they who by labor (the only source) are the authors of every comfort, convenience, and luxury are in justice entitled to an equal participation not only in the meanest and the coarsest but likewise the richest and choicest of them all. (Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States, 1828 to 1928, Nathan Fine.)

The Declaration of Independence echoes in that statement.

LABOR FIGHTS FOR FREE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Organized labor has always fought for free public education. From the early days of American history the establishment of free public schools has been an integral part of labor's program. This is natural, since labor constitutes the great mass of American people who receive the benefits of free public education. Thomas Jefferson's early struggle for a public-school system was carried on for the benefit of labor. The minority not identified with labor could afford private schools and tutors. Public schools did not interest them. But Jefferson knew that the education of those who labor is the foundation of lasting democracy. Labor unions have from the first recognized this truth.

The Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations, which arose out of the Philadelphia carpenters' strike for a 10-hour day, sent out a circular to candidates for office in Andrew Jackson's time, asking whether the candidate believed—

That an open school and competent teachers for every child from the lowest branch of an infant school to the lecture rooms of practical science should be established, and those who superintend them to be chosen by the people. (Readings in the History of Education, no. 315, New York Free Enquirer, Oct. 7, 1829, quoted in Columbia University Teachers College Contributions to Education, no. 201, p. 10.)

A New York labor paper, the Workingman's Advocate, in 1829 included in its prospectus the statement:

All children are entitled to equal education; all adults to equal property; all mankind to equal privileges. (Readings, p. 16.)

Further information on labor's fight for adequate free public education may be found in my speech of August 7, 1935, Retrenchment, Retrogression, and Ruin, the Three R's of Economized Education, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 12694.

The declaration "All men are created equal" reappears in different words in every major struggle of labor and farmers for the fruits of their toil.

LABOR AND FARMERS UNITE, 1833

Labor and farmers united early in the nineteenth century. In 1833 and 1834 the Association of Farmers, Mechanics, and other Workingmen, in Massachusetts, was active in politics. Farmers and workers united on several demands, including free tax-supported schools. The farmer-labor program also included ending imprisonment for debt and abolition of private monopolies.

LABOR ADVOCATED WORKERS' EDUCATION A HUNDRED YEARS AGO

In 1834 a national trades union, representing the territory from Boston to Cincinnati, included in its constitution provisions advocating the education of union members, the formation of committees to agitate for education, and an attempt to democratize public-school systems.

From then on, organized labor has advocated a broad, general public-education system; its efforts have by no means been confined to vocational education. During the first half of the nineteenth century, labor organizations played a leading part in the campaign for free public schools. It is a fact which cannot be denied that where illiteracy prevails among workers in some sections of America broad militant labor organization does not exist. The workers in these sections have not been able to form economic organizations. They have not been able to make a strong demand for public education. Labor's hope for better opportunities in the future lies in the education of all the people. From the date of its first convention in 1881 the American Federation of Labor has declared for legislation in the interest of improving and expanding free public education.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR DEMANDS FREE TEXTBOOKS, 1911

As early as 1911 the American Federation of Labor recommended that socially archaic textbooks be replaced with books which teach the dignity of manual labor and—

That will not teach the harmful doctrine that the wage workers should be content with their lot, because of the opportunity that may be afforded a few of their number rising out of their class, instead of teaching that the wage earners should base their hopes upon the elevation of the conditions of the working people.

THE BIRTH OF MINNESOTA

Labor organizations helped to keep the spirit of the Declaration of Independence before the American people at all times. In periods of persecution and distress, labor and farm leaders led a united protest of city and country workers.

When Minnesota became a State, the first President we helped to elect was that great champion of labor, Abraham Lincoln, in whose words the Declaration of Independence lived once more. Minnesota voted for Abraham Lincoln by a vote of 22,069, against 11,920 for Stephen A. Douglas, Democrat.

LINCOLN'S OWN WORDS ON LABOR

With reference to the rights and the dignity of labor Abraham Lincoln said:

It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, somehow by the use of it induces him to labor. • • •

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. • • •

Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all of liberty shall be lost (Dec. 3, 1861, Annual Message, quoted in Nicolay & Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. VII, pp. 57, 59).

THE FRUITS OF LABOR

Abraham Lincoln said:

In the early days of our race the Almighty said to the first of our race, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread"; and since then, if we except the light and the air of Heaven, no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without having first cost labor. And inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have without labor enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government (Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, Nicolay & Hay, vol. I, pp. 306-307, Abraham Lincoln, Dec. 1, 1847, Tariff Discussion).

Later Lincoln said:

It may seem strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; • • • (Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, Nicolay & Hay, vol. XI, pp. 45-46, Abraham Lincoln, Mar. 4, 1865, Second Inaugural Address).

MINNESOTA TERRITORY

Minnesota was organized as a Territory on June 1, 1849. A Governor, secretary, marshal, and attorney were appointed by the President. A chief justice and two associate justices were assigned to judicial districts of the Territory by the Governor. Following were the first officers of Minnesota Territory:

Alexander Ramsey, of Pennsylvania, Governor.

C. K. Smith, of Ohio, secretary.

Aaron Goodrich, of Tennessee, chief justice.

David Cooper, of Maryland, associate justice.

Bradley B. Meeker, of Kentucky, associate justice.

Col. A. M. Mitchell, of Ohio, marshal.

Henry L. Moss, attorney.

On August 1, 1849, the qualified voters elected Henry H. Sibley as the first Delegate to the House of Representatives. Nine councilmen and eighteen representatives were elected to the legislative assembly of the Territory.

TERRITORIAL GOVERNORS

The first Territorial Governor, Alexander Ramsey, was born near Harrisburg, Pa., September 8, 1815, and died in St. Paul April 22, 1903. He was a Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania from 1842 to 1847, a United States

Senator from 1863 to 1875, and Secretary of War in President Hayes' Cabinet. He served as Territorial Governor from June 1, 1849, to May 15, 1853.

The second Territorial Governor, Willis Arnold Gorman, served from May 15, 1853, to April 23, 1857. He was born near Flemingsburg, Ky., January 12, 1816, and died in St. Paul May 20, 1876. He was a lawyer, served in the Mexican War and the Civil War, and was made brigadier general.

The third Territorial Governor, Samuel Medary, served from April 23, 1857, to May 24, 1858. He was born in Montgomery County, Pa., February 25, 1801, and died in Columbus, Ohio, November 7, 1864. He was the last Governor of Minnesota Territory, holding that position until Minnesota was admitted to statehood.

MINNESOTA MADE A STATE MAY 11, 1858

Minnesota was admitted to the Union on May 11, 1858. State officers were sworn in May 24, 1858. Henry H. Sibley, the first Governor, was a Democrat. He received 17,790 votes against 17,550 for Alexander Ramsey, Republican. In the 1859 election Alexander Ramsey, Republican, won over George L. Becker, Democrat, and Republican Governors continued to be elected to office in Minnesota until Democrats and Populists together elected John Lind, Democratic-People's candidate, in 1898 by a vote of 131,980 to 111,796 for the Republican, William H. Eustis.

TERRITORIAL DELEGATES TO CONGRESS

Minnesota's Territorial Delegates to Congress were Henry H. Sibley from January 15, 1849, to March 4, 1853; Henry M. Rice from December 5, 1853, to March 4, 1857; and W. W. Kingsbury from December 7, 1857, to May 11, 1858.

SHIELDS AND RICE IN HALL OF FAME

Minnesota's first Senator was James Shields, Democrat, who served from May 12, 1858, to March 4, 1859. James Shields and Henry M. Rice represent Minnesota in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol. Major General Shields served as United Senator from Illinois, Minnesota, and Missouri. He is the only United States Senator I know of who served three States in that high office.

AFTER LINCOLN, THE NATIONAL LABOR UNION, 1866

In 1866 a convention of the National Labor Union met in Baltimore to form a National Labor Party. The object of this convention was to secure enactment of laws guaranteeing the 8-hour day.

The National Labor Union again had a convention in 1867, and in 1868 leaders of the union met and decided the organization was too weak to put up a national ticket that year. Always there are those who want to wait—wait till next time. At its fifth convention in Cincinnati in 1870 a motion was adopted to organize a Labor Party and put up national candidates. When the nominating convention met in February 1872, three names were under consideration for President—Judge Davis; Governor John W. Geary, of Pennsylvania; and Wendell Phillips. Phillips was more definitely identified with the labor movement, but Davis was nominated. Later the liberal faction of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party nominated Horace Greeley for President; Davis withdrew with a statement that he would support Greeley. The Labor Party was left without a candidate. (Information from Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States by Nathan Fine.)

Horace Greeley died November 29, 1872, and the Liberal-Republican and Democrat electors were compelled to vote for other persons in the electoral college.

GRANGERS WAR AGAINST MONOPOLIES

The Grange movement was the farmers' war against monopolies. Illinois was the center of the uprising. Farmers were outraged by railroad abuses. They, and the Government, had given huge grants of public lands to railroads, and now these lands were being held for speculative purposes. Farmers felt that railroads ought to be run at least partially for the farmers' benefit. They demanded Government regulation of rates and correction of abuses. California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin were active in the Grange

movement. Affiliated political parties went under different names in different States. There were Anti-Monopoly, Reform, Independent, and Independent Reform Parties. Many representatives and senators were elected to State legislatures. In Minnesota the Anti-Monopoly Party elected a State treasurer, Edwin W. Dyke, in 1873. Minnesota's Anti-Monopoly Party opposed monopoly of wood and coal and demanded limitation of hours in shops and factories.

GREENBACKERS AND GRANGERS UNITE

In 1874 Greenbackers, Anti-Monopolists, Grangers, and other opposition elements met and formed a national independent "Greenback" Party. James Buchanan presided. A nominating convention was held in 1876 with delegates from 18 States. Ignatius Donnelly, of Minnesota, was temporary chairman; Thomas J. Durant, permanent chairman. Peter Cooper, New York philanthropist was nominated for President and Newton Booth, of California, for Vice President. Samuel F. Cary was substituted for Booth when Booth declined.

Cooper, after being nominated made the public statement that the needed relief may yet be had from the Republican or Democratic Party. He did not campaign aggressively. The platform demanded that United States notes be issued by the Government, bearing a low rate of interest. The platform was largely concerned with financial questions; it declared that the economic depression was due to mismanagement of national finances. (Nathan Fine.)

Cooper polled 81,737 votes. His support came from the Middle West. Minnesota gave him 2,389 votes; Illinois, 17,233.

The Greenback Party continued to grow after Granger activities declined. Greenbackers demanded Government issuance of paper money. In 1878, an off-year congressional election, Greenback-Labor elements combined in the National Party, and in local and State elections received over a million votes. Minnesota gave the national congressional candidates 22,600 votes in 1878. Thirty-six States contributed to the million votes received ranging from 590 in Florida to 123,517 in Iowa. Minnesota had a Greenback candidate for Governor, William Meigher, in 1877. He received 2,396 votes.

GREENBACK PARTY PLATFORM

In 1880 and 1884 the Greenback Party platform included reduction of hours, Government bureaus of labor, no contract prison labor, suppression of Chinese immigration. It included six monetary proposals:

First. It is the exclusive function of the General Government to coin and create money and regulate its value. All bank issues designed to circulate as money should be suppressed. The circulating medium, whether of metal or paper, shall be issued by the Government and made a full legal tender for all debts and taxes in the United States at its stamped value.

Second. There shall be no privileged class of credits. Official salaries, pensions, bonds, and all other debts and obligations, public and private, shall be discharged in the legal-tender money of the United States, strictly according to the stipulations of the laws under which they were contracted.

Third. The coinage of silver shall be placed on the same footing as that of gold.

Fourth. Congress shall provide said money adequate to the full employment of labor, the equitable distribution of its products, and the requirements of business, fixing a minimum amount per capita of the population as near as may be, and otherwise regulate its value by wise and equitable provisions of law, so that the rate of interest will secure to labor its just reward.

Fifth. It is inconsistent with the genius of popular government that any species of private property should be exempt from bearing its just share of the public burdens. Government bonds and money should be taxed precisely as other property, and a graduated income tax should be levied for the support of the Government and the payment of its debts.

Sixth. The public lands should be reserved for actual settlers only and granted in limited quantities. (P. 68, Labor and Farmer Parties, Nathan Fine.)

GREENBACK VOTES, 1880 AND 1884

The Greenback Party continued to run Presidential candidates in 1880 and 1884. In 1880, James B. Weaver, the Presidential candidate, polled 308,578 votes. Minnesota gave him 3,267. In 1884 Benjamin F. Butler, the Presidential candidate, polled 175,370 votes nationally and 3,583 in Minnesota. That was the last year a Greenback candidate appeared on the Presidential ticket.

HENRY GEORGE

In 1886 the Central Labor Union, Knights of Labor, Socialist Labor Party, Greenbackers, Anti-Monopolists, and Single Taxers put up a united front for Henry George for mayor of New York City on the United Labor Party ticket. Samuel Gompers campaigned for the new party in New York. George lost the campaign, receiving 67,930 against the 90,456 votes of the Tammany candidate, ex-Congressman Abram S. Hewitt, and 60,474 for the Republican candidate, Theodore Roosevelt. After this campaign the United Labor Party divided into factions. Socialists felt that the party was a "Henry George" party and did not belong to labor. George finally withdrew from the United Labor Party, and the single-tax delegation followed him.

LABOR PARTIES IN 1888

By 1888 other labor parties had been formed. There was a United Labor Party formed in Cincinnati in 1888 by a group of farmers and laborers. Free trade and single tax on land values were their demands. Robert H. Cowdrey, of Illinois, was named for President, and W. H. T. Wakefield, of Kansas, for Vice President. Cowdrey received 1,721 votes in New York and Brooklyn—Information from Nathan Fine, Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States.

Alson J. Streeter, Union Labor candidate for President, received 146,935 votes in 1888. Samuel Evans was his running mate. In 1890 Minnesota gave 58,513 votes to Sidney M. Owen, "Alliance" candidate for Governor, and Kittel Halvorson was elected Congressman on the Alliance ticket from the Fifth District. He served one term.

PEOPLE'S PARTY

The first national convention of the People's Party was held at Omaha on July 2, 1892. H. L. Loucks, of South Dakota, was permanent chairman. The platform adopted by the People's Party in 1892 and other platforms of interest are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 17, 1935, included in my speech on "A National Labor Party—Eventually, Why Not Now?"

PLATFORMS AND PROGRAMS IN AUGUST 17, 1935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The People's Party sprang from the needs of southern and western farmers. High rates of interest, crop failures, low prices for farm products, and high prices of farm necessities contributed to the economic troubles of farmers. There was no income tax in those days. Railroads and corporations escaped their tax burden. The farmers bore much more than their share in taxes on land. The Knights of Labor, first organized in 1869, joined with farmer and labor organizations to form the People's Party.

James Weaver, of the Knights of Labor, was the Presidential nominee of the People's Party. The platform and resolutions called for more effective laws against contract labor, restriction of undesirable immigration, shorter hours, abolition of "the army of mercenaries, known as the Pinkerton system."

Weaver carried Colorado, Idaho, and Kansas, where the Democratic Party did not have a Presidential ticket. He also carried Nevada. He failed to win Nebraska by less than a hundred votes.

In Minnesota in 1892 Weaver received a fusion vote of 107,077, compared with Benjamin H. Harrison's vote of 122,823 and 100,920 for Grover Cleveland.

Weaver's total vote was 1,040,886, compared with 5,556,543 for the Democratic candidate, Grover Cleveland, and 5,175,582 for the Republican candidate, Benjamin Harrison. At a time when the population was half of what it is today, and no women were voting, the People's Party received over a million votes. That is equivalent to 5,000,000 today.

The same year Ignatius Donnelly ran on the People's Party ticket for Governor of Minnesota and polled 39,862 votes, against 109,220 for Knute Nelson, Republican, 94,600 for Daniel W. Lawler, Democrat, and 12,239 for William J. Dean, Prohibition Party. Haldar E. Boen was elected to Congress on the People's Party ticket. He represented the Seventh District for one term.

PEOPLE'S PARTY INFLUENCE ON DEMOCRATS

The Populist Party had an effect upon the tactics of the Democratic Party in 1896. In 1894 the Populists had again shown great strength in the congressional elections. They almost wiped out the Democrats in the West and Northwest, and once more that is the Farmer-Labor-Democrat situation in Minnesota today. In 1894 Sidney M. Owen, Populist candidate for Governor of Minnesota received 87,890 votes, compared with 53,584 for the Democratic candidate, George L. Becker, and 147,943 for the Republican candidate, Knute Nelson.

BRYAN DEMOCRACY

The Democratic platform of 1896, therefore, was formulated to appeal to the Populists. The income-tax law had been declared unconstitutional. The Democratic platform of 1896 proposed that Congress obtain a reversal of that decision. It protested the use of injunctions. The money planks included the famous declaration for free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the legal ratio of 16 to 1. The platform stated that Congress alone has the power to coin and issue money. It was opposed to the issuing of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace.

There were two factions at the People's Party convention of 1896—those opposed to fusion and those favoring. S. F. Norton was the outstanding Populist candidate for President at that convention. However, by a majority of 1,042 to 321, Bryan was endorsed over Norton. (Nathan Fine.) The People's Party in 1896 gave up its identity to support Bryan. The magnificent results of the campaign of 1892 were lost to America by fusion with the Democratic Party. Fusion means death. Let the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota and America heed this warning.

INDEPENDENT POPULISTS

In 1900 the antifusion faction of the Populist Party ran Wharton Barker, of Pennsylvania, for President, and Ignatius Donnelly, of Minnesota, for Vice President. These candidates received 50,599 votes. Two-fifths of the vote came from Texas.

The fusion faction again nominated Bryan; this time by acclamation.

A Presidential candidate, Thomas Watson, of Georgia, was filed on the People's Party—antifusion—ticket as late as 1908. In 1904 Watson received 114,546 votes nationally and 2,103 from Minnesota. In 1908 he received 29,146 votes nationally. William Jennings Bryan again ran for President that year on the Democratic ticket, and apparently Minnesota's Populists voted for Bryan.

IGNATIUS DONNELLY

No history of the Farmer-Labor Party is complete without mention of Ignatius Donnelly. To this scholar and statesman many Nonpartisan League and Farmer-Labor Party founders owed their inspiration.

Ignatius Donnelly was born in Philadelphia on November 3, 1831; was admitted to the bar in 1852 and practiced law in Philadelphia. In 1857 he moved to Minnesota, the year before Minnesota was admitted to the Union. He was a pioneer, settling in Nininger, Dakota County. He was the second Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota, serving two terms. From 1863 to 1869 he served three consecutive terms in Congress. He ran for Congress again in 1868 and 1870 but was defeated. He served in the State senate from 1874 to 1878. In 1876 he was temporary chairman of the convention of Greenbackers and Grangers, when Peter Cooper was nominated for President. In 1892 he ran for Governor of Minnesota as the People's Party candidate, and in 1900 he was Independent Populist candidate for Vice President. His home, on the banks of Minnesota at Nininger, about 1 mile from Hastings, was the mecca for progressive and liberal pilgrims from afar. The residence still stands, containing probably the most scholarly individual library in Minnesota. Attempts have been made to preserve the library by legislative action. This should be done. He died in Minneapolis on January 1, 1901 (Biographical Directory of Congress and Minnesota Legislative Manual, 1935).

The writings of Ignatius Donnelly in newspapers, magazines, and books educated and inspired the men and women who later built the Farmer-Labor Party.

JOHN LIND

Another outstanding Populist leader in Minnesota was John Lind, Member of Congress and Governor. The People's Party had polled a large vote in 1894. In 1896 John Lind ran as the Democratic-People's candidate for Governor of Minnesota, receiving 162,254 votes against 165,806 for David M. Clough, Republican, who was elected.

In 1898 John Lind again ran as Democratic-People's candidate, and won by a vote of 131,980 against 111,796 for William H. Eustis, Republican. The party continued to file Governor candidates through 1902.

John Lind was born in Kanna, Sweden, on March 25, 1854. He emigrated to the United States in 1867 with his parents. He was a teacher and a lawyer. He was at one time president of the University of Minnesota Board of Regents.

Lind was elected to Congress as a Republican representing the Second District from 1887 to 1893. He declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1892. He ran for Governor in 1896 as the Democratic-People's candidate but was defeated. He was elected as Democratic-People's candidate for Governor in 1898 and served from 1898 to 1900. In 1900 he was defeated by the Republican candidate, S. R. Van Sant, prominent member of the G. A. R.

In the Spanish-American War, Lind was first lieutenant and quartermaster in the Twelfth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry. In the same regiment Ernest Lundeen served as a private in Company B. Lind was again elected to Congress as a Democrat, serving from 1903 to 1905, representing the Fifth District. He declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1904. He continued the practice of law in Minneapolis, Minn., and died in that city on September 18, 1930.

SOCIALIST PARTY

The People's Party gave way to the Socialists. Socialists had combined with Greenbackers and with Henry George followers. Many of them supported the Populist Party. There have been Socialist or Socialist-Labor candidates, or both, in every Presidential election beginning with 1892. The outstanding leader of the Socialist Party was Eugene V. Debs, candidate for President in 1900, 1904, 1908, 1912, and 1920.

For Governor of Minnesota the Socialists put up W. B. Hammond in 1896. He received 1,125 votes. Hammond again ran in 1898, receiving 1,685 votes. In 1900 there was a Socialist-Democrat candidate for Governor, Thomas H. Lucas, who received 3,546 votes, and Edward Kris, Socialist-Labor candidate, received 886 votes. Jay E. Nash appeared as the Socialist candidate for Governor in 1902, polling 2,521 votes. Thomas Van Lear ran as Socialist-Labor candidate for Governor in 1902 and received 2,570 votes. In 1904 Nash ran as public-ownership candidate for Governor and received 5,810 votes; while A. W. M. Anderson ran as Socialist-Labor candidate and received 2,293 votes. Socialist, Socialist-Labor, Socialist-Democrat, Independent-Socialist, or Public Ownership candidates continued to file for Governor every year up to and including 1924, with the exception of 1922, when Magnus Johnson ran for Governor on the Farmer-Labor ticket. Since 1924 we have had no candidates for Governor on the Socialist ticket.

Socialist political activity was continuous from before 1850 until the World War, when there was a split in the ranks on the war question. The famous war declarations of the Socialist Party at St. Louis in April 1917 are printed in my speech of August 17, 1935, on page 13519 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Socialist Party platform of 1932 is also included in my speech of August 17.

EUGENE V. DEBS

Eugene V. Debs was a lecturer, writer, and labor organizer. In 1893 Debs organized in Chicago the American Railway Union. In 1894 the great Pullman strike was fought. Federal troops were used to crush the strike. Strikers were persecuted and charges of crime brought against them. Debs served 6 months in Woodstock jail for contempt of court.

At the same time he was being taken to Chicago each day under guard to be tried for other charges.

Debs was also a leader in the Great Northern strike of the American Railway Union. After his experiences as a leader in railroad-labor strikes Debs turned to politics to seek victory in his struggle for labor's rights. He was Socialist candidate for President in 1900, 1904, 1908, 1912, and 1920. Eugene V. Debs is regarded as the most outstanding Socialist leader America has produced. Norman Thomas is the Socialist Party leader at present. He ran for President in 1928 and 1932.

COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party did not offer candidates for Governor of Minnesota until 1928, when J. O. Bentall ran, receiving 5,760 votes. In 1930 Karl Reeve, Communist, ran for Governor and received 5,594 votes. In 1932 William Schneiderman received 4,807 votes on the Communist ticket for Governor, and in 1934 S. K. Davis polled 4,334 as the Communist Party's choice for Governor.

Communist (Workers') Party candidates for President began to appear in 1924 with William Z. Foster. Foster was again the party candidate in 1928 and 1932. Earl Browder is the 1936 Communist candidate for President.

William Z. Foster was born in Taunton, Mass., February 25, 1881. He went to work at the age of 10, after attending school for 3 years. He worked at a great variety of trades. He joined the Socialist Party in 1900 and was expelled in 1909 and joined the International Workers of the World. He was a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen.

Foster spent 13 months studying the European labor movement. In 1921 he went to Russia. He joined the Communist Party in the United States and became candidate for President in the first Communist election campaign in 1924. He was again candidate for President in 1928 and 1932. He has written many books.

Other Communist leaders are Earl Browder, secretary of the Communist Party, and Clarence Hathaway, editor of the Daily Worker.

PROGRESSIVE PARTY—BULL MOOSERS OF 1912

When Theodore Roosevelt left the Republican Party and ran for President as a Progressive in 1912 he carried Minnesota by 20,000 votes.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

The conscience of the people, in a time of grave national problems, has called into being a new party, born of the Nation's awakened sense of justice. We of the Progressive Party here dedicate ourselves to the fulfillment of the duty laid upon us by our fathers to maintain that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose foundations they laid.

We hold with Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln that the people are the masters of their Constitution, to fulfill its purposes and to safeguard it from those who, by perversion of its intent, would convert it into an instrument of injustice. In accordance with the needs of each generation the people must use their sovereign powers to establish and maintain equal opportunity and industrial justice, to secure which this Government was founded and without which no republic can endure.

This country belongs to the people who inhabit it. Its resources, its business, its institutions, and its laws should be utilized, maintained, or altered in whatever manner will best promote the general interest.

It is time to set the public welfare in the first place.

The old parties

Political parties exist to secure responsible government and to execute the will of the people.

From these great tasks both of the old parties have turned aside. Instead of instruments to promote the general welfare, they have become the tools of corrupt interests which use them impartially to serve their selfish purposes. Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government, owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people.

To destroy this invisible government, to dissolve the unholy alliance between corrupt business and corrupt politics is the first task of the statesmanship of the day.

The deliberate betrayal of its trust by the Republican Party, and the fatal incapacity of the Democratic Party to deal with the new issues of the new time, have compelled the people to forge a new instrument of government through which to give effect to their will in laws and institutions.

Unhampered by tradition, uncorrupted by power, undismayed by the magnitude of the task, the new party offers itself as the instrument of the people to sweep away old abuses, to build a new and nobler commonwealth.

A covenant with the people

This declaration is our covenant with the people, and we hereby bind the party and its candidates in State and Nation to the pledges made herein.

The rule of the people

The Progressive Party, committed to the principle of government by a self-controlled democracy expressing its will through representatives of the people, pledges itself to secure such alterations in the fundamental law of the several States and of the United States as shall insure the representative character of the Government.

In particular, the party declares for direct primaries for the nomination of State and National officers, for Nation-wide preferential primaries for candidates for the Presidency, for the direct election of United States Senators by the people; and we urge on the States the policy of the short ballot, with responsibility to the people secured by the initiative, referendum, and recall.

Amendment of Constitution

The Progressive Party, believing that a free people should have the power from time to time to amend their fundamental law so as to adapt it progressively to the changing needs of the people, pledges itself to provide a more easy and expeditious method of amending the Federal Constitution.

Nation and State

Up to the limit of the Constitution, and later by amendment of the Constitution, if found necessary, we advocate bringing under effective national jurisdiction those problems which have expanded beyond reach of the individual States.

It is as grotesque as it is intolerable that the several States should by unequal laws in matter of common concern become competing commercial agencies, barter the lives of their children, the health of their women, and the safety and well-being of their working people for the profit of their financial interests.

The extreme insistence on States' rights by the Democratic Party in the Baltimore platform demonstrates anew its inability to understand the world into which it has survived or to administer the affairs of a Union of States which have in all essential respects become one people.

Social and industrial justice

The supreme duty of the Nation is the conservation of human resources through an enlightened measure of social and industrial justice. We pledge ourselves to work unceasingly in State and Nation for:

Effective legislation looking to the prevention of industrial accidents, occupational diseases, overwork, involuntary unemployment, and other injurious effects incident to modern industry;

The fixing of minimum safety and health standards for the various occupations, and the exercise of the public authority of State and Nation, including the Federal control over interstate commerce and the taxing power, to maintain such standards;

The prohibition of child labor;

Minimum wage standards for working women, to provide a living scale in all industrial occupations;

The prohibition of night work for women and young persons;

One day's rest in seven for all wage workers;

The 8-hour day in continuous 24-hour industries;

The abolition of the convict contract labor system; substituting a system of prison production for governmental consumption only; and the application of prisoners' earnings to the support of their dependent families;

Publicity as to wages, hours, and conditions of labor; full reports upon industrial accidents and diseases; and the opening to public inspection of all tallies, weights, measures, and check systems on labor products;

Standards of compensation for death by industrial accident and injury and trade diseases which will transfer the burden of lost earnings from the families of working people to the industry, and thus to the community;

The protection of home life against the hazards of sickness, irregular employment, and old age, through the adoption of a system of social insurance adapted to American use;

The development of the creative labor power of America by lifting the last load of illiteracy from American youth and establishing continuation schools for industrial education under public control and encouraging agricultural education and demonstration in rural schools;

The establishment of industrial research laboratories to put the methods and discoveries of science at the service of American producers.

We favor the organization of the workers, men and women, as a means of protecting their interests and of promoting their progress.

Business

We believe that true popular government, justice, and prosperity go hand in hand, and, so believing, it is our purpose to secure that large measure of general prosperity which is the fruit of legitimate and honest business, fostered by equal justice and by sound progressive laws.

We demand that the test of true prosperity shall be the benefits conferred thereby on all the citizens not confined to individuals or classes and that the test of corporate efficiency shall be the ability better to serve the public; that those who profit by control of business affairs shall justify that profit and that control by sharing with the public the fruits thereof.

We therefore demand a strong national regulation of interstate corporations. The corporation is an essential part of modern business. The concentration of modern business, in some degree, is both inevitable and necessary for national and international business efficiency. But the existing concentration of vast wealth under a corporate system, unguarded and uncontrolled by the Nation, has placed in the hands of a few men enormous, secret, irresponsible power over the daily life of the citizen—a power insufferable in a free government and certain of abuse.

This power has been abused, in monopoly of national resources, in stock watering, in unfair competition and unfair privileges, and finally in sinister influences on the public agencies of State and Nation. We do not fear commercial power, but we insist that it shall be exercised openly, under publicity, supervision, and regulation of the most efficient sort, which will preserve its good while eradicating and preventing its evils.

To that end we urge the establishment of a strong Federal administrative commission of high standing, which shall maintain permanent active supervision over industrial corporations engaged in interstate commerce, or such of them as are of public importance, doing for them what the Government now does for the national banks, and what is now done for the railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Such a commission must enforce the complete publicity of those corporation transactions which are of public interest; must attack unfair competition, false capitalization, and special privilege, and by continuous trained watchfulness guard and keep open equally to all the highways of American commerce.

Thus the businessman will have certain knowledge of the law and will be able to conduct his business easily in conformity therewith; the investor will find security for his capital; dividends will be rendered more certain, and the savings of the people will be drawn naturally and safely into the channels of trade.

Under such a system of constructive regulation, legitimate business, freed from confusion, uncertainty, and fruitless litigation, will develop normally in response to the energy and enterprise of the American businessman.

Commercial development

The time has come when the Federal Government should cooperate with manufacturers and producers in extending our foreign commerce. To this end we demand adequate appropriations by Congress, and the appointment of diplomatic and consular officers solely with a view to their special fitness and worth, and not in consideration of political expediency.

It is imperative to the welfare of our people that we enlarge and extend our foreign commerce. We are preeminently fitted to do this because as a people we have developed high skill in the art of manufacturing; our businessmen are strong executives, strong organizers. In every way possible our Federal Government should cooperate in this important matter. Anyone who has had opportunity to study and observe first-hand Germany's course in this respect must realize that their policy of cooperation between Government and business has in comparatively few years made them a leading competitor for the commerce of the world. It should be remembered that they are doing this on a national scale and with large units of business, while the Democrats would have us believe that we should do it with small units of business, which would be controlled not by the National Government but by 49 conflicting sovereignties. Such a policy is utterly out of keeping with the progress of the times and gives our great commercial rivals in Europe—hungry for international markets—golden opportunities of which they are rapidly taking advantage.

Tariff

We believe in a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

Primarily the benefit of any tariff should be disclosed in the pay envelope of the laborer. We declare that no industry deserves protection which is unfair to labor or which is operating in violation of Federal law. We believe that the presumption is always in favor of the consuming public.

We demand tariff revision because the present tariff is unjust to the people of the United States. Fair dealing toward the people requires an immediate downward revision of those schedules wherein duties are shown to be unjust or excessive.

We pledge ourselves to the establishment of a nonpartisan scientific tariff commission, reporting both to the President and to either branch of Congress, which shall report, first, as to the costs of production, efficiency of labor, capitalization, industrial organization, and efficiency and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress; second, as to the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of government; and, third, as to the effect of the tariff on prices, operations of middlemen, and on the purchasing power of the consumer.

We believe that this commission should have plenary power to elicit information, and for this purpose to prescribe a uniform system of accounting for the great protected industries. The work of the commission should not prevent the immediate adoption of acts, reducing those schedules generally recognized as excessive.

We condemn the Payne-Aldrich bill as unjust to the people. The Republican organization is in the hands of those who have broken, and cannot again be trusted to keep, the promise of necessary downward revision. The Democratic Party is committed

to the destruction of the protective system through a tariff for revenue only—a policy which would inevitably produce widespread industrial and commercial disaster.

We demand the immediate repeal of the Canadian Reciprocity Act.

High cost of living

The high cost of living is due partly to world-wide and partly to local causes; partly to natural and partly to artificial causes. The measures proposed in this platform on various subjects such as the tariff, the trusts, and conservation will of themselves tend to remove the artificial causes.

There will remain other elements, such as the tendency to leave the country for the city, waste, extravagance, bad system of taxation, poor methods of raising crops, and bad business methods in marketing crops.

To remedy these conditions requires the fullest information and based on this information, effective Government supervision and control to remove all the artificial causes. We pledge ourselves to such full and immediate inquiry and to immediate action to deal with every need such inquiry discloses.

Currency

We believe there exists imperative need for prompt legislation for the improvement of our national currency system. We believe the present method of issuing notes through private agencies is harmful and unscientific.

The issue of currency is fundamentally a Government function and the system should have as basic principles soundness and elasticity. The control should be lodged with the Government and should be protected from domination or manipulation by Wall Street or any special interests.

We are opposed to the so-called Aldrich currency bill, because its provisions would place our currency and credit system in private hands, not subject to effective public control.

Conservation

The natural resources of the Nation must be promptly developed and generously used to supply the people's needs, but we cannot safely allow them to be wasted, exploited, monopolized, or controlled against the general good. We heartily favor the policy of conservation, and we pledge our party to protect the national forests without hindering their legitimate use for the benefit of all the people.

Agricultural lands in the national forests are, and should remain, open to the genuine settler. Conservation will not retard legitimate development. The honest settler must receive his patent promptly, without needless restrictions or delays.

We believe that the remaining forests, coal and oil lands, water powers, and other natural resources still in State or national control (except agricultural lands) are more likely to be wisely conserved and utilized for the general welfare if held in the public hands.

In order that consumers and producers, managers and workmen, now and hereafter, need not pay toll to private monopolies of power and raw material, we demand that such resources shall be retained by the State or Nation, and opened to immediate use under laws which will encourage development and make to the people a moderate return for benefits conferred.

In particular we pledge our party to require reasonable compensation to the public for water-power rights hereafter granted by the public.

We pledge legislation to lease the public grazing lands under equitable provisions now pending which will increase the production of food for the people and thoroughly safeguard the rights of the actual homemaker. Natural resources, whose conservation is necessary for the national welfare, should be owned or controlled by the Nation.

Waterways

The rivers of the United States are the natural arteries of this continent. We demand that they shall be opened to traffic as indispensable parts of a great Nation-wide system of transportation in which the Panama Canal will be the central link, thus enabling the whole interior of the United States to share with the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard in the benefit derived from the canal.

It is a national obligation to develop our rivers, and especially the Mississippi and its tributaries, without delay, under a comprehensive general plan covering each river system from its source to its mouth, designed to secure its highest usefulness for navigation, irrigation, domestic supply, water power, and the prevention of floods.

We pledge our party to the immediate preparation of such a plan, which should be made and carried out in close and friendly cooperation between the Nation, the States, and the cities affected.

Under such a plan, the destructive floods of the Mississippi and other streams, which represent a vast and needless loss to the Nation, would be controlled by forest conservation and water storage at the headwaters, and by levees below; land sufficient to support millions of people would be reclaimed from the deserts and the swamps, water power enough to transform the industrial standing of whole States would be developed, adequate water terminals would be provided, transportation by river would revive, and the railroads would be compelled to cooperate as freely with the boat lines as with each other.

The equipment, organization, and experience acquired in constructing the Panama Canal soon will be available for the Lakes-to-the-Gulf deep waterway and other portions of this great work.

and should be utilized by the Nation in cooperation with the various States, at the lowest net cost to the people.

Panama Canal

The Panama Canal, built and paid for by the American people, must be used primarily for their benefit.

We demand that the Canal shall be so operated as to break the transportation monopoly now held and misused by the trans-continental railroads by maintaining sea competition with them; that ships directly or indirectly owned or controlled by American railroad corporations shall not be permitted to use the Canal, and that American ships engaged in coastwise trade shall pay no tolls.

The Progressive Party will favor legislation having for its aim the development of friendship and commerce between the United States and Latin-American Nations.

Alaska

The coal and other natural resources of Alaska should be opened to development at once. They are owned by the people of the United States, and are safe from monopoly, waste, or destruction only while so owned.

We demand that they shall neither be sold nor given away, except under the homestead law, but while held in Government ownership shall be opened to use promptly upon liberal terms requiring immediate development.

Thus the benefit of cheap fuel will accrue to the Government of the United States and to the people of Alaska and the Pacific coast; the settlement of extensive agricultural lands will be hastened; the extermination of the salmon will be prevented, and the just and wise development of Alaskan resources will take the place of private extortion or monopoly.

We demand also that extortion or monopoly in transportation shall be prevented by the prompt acquisition, construction, or improvement by the Government of such railroads, harbor, and other facilities for transportation as the welfare of the people may demand.

We promise the people of the Territory of Alaska the same measure of local self-government that was given to other American Territories, and that Federal officials appointed there shall be qualified by previous bona-fide residence in the Territory.

Equal suffrage

The Progressive Party, believing that no people can justly claim to be a true democracy which denies political rights on account of sex, pledges itself to the task of securing equal suffrage to men and women alike.

Corrupt practices

We pledge our party to legislation that will compel strict limitation on all campaign contributions and expenditures, and detailed publicity of both before as well as after primaries and elections.

Publicity and public service

We pledge our party to legislation compelling the registration of lobbyists, publicity of committee hearings except on foreign affairs, and recording of all votes in committee; and forbidding Federal appointees from holding office in State or national political organizations, or taking part as officers or delegates in political conventions for the nomination of elective State or National officials.

The courts

The Progressive Party demands such restriction of the power of the courts as shall leave to the people the ultimate authority to determine fundamental questions of social welfare and public policy. To secure this end, it pledges itself to provide:

1. That when an act, passed under the police power of the State, is held unconstitutional under the State constitution, by the courts, the people, after an ample interval for deliberation, shall have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they desire the act to become a law, notwithstanding such decision.

2. That every decision of the highest appellate court of a State declaring an act of the legislature unconstitutional on the ground of its violation of the Federal Constitution shall be subject to the same review by the Supreme Court of the United States as is now accorded to decisions sustaining such legislation.

Administration of justice

The Progressive Party, in order to secure to the people a better administration of justice and by that means to bring about a more general respect for the law and the courts, pledges itself to work unceasingly for the reform of legal procedure and judicial methods.

We believe that the issuance of injunctions in cases arising out of labor disputes should be prohibited when such injunctions would not apply when no labor disputes existed.

We also believe that a person cited for contempt in labor disputes, except when such contempt was committed in the actual presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere with the proper administration of justice, should have a right to trial by jury.

Department of Labor

We pledge our party to establish a Department of Labor with a seat in the Cabinet, and with wide jurisdiction over matters affecting the conditions of labor and living.

Country life

The development and prosperity of country life are as important to the people who live in the cities as they are to the farmers. Increase of prosperity on the farm will favorably affect the cost of living and promote the interests of all who dwell in the country.

and all who depend upon its products for clothing, shelter, and food.

We pledge our party to foster the development of agricultural credit and cooperation, the teaching of agriculture in schools, agricultural college extension, the use of mechanical power on the farm, and to reestablish the Country Life Commission, thus directly promoting the welfare of the farmers, and bringing the benefits of better farming, better business, and better living within their reach.

Health

We favor the union of all the existing agencies of the Federal Government dealing with the public health into a single national health service without discrimination against or for any one set of therapeutic methods, school of medicine, or school of healing with such additional powers as may be necessary to enable it to perform efficiently such duties in the protection of the public from preventable diseases as may be properly undertaken by the Federal authorities; including the executing of existing laws regarding pure food; quarantine and cognate subjects; the promotion of appropriate action for the improvement of vital statistics and the extension of the registration area of such statistics, and cooperation with the health activities of the various States and cities of the Nation.

Patents

We pledge ourselves to the enactment of a patent law which will make it impossible for patents to be suppressed or used against the public welfare in the interests of injurious monopolies.

Interstate Commerce Commission

We pledge our party to secure to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to value the physical property of railroads. In order that the power of the Commission to protect the people may not be impaired or destroyed, we demand the abolition of the Commerce Court.

Good roads

We recognize the vital importance of good roads and we pledge our party to foster their extension in every proper way, and we favor the early construction of national highways. We also favor the extension of the rural free delivery service.

Inheritance and income tax

We believe in a graduated inheritance tax as a national means of equalizing the obligations of holders of property to government, and we hereby pledge our party to enact such a Federal law as will tax large inheritances, returning to the States an equitable percentage of all amounts collected.

We favor the ratification of the pending amendment to the Constitution giving the Government power to levy an income tax.

Peace and national defense

The Progressive Party deplores the survival in our civilization of the barbaric system of warfare among nations with its enormous waste of resources even in time of peace, and the consequent impoverishment of the life of the toiling masses. We pledge the party to use its best endeavors to substitute judicial and other peaceful means of settling international differences.

We favor an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces. Pending such an agreement, and as the best means of preserving peace, we pledge ourselves to maintain for the present the policy of building two battleships a year.

Treaty rights

We pledge our party to protect the rights of American citizenship at home and abroad. No treaty should receive the sanction of our Government which discriminates between American citizens because of birthplace, race, or religion, or that does not recognize the absolute right of expatriation.

The immigrant

Through the establishment of industrial standards we propose to secure to the able-bodied immigrant and to his native fellow workers a larger share of American opportunity.

We denounce the fatal policy of indifference and neglect which has left our enormous immigrant population to become the prey of chance and cupidity.

We favor governmental action to encourage the distribution of immigrants away from the congested cities, to rigidly supervise all private agencies dealing with them and to promote their assimilation, education, and advancement.

Pensions

We pledge ourselves to a wise and just policy of pensioning American soldiers and sailors and their widows and children by the Federal Government. And we approve the policy of the Southern States in granting pensions to the ex-Confederate soldiers and sailors and their widows and children.

Parcels post

We pledge our party to the immediate creation of a parcels post, with rates proportionate to distance and service.

Civil service

We condemn the violations of the civil service law under the present administration, including the coercion and assessment of subordinate employees and the President's refusal to punish such violation after a finding of guilty by his own commission; his distribution of patronage among subservient Congressmen, while withholding it from those who refuse support of administration measures; his withdrawal of nominations from the Senate until

political support for himself was secured, and his open use of the offices to reward those who voted for his renomination.

To eradicate these abuses, we demand not only the enforcement of the Civil Service Act in letter and spirit, but also legislation which will bring under the competitive system postmasters, collectors, marshals, and all other nonpolitical officers, as well as the enactment of an equitable retirement law, and we also insist upon continuous service during good behavior and efficiency.

Government business organization

We pledge our party to readjustment of the business methods of the National Government and a proper coordination of the Federal bureaus, which will increase the economy and efficiency of the Government service, prevent duplications, and secure better results to the taxpayers for every dollar expended.

Government supervision over investments

The people of the United States are swindled out of many millions of dollars every year, through worthless investments. The plain people, the wage earner, and the men and women with small savings, have no way of knowing the merit of concerns sending out highly colored prospectuses offering stock for sale, prospectuses that make big returns seem certain and fortunes easily within grasp.

We hold it to be the duty of the Government to protect its people from this kind of piracy. We, therefore, demand wise, carefully thought-out legislation that will give us such governmental supervision over this matter as will furnish to the people of the United States this much-needed protection, and we pledge ourselves thereto.

Conclusion

On these principles and on the recognized desirability of uniting the progressive forces of the Nation into an organization which shall unequivocally represent the progressive spirit and policy we appeal for the support of all American citizens, without regard to previous political affiliations.

The Progressives rallied their strength around one man. When he left the Progressive Party and returned to the Republican fold the Bull Moose movement faded.

In 1912 P. V. Collins, Progressive candidate for Governor of Minnesota, polled 33,455 votes.

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE PLATFORM

Before the war had disrupted the Socialist Party the Nonpartisan League had been launched in North Dakota. The purpose of the Nonpartisan League was to fight against the evils of a situation where "the farmer raised a bushel and got paid for a peck; the consumer received a peck and paid for a bushel." It was a farmers' organization.

The program of the Nonpartisan League included the following demands (p. 60, H. E. Gaston, on The Nonpartisan League):

State ownership of terminal elevators, flour mills, packing houses, and cold-storage plants.

State inspection of grain and grain dockage.

Exemption of farm improvements from taxation.

State hail insurance on the acreage tax basis.

Rural credit banks operated at cost.

These planks had for years been the accepted program of farm cooperative leaders.

An economic crisis faced the farmers of North Dakota. Financial manipulations had been carried on by bankers, speculators, and farm-machinery manufacturers. An unfair system of grading grain cheated the farmers out of prices due them for their products.

COOPERATION AMONG FARMERS

North Dakota was fertile soil for the Nonpartisan League. No layers of social strata had been laid down. It was the home of traditional Americanism, with its respect for courage, honesty, and ability, and its disregard for claims of wealth or achievement of past generations. Cooperation was a common practice; North Dakota was a State of neighborliness, though the neighbors sometimes lived 25 to 50 miles apart. There were cooperative country elevators and country stores. The farmer through these learned the economic value of cooperation. When moneyed interests controlling railroads, grain elevators, and banks bore down upon North Dakota farmers, they used teamwork. They organized.

The Nonpartisan League was formed in February 1915 by A. C. Townley in conference with Howard Wood at Wood's home in Bismarck, N. Dak. Immediately Wood and Townley started recruiting members. At first dues were \$2.50 a year, then \$6, then \$9, and finally \$16 every 2 years and \$100 for life memberships. Offices were opened at Minot, N. Dak.

The League swept North Dakota like a prairie fire. By fall there were 26,000 members. It achieved remarkable political success in the very first election and passed a number of progressive laws. The official paper, the Nonpartisan Leader, was established in St. Paul in 1915.

NONPARTISAN LEADER

The Nonpartisan Leader made its appearance on September 23, 1915. It included cartoons by John Baer, North Dakota artist and later Congressman. The paper was edited by Charles Edward Russell. The first issue stated very clearly the purpose of the Nonpartisan League:

This journal belongs to the farmers of the Northwest. It is founded by them to voice their protest against unjust and unrighteous conditions—to voice that protest and make it count.

The farming class does the hardest work and gets proportionately the smallest return.

This is the result of conditions that will never be changed or bettered until farmers, organized for their own protection, will make their power and numbers felt at the polls and in government.

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE OPPOSED TO A NEW PARTY

That is why the Farmers' Nonpartisan Organization League came into being. It has no idea of starting a new party; it seeks only to secure union and organized effort that the farmers may secure their just share of representation in the affairs of government.

SUCCESS IN FIRST NORTH DAKOTA ELECTION

In the first election after formation of the Nonpartisan League the Nonpartisan candidate for Governor, LYNN J. FRAZIER won by a vote exceeding the total for all three of his opponents. The Nonpartisan League elected 81 out of 113 members of the State house of representatives and 18 of the 25 State senators. League candidates for the Supreme Court were elected by pluralities ranging from 10,000 to 40,000. All State officers were elected. The Nonpartisan League was endorsed and assisted by the North Dakota State Federation of Labor (p. 44, Biennial Report Railway Brotherhoods' State Legislative Board, Minn., 1917).

A year later John M. Baer, cartoonist for the Nonpartisan Leader, was sent to Congress to fill out the unexpired term of Henry T. Helgesen. In 1918 the primaries were captured again and a majority of the members of the State legislature were elected and three Congressmen, John Baer, James H. Sinclair, and George Young, were sent to Washington by the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota.

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE ENTERS MINNESOTA

After the first remarkable success in North Dakota Nonpartisan League leaders crossed the border determined to set up a similar organization in Minnesota. In July 1916 the Nonpartisan League sent organizers into Minnesota, South Dakota, and Montana. By January 1917 national headquarters had been opened in St. Paul.

By the summer of 1917 the Nonpartisan League was powerful enough in Minnesota to draw the vicious attacks of powerful financial interests.

Prominent financial and commercial interests in Minneapolis formed secret organizations to fight the Nonpartisan League. Two magazines were published, *On the Square* and the *Pan-American Anti-Socialist*. Individuals back of these anti-Nonpartisan League campaigns seldom made their identity known. The pro-German cry waxed strong, and anti-Nonpartisan League propaganda grew more bitter as the primary elections of 1918 approached.

A large paper-bound book was published by prominent citizens of Minnesota enumerating various leaders and casting bitter aspersions against them. That book was distributed by the hundreds of thousands over the State of Minnesota at an enormous expenditure of funds. Another book was published by Nonpartisan League supporters listing atrocities of persecution committed by the opposition.

I have already mentioned the great vote received by Nonpartisan League candidates on the Republican ticket in the spring of 1918 and on the Farmer-Labor ticket in the fall.

WORKING PEOPLE'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE FORMED

After the 1918 fall election the question presented itself: Shall the Farmer-Labor Party continue? There was some dispute on that point. One faction of the campaign committee favored reporting to the State Federation of Labor

and then disbanding. The next convention of the State Federation of Labor was at New Ulm, Minn., in 1919, and the suggestion that the Farmer-Labor campaign committee disband was defeated. Instead the convention voted to set up a nonpartisan league for labor in the cities similar to the Farmers' Nonpartisan League. The result was the formation of the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League, formed in 1919, as a complementary force to the farmers' organization.

1920 FARMER-LABOR CANDIDATES STILL FLIRT WITH OLD PARTIES

In 1920 there was a dual convention in St. Paul. The Farmers' Nonpartisan League met in one room and the Working People's Nonpartisan League met in another room. They agreed upon a slate of candidates, but the majority again seemed to favor breaking in on the Republican primaries instead of putting up a Farmer-Labor ticket. Henrik Shipstead was endorsed for Governor after a discussion during which James Manahan was also considered. Shipstead was friendly to the League. He had been in charge of the public-safety committee in his county. His house was said to have been painted yellow during the war.

FARMER-LABOR PARTY KEPT ALIVE

The election of 1918 gave the Farmer-Labor Party official standing and in order to keep that standing it was necessary to file candidates for the next election.

One faction felt very strongly that it was important to have candidates on the Farmer-Labor ticket in order to keep the party alive. Fred A. Pike, William Lemke, and William Mahoney were of that opinion. They decided to file Cyrus King for Governor and Lily Anderson for secretary of state on the Farmer-Labor ticket. Shipstead filed as a Republican and King as Farmer-Labor in the primary of 1920.

KEEPING THE FARMER-LABOR NAME ALIVE

Neither Farmer-Labor candidate had any opposition in the primary, and therefore both were slated to appear on the Farmer-Labor ticket in the fall. However, those who urged King to file in the primary had no intention of opposing Shipstead but only wanted to keep the Farmer-Labor name alive. Therefore, King withdrew after the primary, and Shipstead, after being defeated in the Republican primaries, filed as an Independent in the fall. It was again necessary to secure signatures of 2,000 voters on a petition before Shipstead could file.

The same procedure was followed for other State and congressional offices. In the Fifth District, however, Lynn Thompson, who filed on the Farmer-Labor ticket for Congress in the same manner as Cyrus King filed for Governor, refused to withdraw, although the Independent candidate, Ernest Lundein, had polled the largest vote of any labor-endorsed candidate in the Fifth District primary. This divided the Fifth District labor vote in the fall.

The vote for Governor in the Republican primary gave Shipstead 125,861, against 133,832 for J. A. O. Preus.

The vote for Shipstead in the fall election, as an Independent, was 281,402, against 415,802 for J. A. O. Preus, Republican, and 81,293 for L. C. Hodgson, Democrat.

The Farmer-Labor candidates for secretary of state, Lily Anderson; for treasurer, John P. Wagner, and for railroad and warehouse commissioner, Emil C. MacKenzie were kept on the ticket to keep the Farmer-Labor name alive.

Lily Anderson, Farmer-Labor candidate for secretary of state, received 193,658 votes against Mike Holm's 434,130. Her name was placed on the ticket merely to keep the Farmer-Labor name alive. No campaign was conducted for her.

There were also congressional candidates backed by the Nonpartisan League in the 1920 Republican primaries and as Independents in the fall elections. Julius J. Reiter in the First, Ernest Lundein in the Fifth District, Charles A. Lindbergh in the Sixth, O. J. Kvale in the Seventh, and William L. Cars in the Eighth ran Farmer-Labor endorsed as Independents in the fall of 1920. William L. Cars, locomotive engineer of the Eighth Congressional District, was almost elected, having a vote in the fall of 32,395 against his opponent, Oscar J. Larson, who polled 33,428.

WORKING PEOPLE'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE CONVENTION

The second annual convention of the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League of Minnesota was held at the armory, Rochester, Minn., Sunday afternoon and evening, July 18, 1920. The headquarters of the league were at rooms 301-303, Daily Star Building, 427 Sixth Avenue South, Minneapolis. Officers were William Mahoney, president; Thomas Van Lear, secretary-treasurer. The executive board was composed of William Mahoney, J. A. Watkins, E. G. Whitney, C. Z. Nelson, Louis Frank, and A. E. Smith.

In the 12 months previous to the second convention 300 unions in Minnesota became affiliated with the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League. This represented a membership of over 45,000 union people. This organization had made its strength felt in the streetcar strike of 1919. The league threw its strength against the street-railway company, with the result that the company was defeated in Minneapolis. Although the Nonpartisan League candidates on the State ticket were not victorious in the spring of 1920, there had been victories in many legislative districts. In fact, when the fall election was over the Minnesota Leader claimed Nonpartisan League victories in 46 legislative districts.

The program of the Working People's Nonpartisan League, a forerunner of the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota, is set forth in the league's constitution, bylaws, rules, and political and legislative program, contained in the proceedings of its second annual convention:

WORKING PEOPLE'S NONPARTISAN POLITICAL LEAGUE PROGRAM

Constitution, bylaws, and rules

Section 1

Rule 1. The name shall be the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League of Minnesota. No member of the governing committees of the league shall be affiliated with any political party.

Rule 2. The purpose of this organization shall be to unite members of organized and unorganized labor into a political league, together with those in sympathy with the interests of the common people, in order that representatives may be elected to public office who will enact, interpret, and enforce laws that will serve the general welfare in accordance with the platform adopted by this body.

Rule 3. The membership of this league shall be made up as follows: All local unions and brotherhood organizations in the State of Minnesota who agree to affiliate and pay in advance an affiliation fee equal to 25 cents per member per year; all trades and labor assemblies and union central bodies, including city and county central committees, of the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League, who pay an affiliation fee of \$3 per year, and all city, ward, or district locals whose membership pay an individual membership fee of \$3 each into the State treasury of the league.

Section 2. Conventions

Rule 1. The regular convention of this organization shall be held biennially to endorse or select candidates for political office and arrange for campaigns.

Rule 2. Special meetings may be called by the president or a majority of the State executive board to be held at the time and place of meeting of the State federation of labor to adopt rules and laws and a constitution, elect officers, and such other business as may legally come before the convention.

Section 3. Representation at conventions

Rule 1. Each local union affiliated shall be entitled to 1 delegate for the union and 1 additional delegate for each 100 additional members, but no union shall have more than 3 delegates.

Rule 2. Each ward or district local of the league with not less than 10 members shall be allowed 1 delegate and 1 additional delegate for each additional 100 members, but no local shall have more than 3 delegates.

Rule 3. All central bodies composed of delegates from local bodies and affiliated with this league shall be entitled to one delegate.

Section 4. Government

Rule 1. This league shall select at each convention a general committee composed of one member from each city represented in the convention and selected by the delegates of said city at the convention to advise and assist the State executive committee.

Rule 2. There shall be elected at the annual special convention of this league a State chairman, a vice chairman, a State secretary-treasurer, and five other members, who shall compose the State executive board. The members of this board shall hold office between annual conferences. This board shall have charge of the educational and organization work and shall have care of the finances. (If possible, the members of this board should be residents of the Twin Cities for reason of convenience and economy.)

Rule 3. The executive board may appoint a county organizer for any county, who shall have supervision over the political work in

said county and shall cooperate with the members of the general committee in cities and towns in the county.

Rule 4. Each county, city, or town shall have charge of its local campaign, subject only to the advice of the State executive board and the rules laid down by the convention.

Rule 5. Candidates desiring to secure the endorsement of the league or any of its affiliated bodies must first sign, in presence of witnesses, and agree to support publicly the legislative program of the league as adopted by the convention, copies of which will be furnished by the State secretary to local bodies and committees of same to present to candidates.

Rule 6. Any matter appealed from the executive board shall be submitted to a referendum of the general membership of the unions upon the request of 10 unions of three or more different cities.

Rule 7. The funds of the league shall be derived from an enrollment fee of 25 cents per capita tax per year from each local union, an enrollment fee of \$3 per year from each central body or league local, and an individual membership fee of \$3 per member per year for each individual league member of a league local.

Rule 8. Any political league local organized with 10 or more members may secure half of the individual membership fee by applying for same to the State secretary-treasurer, provided they stand all the organizing expenses of their local.

Rule 9. There may be organized, under the authority and jurisdiction of this league, local organizations in each town, each city, or each ward, made up of both union and nonunion men and women. When there is more than one ward local in a city or more than one union in a city, each union and each ward league local may elect delegates (not more than three from each organization) and form a city central political committee, same to have charge of all local political campaigns, subject to the State executive board.

Rule 10. These rules may be amended at any annual convention of the organization called for that purpose, or by a referendum vote when demanded by 10 locals in three or more different towns.

Political and legislative program

1. The unqualified right of workers to organize and to deal collectively with employers through such representatives of their unions as they choose, to be recognized and enforced by appropriate legislative enactments.

2. A maximum 8-hour day, of 44 hours a week, with 1 full day's rest in 7, in all branches of industry, with minimum rates of pay which, without the labor of mothers and children, will maintain the worker and his family in health and comfort and provide a competence for old age, with ample provision for recreation and good citizenship.

3. A workman's compensation plan, administered by the State, that will bring to injured workmen, their families and dependents, sure, certain, and full relief, regardless of question or fault, and to the exclusion of every other remedy, without recourse to the courts.

4. Abolition of unemployment by the creation of opportunity for steady work at standard wages by the stabilization of industry through the establishment and operation, during periods of depression, of Government work on housing, road building, reforestation, reclamation of cut-over and swamp lands, and development of water-power plants.

5. Public ownership and operation of railways, steamships, banking business, stockyards, packing plants, grain elevators, terminal markets, telegraphs, telephones, and all other public utilities; and the nationalization and development of basic natural resources, water power, and unused land, with the repatriation of large holdings, to the end that soldiers and sailors and dislocated workers may find an opportunity for an independent livelihood.

6. Reduction of the cost of living to a just level immediately by Government restriction and supervision and as a permanent policy by fostering the development of cooperation, which will eliminate wasteful methods, parasitical middlemen, and all profiteering in the creation and distribution of the products of industry and agriculture, in order that the actual producers may enjoy the fruits of their toil.

7. Revenue for the payment of public debts and for the expenses of Government shall be obtained mainly from taxes on incomes and inheritances and from a system of land-value taxation which will stimulate rather than retard production.

8. Continuation of soldiers' and sailors' insurance; extension of such life insurance by the Government without profit to all men and women; and the establishment of governmental insurance against industrial and other accidents, illness, unemployment, and old age, and upon all insurable forms of property; establishment of a definite fund to provide adequate pensions for indigent mothers.

9. Complete equality of men and women in Government and in industry, with the fullest enfranchisement of women, and equal pay for men and women doing similar work.

10. That the autocratic domination of the sources of wealth, production, and distribution by selfish private interests which has proved to be the prolific sources of class antagonisms and the prime cause of industrial paralysis and consequent idleness and poverty among the masses shall be gradually superseded by a process of governmental supervision, which shall ultimately put those who work by hand and brain in control of industry and commerce for the benefit of all the people.

11. Cooperation with the National Government in the establishment of a department of education coordinate with other branches of the Federal Government, in order that a uniform and effective

educational system may be developed in which every child will be guaranteed a thorough cultural and industrial education and the academic freedom and economic independence of the teachers will be secured.

12. As the freedom of speech, of the press, and of assemblage are the surest safeguards against tyranny, revolution, and reaction, and a guarantee of the orderly development of industry and the peaceful progress of society, we demand the immediate and complete restoration of these fundamental political rights, with adequate security against their abridgment or infringement by any person or persons whatsoever.

1922 FARMER-LABOR PARTY BURNS ITS BRIDGES

In 1922 the Working People's Nonpartisan League met in one hall and the Farmers Nonpartisan League met in another hall at the Star Building, Minneapolis. The Working People's group seemed to favor sticking with the Farmer-Labor Party, while the farmers, lead by Townley, thought it best to file again on the Republican ticket in the primary. For 2 days the two factions were deadlocked.

FIRST REAL FARMER-LABOR BATTLE IN MINNESOTA

Finally a committee of the two conventions agreed to put up a Farmer-Labor slate in the primary, and the following candidates were placed on the ticket. This was the first time that the city and country Nonpartisan League groups had struck out boldly for a new party of their own in the primary. There was even a primary contest in one congressional district. Knud Wefald defeated James S. Barnett by a vote of 4,532 to 4,144 in the Ninth Congressional District.

SHIPSTEAD ELECTED FARMER-LABOR UNITED STATES SENATOR

The year 1922 was a turning point in Farmer-Labor history. Henrik Shipstead was elected Senator on the Farmer-Labor ticket by a vote of 325,372 against Frank B. Kellogg's 241,833. Senator Bob La Follette, Sr., and the railroad brotherhoods came to Minnesota fighting for SHIPSTEAD and the Farmer-Labor Party.

Magnus Johnson came within 15,000 votes of being the first Farmer-Labor Governor. Other State candidates made a fine showing.

Farmer-Labor candidates, or candidates endorsed by the Farmer-Labor Party supporters, were filed in almost every district. In the seventh district O. J. Kvale, Independent, defeated Volstead, Republican incumbent, by a vote of 42,832 to 28,918. In the Ninth District Knud Wefald, Farmer-Labor, defeated Halvor Steenerson by a vote of 35,551 to 27,590.

1923 SPECIAL ELECTION

In 1923, Knute Nelson, Republican Senator from Minnesota, died in office and a special senatorial election was held. In the special election there were three Farmer-Labor candidates. Magnus Johnson won with 57,570 votes. The final senatorial election in the fall of 1923 was another victory for the Farmer-Labor Party. Magnus Johnson won with 290,165 votes against 195,319 for the Republican candidate, Gov. J. A. O. Preus.

FARMER-LABOR FEDERATION FORMED

Between the time of the special senatorial primary and the final senatorial election in the fall a State-wide conference was called of the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League and the Farmers' National Nonpartisan League. The conference was held in Minneapolis, September 7 and 8, 1923, and I had the pleasure of attending and addressing the conference in favor of a permanent National and State Farmer-Labor Party. It had for a long time been felt that the two organizations should merge. The result of the State-wide conference in 1923 was the formation of the Farmer-Labor Federation of Minnesota.

The chairman of the State executive committee of the Farmer-Labor Party, Mr. A. C. Welch, of Glencoe, Minn., acted as chairman for the conference. Ralph Harmon was secretary of the State executive committee. The call for the conference had been sent out by Henry G. Teigen, secretary of the Farmers' National Nonpartisan League, and William Mahoney, president of the Working People's Nonpartisan League.

The solid farm and labor foundation of the Farmer-Labor Federation was clearly shown by the list of delegates who attended. Each one represented a labor or farm organiza-

tion. They were not there as individuals but as representatives of labor unions, farm cooperatives, or affiliated organizations.

LIST OF DELEGATES, 1923 FARMER-LABOR CONFERENCE

Duluth

Carpenters No. 1284—Charles Olson.
 B. of L. E. No. 395—C. F. Lang.
 B. of L. F. and E. No. 519—P. F. DeMore.
 Duluth Central Political Committee—J. W. Jollymore.
 National Federation of P. O. Clerks No. 142—Henry Morin.
 B. of R. T. No. 569—G. O. Lockhart.
 Farmer-Labor Party of Hibbing—Oscar Widstrand.
 Farmer-Labor Party of Dakota County—R. L. Harmon.
 Farmer-Labor Party of McCloud County—Joseph L. Baldus.
 B. of L. F. and E. No. 539—J. J. Koshunski.
 B. R. T. No. 529—H. W. Dart, J. L. Peterson.
 Benton County Farmer-Labor Party—J. Ross.
 Farmer-Labor Party, Third Congressional District—J. B. Lokkesmoe.
 Ladies' Auxiliary of B. R. T., Two Harbors, No. 530—Ellen Halden.
 Farmer-Labor Party of Virginia, Minn.—F. Pettinelli.
 I. A. M. Winona, No. 133—Louis Luetje.
 Carpenters No. 2325, Willmar—Anton Peterson.
 Firemen and Oilers No. 29—S. M. Harrington, Duluth.
 Federated Trades Assembly—Elling Munkeby, Duluth.
 Duluth Central Political Committee—A. A. Ziegler, J. W. Jollymore.
 Machinist Lodge No. 274—Walter C. Emerson.
 Cabinet Makers No. 1284—Charles Olson.
 Painters No. 106—Joel Lichten.

Austin

Central Labor Union—J. F. Placek.
 Farmer-Labor Party, Mower County—J. F. Kennedy.
 Carpenters' Union No. 1486—J. E. Lugg.
 B. of R. T., Cedar River Lodge No. 283—H. S. Voorhees.

Glenwood

B. of L. Engineers' Legislative Board—W. W. Royster.

Rochester

Trades and Labor Assembly—Fred R. Wetzke.
 Carpenters No. 980—E. A. Callahan.
 Building Laborers No. 405—John S. Reed.
 Bricklayers of Rochester No. 8—W. H. Newcome.
 Teamsters No. 195—A. G. Van Gensert.

Crookston

B. of L. F. and E. No. 483—Geo. A. Voytilla.
 B. of F. & L. E. No. 842—Hans C. Nelson.
 Farmer-Labor Party of Polk County—Jules J. Anderson.
 Farmer-Labor Party, Meeker County—Gust C. Carlson, H. S. Johnson.
 Ladies' Auxiliary of the B. of R. T. No. 592—Jessie Matson.
 Carpenters' Union No. 1486—J. E. Lugg.
 Maintenance and Way No. 364—M. N. Grondahl.
 Cigar Makers No. 331—J. C. Pratt.
 (N. P. L.): R. T. Buckler.

Spooner

Farmer-Labor Party—Gustave Erickson, Arthur Tannem.

Two Harbors

B. of R. T. No. 339.

Thief River Falls

Firemen and Enginemen No. 103—Arthur M. Johnson.

St. James

Farmer-Labor Party—O. E. McCue.

Wheaton

Traverse County Nonpartisan League—J. A. Norsen, T. Heggen, Ernest G. Gross, Joe Deal, M. A. Hanson.

Winona

Machinist Lodge No. 133—Louis Luetje.
 Steam Engineers No. 669—A. J. McCraidy.

Willmar

Kandiyohi County Nonpartisan League—V. E. Lawson, J. W. Jonk, W. J. DeVries, W. S. Hallberg, R. C. Sletten.
 Kandiyohi Farmer-Labor Party—H. S. Nelson, C. O. Bergquist.
 Carpenters No. 2325—Anton Peterson.

Chisholm

Farmer-Labor Party—Joseph Grame, Joseph Vodovnik.

New York Mills

People's Voice Publishing Co. Co-operative Association—Yalmer Karvonen, E. Heikkinen.

Glencoe

Glencoe Farmer-Labor Party—Henry Luehrs, Glencoe.
 (N. P. L.):

Mrs. Ben Harpel—Glencoe.

W. P. Meyer—Glencoe.

Proctor

B. of R. T. No. 529—H. W. Hart, J. L. Peterson.
 B. of L. F. & E. No. 539—J. J. Koshinski.

St. Paul

Cement Finishers No. 560.

F. L. Peretz Branch No. 573—Morris Lotzer.

B. of R. T. No. 122—J. Kennedy.
 Workmen's Circle, Branch No. 266—Max Flashman.
 Furriers No. 52—Chas. Mulkenbur.
 Second Ward Local—John Devine.
 House Wives Union No. 1—C. S. Brons.
 Coopers No. 1—J. C. Prochaska.
 B. of L. F. and E. Legislative Board—F. E. Tillquist.
 Men Teachers' Federation—P. A. McMillan.
 R. R. Clerks No. 593—A. R. Lewis, L. R. Danials, P. T. Karschina.
 Bakers No. 21—J. E. Dusterhoff.
 R. R. Clerks No. 1504—Geo. McMann.
 Bricklayers' Union No. 1—Henry Kelting.
 Milk Wagon Drivers No. 54—Frank T. Starkey, Job Allen, Frank Rose.
 B. of R. T. No. 122, St. Paul—J. Kennedy.
 Bohemian Marxian Federation—John Lenicek.
 Typographical Union No. 30—L. T. Ariund, J. E. Corcoran, John Klaus.
 Carpenters No. 87—Gus Almquist, C. R. Carlgren, Otto J. Waller.
 Machinist Lodge No. 112—Fred Mortenson, A. E. Smith, Anton Brost.
 Steam Fitters No. 455—J. L. Cowden, E. D. McKinnon, J. J. Foley.
 Building Laborers No. 132—H. E. Bolty, Robert Rykman, J. C. Johnson.
 R. R. Carmen No. 764—J. P. Rains.
 Switchmen No. 206—W. H. Watkins; alternate, Wm. Deming.
 Blacksmiths No. 43—F. H. Welbel, Frank Kratochovil.
 Machinist District Lodge No. 77—O. R. Votaw.
 Sixth Ward Local—Chas. Isaacson.
 Hat and Cap Makers No. 10—I. Feingold, Louis Levi.
 Molders No. 232—John Murray.
 Firemen and Oilers No. 48—Hans Svendsen.
 Machinist Lodge No. 459—C. A. Hathaway, J. F. Emme.
 Pressmen No. 29—Wm. Mahoney, Frank Pampusch.
 Fifth Ward Local—Chas. Hauserer.
 Painters No. 61—M. R. Smith, A. B. Krenkel, Gilbert Clark.
 Twin City Carpenters' District Council—L. A. Roseland.
 Boilermakers No. 3—Edward Walch, W. A. Parranto.
 Electrical Workers' District Council—C. J. McGloggan.
 R. R. Electrical Workers No. 902—R. H. Woods, Frank Getz.
 R. R. Carmen District Council—S. L. Gipple.
 Iron Workers No. 94—T. M. Torgerson, Wm. O'Connell.
 Electrical Workers No. 110—Tom Jackson, O. L. Johnson, H. P. Adams.
 Twelfth Ward Local—L. B. Krengel.
 German-American Progressive Club—Arthur Schaub.
 Cigar Makers No. 98—Geo. Noltz.
 Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Association—Frank Nodes.
 Workmen's Circle No. 573—Morris Lotzer.
 Workmen's Circle Branch No. 266—Max Flushman.
 Twin City Joint Board of Amalgamated Clothing Workers—Sander D. Genis.
 Amalgamated Clothing Workers No. 155—Emily Pabst, Christiana Closter, Mary Baucher.
 Amalgamated Clothing Workers, No. 160—Sam Rubenstein, Albert Breming.
 B. of R. T. Women's Auxiliary No. 32—Mrs. Prudence Murray.
 Amalgamated Clothing Workers No. 166—Chas. C. Kramer, S. Eilson.
 Railroad Shop Craft Legislative Committee—O. H. Wangerin.
 Amalgamated Clothing Workers No. 179—Jacob Herson, J. Ramsey.
 Garment Workers No. 171—Miss Alice Quayle, Miss F. Frubette.
 Czechoslovak Workingmen's Gymnastic Association—Joe Kocour.

Minneapolis

Carpenters No. 7—J. O. Johnson, T. Kellstad, E. J. Leidstrom.
 Building Laborers No. 111—Attle Sjostrom, Chas. Carlson, Alfred Gordon.
 Meden Women's Auxiliary, Workman's Circle—Mrs. D. Shier.
 Jewish National Workers' Alliance, Brener Branch No. 75—Harry Arial.
 Third Ward Local, W. P. N. P. P. L.—Fred A. Harding.
 Eleventh Ward W. P. P. League—P. M. White.
 Fifth Ward Unity Campaign Committee—Carl O. Parsons.
 I. L. Peretz Branch, Workman's Circle—Wm. Bishoff.
 Third Ward Farmer-Labor Club—George H. Mallon.
 Fourth Ward Farmer-Labor Club—Pat Tierney.
 Tenth Ward Farmer-Labor Club—Harry Allen.
 City Central Committee, W. P. N. P. P. L.—Thos. Van Lear.
 Fifth Ward Farmer-Labor Club—Henry Wuerzinger, G. E. Jenke.
 U. A. R. E. of N. A. No. 63—C. R. Heldlund, Wm. G. Heise.
 R. R. Clerks No. 1310—J. R. Carrier, Howard De Leyer, Harry Engeland.
 Beer Bottlers No. 205—A. McDonald.
 Machinist Lodge No. 91—Wm. Mauseth.
 Pressmen No. 20—J. H. Fullerton.
 Painters No. 186—W. F. Bennett, Carl Erickson, Dan W. Stevens.
 Business and Professional Men's Association—Wm. A. Schaper.
 Twin City Telegraphers' Club—Joseph A. Poirier.
 Seventh Ward Local—Eugene Hanscom.
 B. of R. T. No. 525—S. C. Lush, G. H. Baland, N. O. Woods.
 Firemen and Enginemen No. 82—A. Karlsson, C. E. Miller, F. D. Revord.
 Machinist Lodge No. 827—Chas. Rittenger, Marshall Lindberg, T. J. Beaudoin.
 Tenth Ward Farmer-Labor Club—R. Miller, Mrs. A. Dunn.
 Eleventh Ward Farmer-Labor Club—W. J. McGaughren.

Bricklayers No. 2—Louis Lauritzen.
 Columbia Heights Local—Mrs. Viva S. Barrows.
 Steamfitters No. 539—C. L. Egan, Wm. Maley.
 Tailors No. 89—O. T. Anderson.
 Electrical Workers No. 292—G. W. Alexander, H. C. McBride, H. H. Broach.
 Machinists No. 299—V. Anderson, Al Johnson, O. V. Johnson.
 Ladies' Auxiliary, Workman's Circle—Bertha Lurchinsky.
 Twelfth Ward W. P. P. L.—Mrs. M. Boyles.
 Brenner Branch No. 75—Harry Arial.
 Twelfth Ward F. L. Club—C. A. Hahlby.
 Eleventh Ward Unity Campaign Com.—A. O. Juvold.
 Thirteenth Ward Unity Campaign Com.—L. Friedman.
 Hennepin County Unity Campaign Com.—Otto Nellermoe.
 Firemen & Oilers No. 29—S. M. Harrington.
 City and County Employees No. 16514—R. S. Wiggin, F. W. Yarwood, Myrtle Cain.
 Firemen and Oilers No. 654—Albert Brown.
 Upholsterers No. 23—L. Vandenberg.
 Tenth Ward—Mrs. Spearing.
 Plumbers No. 15—E. J. Kelly, D. A. Fallon.
 B. of R. T. Legislative Board—G. T. Lindsten.
 B. of R. Conductors' Legislative Board—A. J. Neal.
 Machinist Lodge No. 477—R. A. Henning, Wm. Wenger.
 Plasterers No. 65—Gus Bung, I. G. Scott.
 Ninth Ward—Mrs. E. G. Whitney.
 Twelfth Ward—S. A. Stockwell.
 B. of R. T. No. 102—J. O. Gould, F. E. Silliman, L. W. White.
 Workmen's Circle No. 167—Morris Fishman.
 Steam Engineers No. 34—P. L. Farrell.
 B. of L. E., Division 357—Wm. A. Chisholm.
 Milk Drivers' Local No. 471—Ole Ogg, Ray Sawyer, Arne Flikied.
 Trades and Labor Assembly—R. D. Cramer.
 General Clerks No. 125—Geo. N. Meyers.
 Hennepin County Unity Campaign—Otto Nellermoe.
 Eleventh Ward—O. A. Devold.
 Twelfth Ward—A. L. Oberg.
 Sixth Ward—Albert Bastis.
 Fifth Ward Farmer-Labor Club—Dr. Henry Wuerzinger, Gustav E. Drake.
 Minnesota Federation of Typographical Unions—G. T. Winberg, G. W. Devion.
 Twin City Telegraphers' Club—Joseph A. Poirier.
 Jewish Local Socialist Party—M. Mandel.
 South Minneapolis Local of the Socialist Party—Lynn Thompson.
 Third Ward Branch of Farmer-Labor Party—Carl R. Erickson.
 Ukrainian Self Educational J. Franko Society of Minneapolis—Wm. Darchuk, Minneapolis.
 Poale Zion Organization—Max Linder, M. Nemirov.
 (N. P. L. Delegates):
 B. A. Binger, C. N. Sundby—Renville.
 Andrew Bang—Madison.
 Edd P. Smogard—Madison No. 1.
 A. H. Hendrickson—Sauk Centre.
 Henry Harty—Mahonen.
 G. A. Solberg—Essig.
 Joseph J. Sperl—Searles.
 Charles L. DeReu—Marshall.
 K. Knudson—Cottonwood.
 M. Lau—Farmington.
 Otto Friton—Sleepy Eye.
 Mrs. W. S. Fay—Trosky.
 C. F. Norwood—Balaton.
 M. A. Ulvedhal—Big Falls.
 S. O. Bartness—Elbow Lake.
 Wm. Mildenstein—Brownsville.
 Frank O. Heulin—Heulin.
 O. J. Goetsch—Brownsville.
 Emil Hallgren—Hallock.
 Wm. L. Hintz—Alden No. 1.
 J. P. Rogers—Montrose.
 Mrs. Minnie Cederholm—Granby No. 1.
 Herman Dammann—Plato.
 C. M. Gislason—Ivanhoe.
 P. A. Peterson—Emmons.
 C. A. Wennerberg—Kerkhoven.
 Pat J. Gleason—Olivia.
 A. Van Buren—Raymond.
 Albert Kvanbeck—Minneota.
 Neil A. Pederson—Milan.
 Chas. J. Salmonson—Clinton.
 Ben W. Anderson—Becker County.
 Paul I. D. Ostby—Twin Lakes.
 A. F. Bright—Zumbro Falls.
 Herman Tushaus—Kellogg.
 Mrs. H. K. Helgeson—Minneota.
 Thomas Vollom—Erksine.
 Mrs. Susie Stageberg—Red Wing.
 Louis Enstrom—Malung.
 Lily J. Anderson—Franklin.
 Montevideo
 Mrs. C. W. Olson, A. E. Swenson.
 Magnus Johnson—Montevideo No. 3.
 Benson
 Gust Langved, A. T. Flaten, J. O. Knutson.

CONSTITUTION OF FARMER-LABOR FEDERATION

The following constitution was adopted:

Constitution Farmer-Labor Federation of Minnesota

Article I. Name and purpose

SECTION 1. The name of this organization shall be the Farmer-Labor Federation. Its purpose shall be to unite the members of the farmers' organizations and labor organizations into a political federation, together with those organized or unorganized elements who support independent political action by the workers and farmers, and to carry on an intensive program of education and organization, incidental to participation in the political campaigns of the Farmer-Labor movement.

Article II. Membership

The membership of this organization may comprise:

SECTION 1. The Nonpartisan League; the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League; farmers' economic organizations and cooperative societies; trade unions; railroad brotherhood organizations; and associations of men and women, professional or otherwise, accepting the program and principles of the Farmer-Labor Federation.

Sec. 2. Ward and township clubs, composed of individual members who sign application cards accepting the program and principles of, and pay dues into, the Farmer-Labor Federation.

Sec. 3. Membership at large: In localities where no local club exists, individual persons may become members by signing an application card accepting the program and principles of the Farmer-Labor Federation and paying to the State committee of the federation the sum of \$1 per year.

Sec. 4. Nothing in this constitution shall be construed as abridging the autonomy of affiliated organizations, except that they have pledged their cooperation in political campaigns and have agreed to aid in the conduct of said campaigns as directed by the State committee.

Article III. Conventions

SECTION 1. The regular convention of this organization shall be held annually for the purpose of conducting the business of the organization, perfecting plans for campaigns, and indorsing candidates for nomination in conformity with the principles of the Farmer-Labor Federation.

Sec. 2. Special conventions shall be called by the chairman on demand of not less than two-thirds of the State committee.

Article IV. Representation at conventions

SECTION 1. County conventions of the federation for the purpose of selecting delegates to the State convention shall be called at least 2 weeks prior to the State convention, comprising each farmers' organization, local union, brotherhood lodge, cooperative or association of men and women, professional or otherwise, affiliated, with not less than 10 members, which shall be entitled to one delegate for the organization and one delegate for each hundred members, no organization to have more than three delegates.

Sec. 2. Delegates to the State convention shall be based upon the vote cast for governor on the Farmer-Labor Party ticket at the preceding State election. Each county shall be entitled to such delegates as may be apportioned to the county, as based on the county's vote for governor, the ratio to be determined by the State committee, provided, however, the maximum number of delegates to the State convention shall not exceed 400.

Sec. 3. Each ward or township club of the federation with not less than 10 members shall be entitled to one delegate and one additional delegate for each 100 members, but no club shall have more than three delegates to the county convention.

Sec. 4. All central bodies composed of delegates from local organizations and affiliated with this federation shall be entitled to one delegate to the county convention.

Article V. Administration

SECTION 1. The convention shall be the supreme authority of this organization.

Sec. 2. There shall be elected at each annual convention of the federation, a State chairman, a secretary-treasurer, and two committeemen from each congressional district, who shall comprise the State committee. Committeemen shall be selected by the delegates from such districts, subject to approval of the convention.

Sec. 3. The secretary-treasurer shall give bonds in such amount as specified by the State committee, and shall prepare and publish quarterly in the official organ of the federation a financial statement showing full receipts and disbursements. The secretary-treasurer's books shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant.

Sec. 4. Between conventions, the State committee, to be elected at the convention, shall be the supreme governing body, and shall carry out the mandates of the convention.

Sec. 5. The State committee shall elect an executive committee of three members from its own members to handle any routine matters that may develop between meetings of the State committee. The State chairman and secretary-treasurer shall be ex-officio members of the executive committee.

Sec. 6. The members of the State committee from each congressional district shall be held responsible for the supervision of the affairs of the organization within their respective districts and for the organization of county, ward, and township branches within their districts.

Congressional districts may be divided to suit the convenience of the committeemen.

SEC. 7. The State committee of the federation shall meet quarterly in a place to be designated by the State chairman, to conduct such business as may properly come before it.

SEC. 8. Candidates for political office desiring to secure the endorsement of the federation or any of its affiliated bodies, must sign in the presence of witnesses, a pledge to publicly support the program and principles of the federation, copies of which must be sent to the State secretary of the federation.

SEC. 9. Each county, city, or town shall have charge of its local campaign, subject to the constitution of the Farmer-Labor Federation and conducted in conformity therewith.

No local club shall endorse a candidate for public office, whose respective district is greater than that of the endorsing club, without the approval of the next higher federation unit.

Article VI. Finances

SECTION 1. Each labor or farmer organization, as provided in Section 1 or article II, shall pay a monthly per-capita tax of 2 cents per member, except that cooperative, city central body, and ladies' auxiliary organizations shall pay a monthly per-capita tax of 1 cent.

SEC. 2. Individual members of ward and township clubs shall pay a membership fee of \$1 per year.

SEC. 3. The yearly dues shall be apportioned as follows:

(a) To local club.....	\$0.50
(b) To county central committee.....	.25
(c) To State committee of the federation.....	.25

SEC. 4. Local clubs shall remit for each member 50 cents to the State committee, and the State committee shall remit monthly the total amount due to each county maintaining an active county organization.

SEC. 5. No person shall be permitted to solicit funds for State purposes at any meeting or at any place unless he bears and exhibits credentials from the State executive committee, nor for county purposes without credentials from the county central committee, nor for township, ward, or local purposes without credentials from the township, ward, or local.

Article VII. Branches

SECTION 1. Whenever there are more than 10 members in any ward or township, they shall constitute themselves a local club of the federation. When there is more than one ward or township club or more than one affiliated organization in any city or county, these units shall elect delegates (not more than three from each organization) and form a city or county central committee, same to have charge of participation of the membership in political campaigns.

SEC. 2. The State executive committee shall have power to issue or refuse charters to any organization upon the recommendation of county or central committees.

SEC. 3. Ward and township clubs of the federation must supply their secretaries with proper books and bylaws, to be approved by the State committee, to keep the accounts of the club, and they shall be kept in such a way as to show all receipts and disbursements. Said books shall be audited by a committee of three members of the local club every 3 months, or any other shorter interval the club may desire, and shall be at all times open to the inspection of the State committee, the State secretary of the federation, or their duly authorized representative.

Article VIII. Newspaper

SECTION 1. There may be established by the State committee of this federation a weekly paper for the purpose of education and reform; the dissemination of true conceptions of good government and the politic-economic needs of the people; and teaching the principles of liberty, justice, and equality as enunciated in the Constitution of the United States of America and State Constitution of Minnesota.

SEC. 2. The State committee of the federation may incorporate a "Farmer-Labor educational association" for the purpose of publishing this paper and such other educational literature as it may from time to time determine, in conformity with section 1 of this article, and suitably safeguarded with proper bylaws for its management.

Article IX. Amendments

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended at any regular convention of the federation by a majority vote of the delegates present.

A State executive committee and congressional district committeemen were set up in each district, as follows:

States executive committee: Wm. Mahoney, chairman; Ralph L. Harmon, secretary; Fred E. Osborn, R. D. Cramer, Walter J. Kennedy.

Congressional district committeemen:

First District: John F. Placek, Austin; Walter J. Kennedy, Simpson.

Second District: John F. Johnson, Hanska; W. C. Sprague, Madelia.

Third District: Fred E. Osborn, South St. Paul; A. C. Welch, Glencoe.

Fourth District: Frank Fisher, St. Paul; Frank Starkey, St. Paul.

Fifth District: J. O. Johnson, Minneapolis; R. D. Cramer, Minneapolis.

Sixth District: B. W. Anderson, Becker; A. H. Hendrickson, Sauk Center.

Seventh District: Hemming Nelson, Atwater; Judge Baker (resigned), Renville.

Eighth District: H. W. Dart, Proctor; Geo. E. Webster, Hibbing.

Ninth District: J. C. Pratt, Crookston; Louis Enstrom, Hibbing.

Tenth District: G. H. Lundberg, Montrose; C. R. Hedlund, Minneapolis.

1924 FARMER-LABOR PARTY HAS OPEN PRIMARIES

In 1924 the Farmer-Labor Federation held a convention, and went into the open primaries with several candidates for Governor, Senator, Congress, and State offices.

1924 FARMER-LABOR PRIMARY VOTES

There were three Farmer-Labor candidates for Senator and seven for Governor in the 1924 primaries. Magnus Johnson won the Senate nomination with 174,343 votes. Floyd B. Olson won the nomination for Governor with 55,825 votes.

1924 FINAL ELECTIONS

In the final election of 1924, Magnus Johnson was defeated for the Senate by less than 8,000 votes. Floyd B. Olson lost to Theodore Christiansen by a vote of 366,029 to 406,692.

LA FOLLETTE FOR PRESIDENT 1924

In 1924 came the Presidential election. Minnesota Farmer-Labor people gave a vote of 339,192 to Senator Robert M. La Follette for President and Burton K. Wheeler for Vice President on an Independent ticket.

In the Presidential campaign of 1924 I spent 4 months on the stump in 10 States campaigning for the "Old Lion", "Fighting Bob" La Follette—it was his last fight.

The Independents of 1924, like the Progressives of 1912, were dependent upon one great leader. Many Progressives of 1912 followed Teddy Roosevelt back into the Republican Party. The Independent Party of 1924, headed by a most able and distinguished leader, did not have its roots firmly entrenched in organized labor and farm cooperatives and their affiliated organizations.

FARMER-LABOR PARTY ROOTED IN FARM AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

In Minnesota the Farmer-Labor Party has always been a party of farm and labor organizations, not dependent upon individual leaders. Leaders have come and gone. We have had fair-weather friends and we have had pioneers tried and true. To the pioneer leaders we owe much, but to the rank and file of organized labor and organized farmers we owe more. They are the firm foundation upon which our party rests.

LA FOLLETTE PLATFORM

The La Follette Independent-Progressive platform was as follows:

A covenant with the people

Awakened by the dangers which menace their freedom and prosperity the American people still retain the right and courage to exercise their sovereign control over their Government. In order to destroy the economic and political power of monopoly, which has come between the people and their Government, we pledge ourselves to the following principles and policies:

The House Cleaning

1. We pledge a complete house cleaning in the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and the other executive departments. We demand that the power of the Federal Government be used to crush private monopoly, not to foster it.

Natural Resources

2. We pledge recovery of the Navy's oil reserves and all other parts of the public domain which have been fraudulently or illegally leased, or otherwise wrongfully transferred, to the control of private interests; vigorous prosecution of all public officials, private citizens and corporations that participated in these transactions; complete revision of the water-power act, the general leasing act, and all other legislation relating to the public domain. We favor public ownership of the Nation's water power and the creation and development of a national super-water-power system, including Muscle Shoals, to supply at actual cost light and power for the people and nitrate for the farmers, and strict public

control and permanent conservation of all the Nation's resources, including coal, iron and other ores, oil, and timber lands, in the interests of the people.

Railroads

3. We favor repeal of the Esch-Cummins railroad law and the fixing of railroad rates upon the basis of actual, prudent investment and cost of service. We pledge speedy enactment of the Howell-Barkley bill for the adjustment of controversies between railroads and their employees, which was held up in the last Congress by joint action of reactionary leaders of the Democratic and Republican parties. We declare for public ownership of railroads with definite safeguards against bureaucratic control, as the only final solution of the transportation problem.

Tax Reduction

4. We favor reduction of Federal taxes upon individual incomes and legitimate business, limiting tax exactions strictly to the requirements of the Government administered with rigid economy, particularly by curtailment of the eight hundred million dollars now annually expended for the Army and Navy in preparation for future wars; by the recovery of the hundreds of millions of dollars stolen from the Treasury through fraudulent war contracts and the corrupt leasing of the public resources; and by diligent action to collect the accumulated interest upon the 11 billion dollars owing us by foreign governments.

We denounce the Mellon tax plan as a device to relieve multimillionaires at the expense of other taxpayers, and favor a taxation policy providing for immediate reductions upon moderate incomes, large increases in the inheritance tax rates upon large estates to prevent the indefinite accumulation by inheritance of great fortunes in a few hands; taxes upon excess profits to penalize profiteering, and complete publicity, under proper safeguards, of all Federal tax returns.

The Courts

5. We favor submitting to the people, for their considerate judgment, a constitutional amendment providing that Congress may by enacting a statute make it effective over a judicial veto.

We favor such amendment to the Constitution as may be necessary to provide for the election of all Federal judges, without party designation, for fixed terms not exceeding 10 years, by direct vote of the people.

The Farmers

6. We favor drastic reduction of the exorbitant duties on manufactures provided in the Fordney-McCumber tariff legislation, the prohibiting of gambling by speculators and profiteers in agricultural products; the reconstruction of the Federal Reserve and Federal Farm Loan Systems, so as to eliminate control by usurers, speculators, and international financiers, and to make the credit of the Nation available upon fair terms to all and without discrimination to businessmen, farmers, and home builders. We advocate the calling of a special session of Congress to pass legislation for the relief of American agriculture. We favor such further legislation as may be needful or helpful in promoting and protecting cooperative enterprises. We demand that the Interstate Commerce Commission proceed forthwith to reduce by an approximation to pre-war levels the present freight rates on agricultural products, including livestock, and upon the materials required upon American farms for agricultural purposes.

Labor

7. We favor abolition of the use of injunctions in labor disputes and declare for complete protection of the right of farmers and industrial workers to organize, bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and conduct without hindrance cooperative enterprises.

We favor prompt ratification of the child-labor amendment and subsequent enactment of a Federal law to protect children in industry.

Postal Service

8. We believe that a prompt and dependable postal service is essential to the social and economic welfare of the Nation; and that as one of the most important steps toward establishing and maintaining such a service it is necessary to fix wage standards that will secure and retain employees of character, energy, and ability.

We favor the enactment of the postal salary adjustment measure (S. 1898) for the employees of the Postal Service, passed by the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, vetoed by the President, and now awaiting further consideration by the next session of Congress.

We endorse liberalizing the civil-service retirement law along the lines of S. 3011, now pending in Congress.

War Veterans

9. We favor adjusted compensation for the veterans of the late war, not as charity but as a matter of right, and we demand that the money necessary to meet this obligation of the Government be raised by taxes laid upon wealth in proportion to the ability to pay, and declare our opposition to the sales tax or any other device to shift the obligation onto the backs of the poor in higher prices and increased cost of living. We do not regard the payment at the end of a long period of a small insurance as provided by the law recently passed as in any just sense a discharge of the Nation's obligations to the veterans of the late war.

Great Lakes to Sea

10. We favor a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea. The Government should, in conjunction with Canada, take immediate action to give the Northwestern States an outlet to the

ocean for cargoes without change in bulk, thus making the primary markets on the Great Lakes equal to those of New York.

Popular Sovereignty

11. Over and above constitutions and statutes and greater than all is the supreme sovereignty of the people, and with them should rest the final decision of all great questions of national policy. We favor such amendments to the Federal Constitution as may be necessary to provide for the direct nomination and election of the President, to extend the initiative and referendum to the Federal Government, and to insure a popular referendum for or against war except in cases of actual invasion.

Peace on Earth

12. We denounce the mercenary system of foreign policy under recent administrations in the interests of financial imperialists, oil monopolists, and international bankers, which has at times degraded our State Department from its high service as a strong and kindly intermediary of defenseless governments to a trading outpost for those interests and concession seekers engaged in the exploitation of weaker nations, as contrary to the will of the American people, destructive of domestic development, and provocative of war. We favor an active foreign policy to bring about a revision of the Versailles Treaty in accordance with the terms of the armistice and to promote firm treaty agreements with all nations to outlaw wars, abolish conscription, drastically reduce land, air, and naval armaments, and guarantee public referendums on peace and war.

FARMER-LABOR ASSOCIATION FORMED

After the election of 1924 the Farmer-Labor Federation was much accused of too radical leanings. A special convention was called in March 1925 by William Mahoney, president, who was not a candidate for reelection. About 200 delegates attended. Magnus Johnson was elected president, and the name was changed from Farmer-Labor Federation to Farmer-Labor Association. There was no actual change in the organization. A new constitution was adopted which has remained practically the same until the present time.

After the election of 1924 the Farmer-Labor Party had several "lean" years. Artificial prosperity was beginning to lead up to the crash of 1929. The need of labor for political action by its own representatives was not as urgent as in periods of economic distress and political persecution such as we had during and following the war. However, the Farmer-Labor Party had its candidates in the field again in 1926 and 1928.

1926 FARMER-LABOR PRIMARY

In 1926 Magnus Johnson was candidate for Governor and lost to Theodore Christianson, Republican, by a vote of 266,845 to 395,779.

ERNEST LUNDEEN, FARMER-LABOR NOMINEE FOR GOVERNOR

In 1928 ERNEST LUNDEEN, Farmer-Labor nominee for Governor, lost to the Republican incumbent, Christianson; in a three-way battle—Farmer-Labor, Republican, Democrat—HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Farmer-Labor Senator, was re-elected by a vote of 665,169 to Arthur E. Nelson's 342,992. Here the Democratic candidate withdrew.

FIRST FARMER-LABOR GOVERNOR, FLOYD B. OLSON

To Floyd B. Olson goes the distinction of being elected the first Farmer-Labor Governor in America. In 1930 the Farmer-Labor Party took a step forward and has been the leading party in the State ever since.

ERNEST LUNDEEN won the nomination for Senator and Floyd B. Olson the nomination for Governor. Olson was victorious over Ray P. Chase, Republican, in the fall. ERNEST LUNDEEN lost to Thomas D. Schall, Republican, incumbent. Here again was staged a bitter three-way battle—Farmer-Labor, Republican, and Democrat.

1932 PRIMARY

In 1932 Governor Olson and some other Farmer-Labor candidates had no opposition in the primary election. Also nominated without opposition were John T. Lyons, secretary of state; A. H. Kleffman, State treasurer; Harry H. Peterson, attorney general; K. K. Solberg won the nomination for Lieutenant Governor over Benjamin F. Opsahl. Knud Wefald was nominated railroad and warehouse commissioner over Elmer Gottfried Johnson.

1932 PRIMARY-AT-LARGE REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

In 1932 Minnesota Representatives in Congress were elected at large. The State was being redistricted. The

Governor and the State legislature were unable to agree, resulting in a veto by the Governor of the act. The case was taken to the State supreme court and the United States Supreme Court, finally resulting in a victory for the Farmer-Labor Governor, throwing the election of Congress into the State at large. Thirty-five candidates filed for Congress at large on the Farmer-Labor ticket. Magnus Johnson, Ernest Lundein, Paul John Kvale, and Henry Arens led the field in the order named.

The total Farmer-Labor congressional vote in the 1932 primary was 1,121,506, compared with 1,764,012 for the Republicans and 663,960 for the Democrats. Each voter cast his ballot for nine candidates, the total number of Congressmen allowed Minnesota. The Farmer-Labor Party elected five Members of Congress and gained control of the Minnesota delegation in Congress. I nominated PAUL JOHN KVALE for Speaker of the House, the first Farmer-Labor candidate for Speaker.

FINAL CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION, 1932

In the final election there were 32 candidates for Representatives in Congress at large; 9 Farmer-Labor, 9 Republican, 9 Democrat, 3 Communist, and 2 "sticker" candidates.

The four Congressmen who received the highest number of votes in the final election were all Farmer-Labor—Magnus Johnson, Paul John Kvale, Henry Arens, and Ernest Lundein. The eighth highest, Francis H. Shoemaker, was also Farmer-Labor. Three Republicans and one Democrat were elected.

GOVERNOR OLSON REELECTED 1932

Four Farmer-Labor candidates on the State ticket were victorious in 1932—Gov. Floyd B. Olson, Lt. Gov. K. K. Solberg, Attorney General Harry H. Peterson, and Railroad and Warehouse Commissioner Knud Wefald.

1934 ELECTION

In 1934 the Farmer-Labor Party struck out boldly with a virile and forward-looking program. The 1934 platform of the Farmer-Labor Party appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 17, 1935, page 13525, together with an analysis and explanation of various planks in the program.

In 1934 our Farmer-Labor Governor, Floyd B. Olson, was reelected for his third term. We also elected our Lieutenant Governor, Hjalmar Petersen; our attorney general, Harry H. Peterson; our railroad and warehouse commissioner, Charles Munn; our clerk of supreme court, Russell O. Gunderson. We reelected our Farmer-Labor United States Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD and sent three Farmer-Labor Congressmen to the House of Representatives—R. T. BUCKLER from the Ninth District, PAUL J. KVALE from the Seventh District, and ERNEST LUNDEEN from the Third District.

We had some contests in the Farmer-Labor primary of 1934, as the election returns which I am placing in the RECORD at the close of my remarks will indicate.

SENATOR ELMER BENSON APPOINTED

Last winter Minnesota was shocked by the sudden death of Minnesota's senior Republican Senator, Thomas D. Schall, who was killed in an automobile accident. Senator Schall was to be up for reelection this year. According to the law, the Governor of the State was bound to appoint a successor to fill out Senator Schall's unexpired term. Governor Olson appointed Elmer A. Benson, State banking commissioner, and former State securities commissioner, to the vacancy, to serve until a successor is elected.

1936 PRIMARY

This year the Farmer-Labor Party again had primary contests. Governor Olson is nominated Farmer-Labor candidate for the United States Senate; Senator Elmer Benson is nominated candidate for Governor; Gottfried Lindsten is the candidate for Lieutenant Governor; Harry H. Peterson is up for reelection to the office of attorney general; Dr. Paul C. Hartig was nominated for secretary of state; C. A. Halverson was nominated for State treasurer; Hjalmar Petersen was nominated for railroad and warehouse commissioner.

The Farmer-Labor voters have nominated nine congressional candidates, one from each district: For the First District, Chester Watson; for the Second District, Henry Arens; for the Third District, Ernest Lundein; for the Fourth District, Howard Y. Williams; for the Fifth District, Dewey W. Johnson; for the Sixth District, C. A. Ryan; for the Seventh District, Paul J. Kvale; for the Eighth District, John T. Bernard; for the Ninth District, R. T. Buckler.

NATIONAL FARMER-LABOR PARTY

This year the Farmer-Labor Association in State convention voted to appoint a committee to explore the possibilities of a national Farmer-Labor Party. A conference was held in Chicago on May 30 and 31, 1936, at which it was decided to work for Farmer-Labor congressional candidates in as many States as possible and to build a national Farmer-Labor Party through local and State elections. A continuing committee was named to act with the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Association.

A national Farmer-Labor Party is inevitable. Farmer-Labor Parties have been formed or are being formed in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The landslide of 1932 was not just a Democratic victory. It was a protest vote and a Republican defeat. The programs of both Republican and Democratic Parties have proved inadequate. Labor and farm and veterans' organizations must put their own party in power. The exploiters of labor and farmers will not finance a party which they cannot control. With the control of funds rests the control of power. Labor must place its own party in the field, support it, and control it.

It is my firm belief that a new labor party will successfully rise in this country, based on strong labor-union organizations, farm cooperatives, and their affiliated organizations. Such a party will spring up from the grass roots. There is a demand for such a party from the rank and file of the American people. The building of a national Farmer-Labor Party will be but the repetition of history.

AMERICAN TRADITION—THE PEOPLE RULE

Each time the oppressor's hand has struck at American liberties a challenge has arisen from the depths of traditional American democracy. Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln struck down the hand of oppression at the command of the common people. Leaders are most important, but secondary to the deep-rooted conviction of our people that America is a land where the common man is king. Hundreds of unselfish, intelligent leaders today toil in mines and factories, on railroads and farms, producing the Nation's wealth. Let the liberties of the common people be threatened, and these leaders of the people will spring into prominence.

Fearlessly they repeat the Declaration of Independence, that governments are instituted to protect the right of the people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that when any government becomes subversive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it. Fearlessly they defend constitutional guarantees of free speech, free press, the right of petition and assemblage. They defend the Constitution, the entire constitution, including the provision for constitutional amendment.

NATIONAL FARMER-LABOR PARTY INEVITABLE

Foundations are being laid. The morning glow of a labor party is on the horizon. In two-thirds of the States organizations are under way. There is no need of waiting longer. Leaders may be timid, but the onward march of labor cannot be stopped. A national Farmer-Labor Party is inevitable.

APPENDIX

For other information on the Farmer-Labor Party, Peoples' Party, Socialist, and other labor parties see speech of ERNEST LUNDEEN, August 17, 1935, A National Labor Party, page 13516.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fourth Congress; also Farmer-Labor Governor in Action, page 4564, May 29, 1933; Farmer-Labor Party in 1933, page 4398, May 26, 1933; and Charles A. Lindbergh, page 10015.

The information given here on the history, programs, and platforms of the Farmer-Labor Party is incomplete. While we have tried to be as accurate as possible in compiling the data and statistical information, errors may have crept in. Criticisms and suggestions for making this Farmer-Labor history more complete and more accurate will be welcomed from all sources.

In compiling the information given here we have been assisted by the knowledge of many pioneers in the Farmer-Labor Party and the research work of other persons, including the following:

The Congressional Library; the Farmer-Labor Educational Bureau; the Minnesota Historical Society, where issues of the National Nonpartisan Leader and the old Minnesota Leader are on file; H. E. Gaston; Nathan Fine; Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr.; David H. Evans; Thomas J. Meighen; Fred A. Tillquist; William Mahoney; Tom Davis; Henry Teigen; Joseph Gilbert; Fred A. Pike; Howard Wood; A. C. Townley; William A. Anderson; George H. Griffith; William Lemke; Thomas V. Sullivan; James Manahan; Arthur Le Sueur; Julius J. Reiter; Dr. L. A. Fritsche; Lily J. Anderson; Victor E. Lawson; A. Karlsson; and Lillian Gilliland.

VOTE STATISTICS

(Where source of information not otherwise specified, authority for statistics given here is Minnesota Legislative Manuals)

PRESIDENTIAL VOTES

1800 (electoral vote)

Thomas Jefferson	73
Aaron Burr	73
John Adams	65
C. C. Pinckney	64
John Jay	1

Thomas Jefferson elected by House of Representatives, carrying 10 States against 4 for Burr, 2 not voting. (History of the Presidency, Edward Stanwood, pp. 63, 72.)

1804 (electoral vote)

Thomas Jefferson	162
C. C. Pinckney	14

1828

Andrew Jackson (Democrat, Republican)	647, 276
John Quincy Adams (National Republican)	508, 064

1832

Andrew Jackson (Democrat)	687, 502
Henry Clay (National Republican)	530, 189
(American Parties and Politics, Harold R. Bruce, p. 97, 1804, 1828, and 1832 elections.)	

MINNESOTA TERRITORIAL GOVERNORS

1. Alexander Ramsey: June 1, 1849, to May 15, 1853.
2. Willis A. Gorman: May 15, 1853, to April 23, 1857.
3. Samuel Medary: April 23, 1857, to May 24, 1858.

MINNESOTA: FIRST STATE ELECTION

Governor, 1857

Henry H. Sibley (Democrat)	17, 790
Alexander Ramsey (Republican)	17, 550
Total	35, 340

MINNESOTA: SECOND STATE ELECTION

Governor, 1859

Alexander Ramsey (Republican)	21, 335
George L. Becker (Democrat)	17, 582
Total	38, 917

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S VOTE (NATIONAL)

Presidential election, 1860

Abraham Lincoln (Republican)	1, 866, 452
Stephen A. Douglas (Democrat)	1, 376, 957
John C. Breckinridge (Democrat)	849, 781
John Bell (Constitutional Union)	588, 879

1864

Abraham Lincoln (Republican)	2, 830, 552
George B. McClellan (Democrat)	1, 835, 985
(American Parties and Politics, Harold R. Bruce, p. 118.)	

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S VOTE (MINNESOTA)

Presidential election, 1860

Abraham Lincoln (Republican)	22, 069
S. A. Douglas (Democrat)	11, 920
J. C. Breckinridge (Democrat)	748

1864

Abraham Lincoln (Republican)	25, 055
George B. McClellan (Democrat)	17, 367

GREENBACK PARTY VOTES

Presidential election, 1876

Peter Cooper (Greenback)	81, 737
Rutherford B. Hayes (Republican)	4, 036, 298
Samuel J. Tilden (Democrat)	4, 300, 590
Green C. Smith (Prohibition)	9, 522

1880

James B. Weaver (Greenback)	308, 578
James A. Garfield (Republican)	4, 454, 416
Winfield S. Hancock (Democrat)	4, 444, 952
Neal Dow (Prohibition)	10, 305

1884

Benjamin F. Butler (Greenback)	175, 370
Grover Cleveland (Democrat)	4, 874, 986
James G. Blaine (Republican)	4, 851, 981
John P. St. John (Prohibition)	150, 369

GREENBACK PARTY

Presidential votes—Minnesota, 1876

Peter Cooper (Greenback)	2, 389
R. B. Hayes (Republican)	72, 955
S. J. Tilden (Democrat)	48, 587
Green C. Smith (Prohibition)	144

1888

James B. Weaver (Greenback)	3, 267
James A. Garfield (Republican)	93, 902
Winfield S. Hancock (Democrat)	53, 315
Neal Dow (Prohibition)	286

1892

Benjamin F. Butler (Greenback)	3, 583
James G. Blaine (Republican)	111, 685
Grover Cleveland (Democrat)	70, 065
John P. St. John (Prohibition)	4, 684

(American Parties and Politics, Harold R. Bruce, pp. 118, 137.)

Greenback Governor vote, Minnesota, 1877

Wm. Meigher (Greenback)	2, 396
J. S. Pillsbury (Republican)	57, 071
W. L. Banning (Democrat)	39, 147

UNION LABOR PARTY

Presidential election, 1888

Alson J. Streeter (Union Labor)	146, 935
Benjamin Harrison (Republican)	5, 439, 853
Grover Cleveland (Democrat)	5, 540, 329
Clinton B. Fisk (Prohibition)	249, 506

(American Parties and Politics, Harold R. Bruce, p. 137.)

ALLIANCE VOTE

Governor, Minnesota, 1890

Sidney M. Owen (Alliance)	58, 513
W. R. Merriam (Republican)	88, 111
Thomas Wilson (Democrat)	85, 844
James P. Pinkham (Prohibition)	8, 424

PEOPLE'S PARTY VOTES

Presidential election, 1892

James B. Weaver (Populist)	1, 040, 886
Grover Cleveland (Democrat)	5, 556, 543
Benjamin Harrison (Republican)	5, 175, 582
John Bedwell (Prohibition)	255, 841

1896

William Jennings Bryan (Democrat-Populist)	6, 509, 052
William McKinley (Republican)	7, 111, 607
John M. Palmer (National Democrat)	134, 645
Joshua Levering (Prohibition)	131, 312
Charles Matchett (Socialist-Labor)	36, 373

1900

Wharton Barker (Independent Populist)	50, 599
William McKinley (Republican)	7, 219, 525
William Jennings Bryan (Democrat)	6, 358, 737
John G. Woolley (Prohibition)	209, 157
Eugene V. Debs (Socialist)	94, 864

Joseph Malloney (Socialist-Labor)

1904

Thomas E. Watson (Populist)	114, 546
Theodore Roosevelt (Republican)	7, 628, 785
Alton B. Parker (Democrat)	5, 084, 442
Eugene V. Debs (Socialist)	402, 895
Silas C. Swallow (Prohibition)	258, 950

Charles H. Corrigan (Socialist-Labor)

1908

Thomas E. Watson (Populist)	29, 143
William H. Taft (Republican)	7, 677, 788
William Jennings Bryan (Democrat)	6, 407, 982
Eugene V. Debs (Socialist)	420, 890
Eugene W. Chafin (Prohibition)	252, 511

1912

August Gilhaus (Socialist-Labor)	14, 021
(American Parties and Politics, Harold R. Bruce, pp. 137, 178)	
PEOPLE'S PARTY VOTES	
President (Minnesota)	

1892

James B. Weaver (People's)	29, 313
James B. Weaver (Fusion vote)	107, 077
Benjamin H. Harrison (Republican)	122, 823
Grover Cleveland (Democrat)	100, 920
John Bidwell (Prohibition)	14, 182

	1896
Wm. J. Bryan (Democrat-People's)	130,735
Wm. McKinley (Republican)	193,503
Joshua Levering (Prohibition)	4,339
John M. Palmer (National Democrat)	3,222
Charles Machett (Socialist)	954
	1900
Wm. J. Bryan (Democrat-People's)	112,901
Wm. McKinley (Republican)	190,461
John G. Wooley (Prohibition)	8,555
Eugene V. Debs (Socialist-Democrat)	3,065
Charles W. Brandberg (Socialist-Labor)	1,329
	1904
Thomas Watson (People's)	2,103
Theodore Roosevelt (Republican)	216,651
Alton B. Parker (Democrat)	55,187
Eugene V. Debs (Public Ownership)	11,692
Silas C. Swallow (Prohibition)	6,253
Charles H. Carregan (Socialist-Labor)	974
	Governor, Minnesota
	1892
Ignatius Donnelly (People's)	39,862
Knute Nelson (Republican)	109,220
Daniel W. Lawler (Democrat)	94,600
William J. Dean (Prohibition)	12,239
	Total
	1894
Sidney M. Owen (People's)	87,890
Knute Nelson (Republican)	147,943
George L. Becker (Democrat)	53,584
Hans S. Hilleboe (Prohibition)	6,832
	Total
	1896
John Lind (Democrat-People's)	162,254
David M. Clough (Republican)	165,806
Wm. J. Dean (Prohibition)	5,154
A. A. Ames (Independent)	2,890
W. B. Hammond (Socialist)	1,125
	Total
	1898
John Lind (Democrat-People's)	131,980
L. C. Long (Midroad Populist)	1,802
William H. Eustis (Republican)	111,796
Geo. W. Higgins (Prohibition)	5,299
W. B. Hammond (Socialist)	1,685
	Total
	1900
John Lind (Democrat-People's)	150,651
Samuel R. Van Sant (Republican)	152,905
Bernt F. Haugen (Prohibition)	5,430
S. M. Fairchild (Midroad Populist)	763
Thos. H. Lucas (Socialist-Democrat)	3,546
Edward Kriz (Socialist-Labor)	886
	Total
	1902
Thomas J. Meighen (People's)	4,821
Samuel R. Van Sant (Republican)	155,849
Leonard A. Rosing (Democrat)	99,362
Chas. Scanlon (Prohibition)	5,765
Jay E. Nash (Socialist)	2,521
Thos. Van Lear (Socialist-Labor)	2,570
	Total
	270,888

POPULIST PARTY REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATORS
(From Congressional Library)
(Alphabetical list)

POPULIST PARTY UNITED STATES SENATORS

Allen, William Vincent. Nebraska. Elected as a Populist to the United States Senate, and served from March 4, 1893, to March 3, 1899. Appointed to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Monroe L. Hayward, and served from December 13, 1899, until March 28, 1901 (pp. 636-637).
Butler, Marion. North Carolina. Elected as a Populist to the United States Senate and served from March 4, 1895, to March 3, 1901 (p. 769).
Harris, William A. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-third Congress, March 4, 1893, to March 3, 1895. Elected as a Democrat to the United States Senate and served from March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1903 (pp. 1066-1067). Listed as a Populist in the Congressional Directories for the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, and Fifty-seventh Congresses.
Heifield, Henry. Idaho. Elected as a Populist to the United States Senate and served from March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1903 (p. 1084).
Peffer, William Alfred. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the United States Senate, and served from March 4, 1891, to March 3, 1897 (p. 1397).

Turner, George. Washington. Elected as a Fusionist and served from March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1903 (p. 1632). Congressional Directory for the Fifty-fifth Congress designates him as a Populist and states that he was elected as a representative of the People's Party, composed of a fusion of silver Republicans, Democrats, and Populists.

POPULIST PARTY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES

Baker, Jehu. Illinois. Served in Thirty-ninth, Fortieth, and Fiftieth Congresses. Elected to Fifty-fifth Congress as Fusionist, having been nominated by the People's Party and also the Democratic Party. March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1899. (Congressional Directory, 55th Cong.).

Baker, William. Kansas. Elected as a candidate of the People's Party to the Fifty-second, Fifty-third, and Fifty-fourth Congresses, March 4, 1891-March 3, 1897 (p. 664).

Barlow, Charles Averill. California. Elected as a Populist and Democrat to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 671).

Bell, John C. Colorado. Listed as a Populist in the Congressional Directories of the Fifty-third to Fifty-sixth Congresses and in the Fifty-seventh Congress as a Democrat. Biographical Directory states that he was elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-third and to the four succeeding Congresses, March 4, 1893-March 3, 1903 (p. 690).

Boen, Haldor E. Minnesota. Elected as a candidate of the People's Party to the Fifty-third Congress, March 4, 1893-March 3, 1895 (p. 714).

Botkin, Jeremiah D. Kansas. Biographical Directory states that he was elected to the Fifty-fifth Congress as a Fusionist, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 718). Congressional Directory for the Fifty-fifth Congress states that he was elected as a Populist on the Fusion ticket.

Castle, Curtis H. California. Elected as the candidate of the Populist and Democratic Parties to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 795).

Davis, John. Kansas. Elected as a candidate of the People's Party to the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, March 4, 1891-March 3, 1895 (p. 886).

Fowler, John E. North Carolina. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 984).

Glenn, Thomas Louis. Idaho. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-seventh Congress, March 4, 1901-March 3, 1903 (p. 1016).

Greene, William L. Nebraska. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses and served from March 4, 1897, until his death, March 11, 1899 (p. 1032).

Gunn, James. Idaho. Unsuccessful Populist candidate for election to the Fifty-third and Fifty-fourth Congresses. Elected to Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 4, 1899 (p. 1041). Listed as Populist in Congressional Directory for the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Harris, William A. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-third Congress, March 4, 1893-March 3, 1895. Elected as a Democrat to the United States Senate and served from March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1903 (pp. 1066-1067). Listed as a Populist in the Congressional Directories for the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, and Fifty-seventh Congresses.

Howard, Milford W. Alabama. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses, March 4, 1895-March 3, 1899 (p. 1119).

Hudson, Thomas J. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-third Congress, March 4, 1893-March 3, 1895 (p. 1125). Listed in Congressional Directory in the alphabetical list as a Democrat; in the State list as a Democrat and Populist.

Kem, Omer M. Nebraska. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-second, Fifty-third, and Fifty-fourth Congresses, March 4, 1891-March 3, 1897 (p. 1173).

Kelley, John E. South Dakota. Elected as the candidate of the Democratic Party and the People's Party to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 1170).

Knowles, Freeman T. South Dakota. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 1193).

Mccormick, Nelson B. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 1255).

Martin, Charles Henry. North Carolina. Successfully contested as a Populist the election of James A. Lockhart to the Fifty-fourth Congress. Reelected to the Fifty-fifth Congress and served from June 5, 1896, to March 3, 1899 (p. 1292).

Neville, William. Nebraska. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-sixth Congress to fill vacancy caused by the death of William L. Green. Reelected to Fifty-seventh Congress and served from December 4, 1899, to March 3, 1903 (p. 1353).

Otis, John G. Kansas. Elected as the People's Party candidate to the Fifty-second Congress, March 4, 1891-March 3, 1893 (p. 1376).

Pence, Lafayette. Colorado. Elected as a candidate of the Populists and silver Democrats to the Fifty-third Congress, March 4, 1893-March 3, 1895 (p. 1398).

Peters, Mason S. Kansas. Elected as a Democrat-Populist to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1899 (p. 1404).

Ridgely, Edwin R. Kansas. Elected by the People's and Democratic Parties to the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses, March 4, 1897-March 3, 1901 (p. 1462).

Shuford, Alonzo C. North Carolina. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses, March 4, 1895-March 3, 1899 (p. 1523).

Simpson, Jerry. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, March 4, 1891, to March 3, 1895; unsuccessful candidate for reelection to Fifty-fourth Congress;

elected to Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1899 (p. 1526).

Skinner, Harry. North Carolina. Elected as a Populist to Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses, March 4, 1895, to March 3, 1899 (p. 1529).

Stark, William L. Nebraska. Congressional Directory for the Fifty-fifth Congress lists him as a Fusionist (nominated by the Populists and afterward the Democrats), the Fifty-sixth as a Populist (candidate of the Populist, Democrat, and Silver Republican Parties), and the Fifty-seventh as a Fusionist and Populist. Biographical Directory states that he was the unsuccessful Populist candidate for election to the Fifty-fourth Congress, was elected as a Democrat to the Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, and Fifty-seventh Congresses, March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1903, and was an unsuccessful Fusionist candidate for reelection (p. 1561).

Strowd, William Franklin. North Carolina. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses, March 4, 1895, to March 3, 1899 (p. 1582).

Sutherland, Roderick Dhu. Nebraska. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses, March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1901 (p. 1588).

Todd, Albert M. Michigan. State list in the Congressional Directory for the Fifty-fifth Congress states that he was elected to the Fifty-fifth Congress by a union of Democratic, Union Silver, People's, and National Parties. Biographical Director states that he was elected as a Fusion candidate to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1899 (p. 1620).

Vincent, William Davis. Kansas. Elected as a Populist to the Fifty-fifth Congress, March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1899 (p. 1651).

DELEGATE

Callahan, J. Y. Oklahoma. Congressional Directory for the Fifty-fifth Congress lists him as a Populist in the alphabetical list and in the State list says he was elected by the Populists and Democrats on a free-silver ticket. Biographical Directory states that he was elected to the Fifty-fifth Congress on the free-silver ticket, March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1899 (p. 778).

POPULIST PARTY CONGRESSMEN

(Chronological list)

The following lists show Populist Party Congressmen by sessions of Congress in which these Members served:

FIFTY-SECOND CONGRESS, 1891

Senators, 1: Peffer, Kansas.

Representatives, 5: Baker, Kansas; Davis, Kansas; Kem, Nebraska; Otis, Kansas; Simpson, Kansas.

FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS, 1893

Senators, 2: Allen, Nebraska; Peffer, Kansas.

Representatives, 9: Baker, Kansas; Bell, Colorado; Boen, Minnesota; Davis, Kansas; Harris, Kansas; Hudson, Kansas; Kem, Nebraska; Pence, Colorado; Simpson, Kansas.

FIFTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, 1895

Senators, 3: Allen, Nebraska; Butler, North Carolina; Peffer, Kansas.

Representatives, 8: Baker, Kansas; Bell, Colorado; Howard, Alabama; Kem, Nebraska; Martin, North Carolina; Shuford, North Carolina; Skinner, North Carolina; Strowd, North Carolina.

FIFTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, 1897

Senators, 5: Allen, Nebraska; Butler, North Carolina; Harris, Kansas; Heitfield, Idaho; Turner, Washington.

Representatives, 23: Baker, Illinois; Barlow, California; Bell, Colorado; Botkin, Kansas; Castle, California; Fowler, North Carolina; Greene, Nebraska; Gunn, Idaho; Howard, Alabama; Kelley, South Dakota; Knowles, South Dakota; McCormick, Kansas; Martin, North Carolina; Peters, Kansas; Ridgely, Kansas; Shuford, North Carolina; Simpson, Kansas; Skinner, North Carolina; Stark, Nebraska; Strowd, North Carolina; Sutherland, Nebraska; Todd, Michigan; Vincent, Kansas.

Delegates, 1: Callahan, Oklahoma.

FIFTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, 1899

Senators, 5: Allen, Nebraska; Butler, North Carolina; Harris, Kansas; Heitfield, Idaho; Turner, Washington.

Representatives, 6: Bell, Colorado; Greene, Nebraska; Neville, Nebraska; Ridgely, Kansas; Stark, Nebraska; Sutherland, Nebraska.

FIFTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, 1901

Senators, 3: Harris, Kansas; Heitfield, Idaho; Turner, Washington. Representatives, 3: Glenn, Idaho; Neville, Nebraska; Stark, Nebraska.

NOTE.—This list of Members of Congress of the Populist Party is based upon the alphabetical lists found in the official Congressional Directories for the different sessions of Congress, upon the State lists in the same directories, and upon the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927. Unless otherwise specified, the information in regard to party affiliation and term of service as given with the Members' names was obtained from the Biographical Directory and the page numbers given refer to that directory. There has been included in the list Members designated as members of the People's Party, as Fusionists in cases where connection with the Populist Party was indicated, and those designated as Populists and also some other party. In a number of cases the information with regard to party affiliation given for the same person and the same period differed in the two directories, and in some cases different information was given in the same directory. In compilations or tables showing the political divisions

in the Congresses found in other sources considerable variation is found with respect to the number of Populist Members. The list compiled here does not agree in numbers with the lists found elsewhere, nor do these lists agree with each other. The present list, therefore, cannot purport to go further than the sources here cited (Library of Congress).

PEOPLE'S PARTY GOVERNORS

1893: Colorado, Davis H. Waite; Kansas, L. D. Lewelling; North Dakota, E. C. D. Shortridge.

1894: Colorado, Davis H. Waite; Kansas, L. D. Lewelling; North Dakota, E. C. D. Shortridge; Wyoming, John E. Osborne.

1896: Nebraska, Silas A. Holcomb.

1897: Kansas, John W. Leedy; Nevada, Reinhold Sadler; Washington, J. R. Rogers.

1898 Kansas, John W. Leedy; Montana, Robert B. Smith; Nebraska, Silas A. Holcomb; Nevada, Reinhold Sadler; South Dakota, A. E. Lee; Washington, J. R. Rogers.

1899: Minnesota, John Lind; Montana, Robert B. Smith; Nebraska, William A. Poynter; Washington, J. R. Rogers; South Dakota, election claimed by A. E. Lee (Fusion) and by Phillips (Republican).

1900: Minnesota, John Lind; Montana, Robert B. Smith; Nebraska, William A. Poynter; Nevada, Reinhold Sadler; South Dakota, Andrew E. Lee; Washington, J. R. Rogers.

1901: Nevada, Reinhold Sadler.

1902: Nevada, Reinhold Sadler; Washington, John R. Rogers.

This list is based on information contained in the annual issues of the World Almanac for the period of the Populist movement. It includes Governors designated as members of the People's Party, Populists, Silver Party, and Populist Fusion. Lack of time has prevented checking to separate members of the Silver Party from the Populist and People's Parties (Library of Congress).

SOCIALIST PARTY VOTES

PRESIDENT

1892 (Socialist-Labor); 1896 (Socialist-Labor); 1900 (Socialist); 1900 (Socialist-Labor); 1904 (Socialist); 1904 (Socialist-Labor); 1908 (Socialist); 1908 (Socialist-Labor). (See People's Party votes for Socialist votes in these elections.)

1912. (See Bull Moose (Progressive) Party votes, 1912.)

1916

Allen L. Benson (Socialist)-----	590, 415
Arthur E. Reimer (Socialist-Labor)-----	10, 105
Woodrow Wilson (Democrat)-----	9, 128, 837
Charles E. Hughes (Republican)-----	8, 536, 380
J. Frank Hanly (Prohibition)-----	221, 329

1920

Eugene V. Debs (Socialist)-----	915, 302
Warren G. Harding (Republican)-----	16, 152, 200
James M. Cox (Democrat)-----	9, 147, 353
Parley Christensen (Farmer-Labor)-----	272, 514
(Not affiliated with Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party.)-----	
Aaron S. Watkins (Prohibition)-----	192, 438

1924. (See La Follette Independent Progressive Party, 1924.)

1928

Norman Thomas (Socialist)-----	267, 835
Verne L. Reynolds (Socialist-Labor)-----	21, 181
Herbert Hoover (Republican)-----	21, 392, 190
Alfred E. Smith (Democrat)-----	15, 016, 443
William Z. Foster (Workers-Communist)-----	48, 228
William F. Varney (Prohibition)-----	20, 101
Frank E. Webb (Farmer-Labor; not affiliated with Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party)-----	6, 391
(American Parties and Politics, Harold R. Bruce, p. 179.)-----	

1932

Norman Thomas (Socialist)-----	884, 781
Verne L. Reynolds (Socialist-Labor)-----	33, 276
Franklin D. Roosevelt (Democrat)-----	22, 821, 857
Herbert Hoover (Republican)-----	15, 761, 841
William David Upshaw (Prohibition)-----	81, 869
William Z. Foster (Communist)-----	102, 991
Coin Harvey (Liberty)-----	53, 425
Jacob S. Coxey (Farmer-Labor) (not affiliated with Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party)-----	7, 309
(Compiled by George D. Ellis under direction of South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives.)-----	

Minnesota votes (President, Socialist Party)

1896, 1900, 1904, and 1908. (See Presidential votes under heading "People's Party" for these years. Note Socialist candidate also designated as "Public Ownership.") (See Bull Moose (Progressive) Party votes.)

1916

A. L. Benson (Socialist)-----	20, 117
Charles E. Hughes (Republican)-----	179, 544
Woodrow Wilson (Democrat)-----	179, 152
Arthur E. Reimer (Independent Labor)-----	468
J. Frank Hanly (Progressive)-----	7, 793

1920

E. V. Debs (Socialist)-----	56, 106
W. G. Harding (Republican)-----	519, 421
J. M. Cox (Democrat)-----	142, 994
W. W. Cox (Independent)-----	5, 828
W. W. Watkins (Prohibition)-----	11, 489

1924		1910	
Frank F. Johns (Socialist-Independent)	1,855	George E. Barrett (Public Ownership)	11,173
Robert M. La Follette (Independent)	339,192	C. W. Brandborg (Socialist-Labor)	6,510
Calvin Coolidge (Republican)	420,759	Adolph O. Eberhart (Republican)	164,185
John W. Davis (Democrat)	55,913	James Gray (Democrat)	103,779
William Z. Foster (Workers Party-Communist)	4,427	J. F. Heiberg (Prohibition)	8,960
1928		Total	
Norman Thomas (Socialist)	6,774		295,627
Herbert Hoover (Republican)	560,977		
Al Smith (Democrat)	396,451		
Verne L. Reynolds (Industrial)	1,921		
William Z. Foster (Workers-Communist)	4,853		
1932			
Norman Thomas (Socialist)	25,476		
Herbert Hoover (Republican)	363,959		
Franklin D. Roosevelt (Democrat)	600,806		
William Z. Foster (Communist)	6,101		
Verne L. Reynolds (Independent)	770		
Jacob S. Coxey (Farmer-Labor, not affiliated with Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party)	5,731		
SOCIALIST MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND VOTES RECEIVED			
SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS, 1911			
Victor Berger, Wisconsin, Fifth District. Vote: Victor L. Berger, Socialist, 13,497; H. F. Cochems, Republican, 13,147; J. P. Carney, Democrat, 8,433. (Congressional Directory, 62d Cong.)			
SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, 1915			
Meyer London, New York, Twelfth District. Vote: Meyer London, Socialist, 5,969; Henry M. Goldfogle, Democrat and Independent League, 4,947; Benjamin Barevsky, Republican and Progressive, 1,133. (Congressional Directory, 64th Cong.)			
SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, 1917			
Meyer London, Socialist. Vote: Meyer London, Socialist, 6,103; Louis M. Block, Republican, 968; Leon Sanders, Democrat and Independent League, 5,763; Timothy N. Holden, Progressive, 18; Solomon Suffrin, National Progressive, 17. (New York Year Book, 1917, p. 495.)			
SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, 1919			
Victor Berger, Wisconsin, presented credentials as Member-elect but was not seated. (Biographical Directory of the American Congress, p. 696.) Votes were: Victor Berger (Socialist), 17,920; Carney (Democrat), 12,450; Stafford (Republican), 10,678.			
SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, 1921			
Meyer London, New York, Twelfth District. (Vote not available at present time.)			
The salary due Victor Berger but not paid, after the refusal of Congress to seat him, was voted to his widow by the Seventy-third Congress in 1934, rectifying the cruel error of refusing to seat a duly elected, able, and distinguished Congressman.			
SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, 1923			
Victor Berger, Wisconsin, Fifth District. Vote election November 7, 1922: Victor L. Berger, Socialist, 30,045; William H. Stafford, Republican, 26,274. (Wisconsin Blue Book, 1923, p. 573.)			
SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS, 1925			
Victor L. Berger, Wisconsin, Fifth District. Vote, election November 4, 1924: Victor L. Berger, Socialist, 32,211; Ernst A. Braun, Republican, 31,702; Raymond Moore, Democrat, 13,441. (Wisconsin Blue Book, 1925, p. 570.)			
SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, 1927			
Victor L. Berger, Wisconsin, Fifth District. (Vote not available at present time.)			
NOTE.—This data obtained from numerous sources, as indicated. Limitation of time precludes extensive checking and verification. (Library of Congress.)			
SOCIALIST VOTES: GOVERNOR, MINNESOTA			
(Note also Public Ownership candidates)			
1896, 1898, 1900, 1902. (Refer to Governor elections under heading "People's Party" for these years.)			
1904			
Jay E. Nash (Public Ownership)	5,810		
A. W. M. Anderson (Socialist-Labor)	2,293		
Robert C. Dunn (Republican)	140,130		
John A. Johnson (Democrat)	147,992		
Charles W. Dorsett (Prohibition)	7,577		
Total	303,802		
1906			
O. E. Loftus (Public Ownership)	4,646		
Charles W. Dorsett (Prohibition)	7,223		
A. L. Cole (Republican)	96,162		
John A. Johnson (Democrat)	168,480		
Total	276,511		
1908			
Beecher Moore (Public Ownership)	6,516		
Jacob F. Anderson (Republican)	147,997		
George D. Haggard (Prohibition)	7,034		
John A. Johnson (Democrat)	175,136		
William W. Allen (Independent)	593		
Total	367,266		
1912			
David Morgan (Public Ownership)	25,769		
Adolph O. Eberhart (Republican)	129,688		
Peter M. Ringdahl (Democrat)	99,659		
E. E. Lobeck (Prohibition)	29,876		
P. V. Collins (Progressive)	33,455		
Total	318,447		
1914			
Tom J. Lewis (Socialist)	17,225		
William E. Lee (Republican)	143,730		
Winfield S. Hammond (Democrat)	156,304		
W. G. Calderwood (Prohibition)	18,582		
Hugh T. Halbert (Progressive)	3,553		
Herbert Johnson (Independent Labor)	3,861		
Total	343,255		
1916			
J. O. Bentall (Socialist)	26,306		
J. A. A. Burnquist (Republican)	245,841		
Thomas P. Dwyer (Democrat)	93,112		
Thomas J. Anderson (Prohibition)	19,884		
John P. Johnson (Independent-Labor)	5,476		
Total	390,619		
1918, 1920, 1924. (Refer to Final Elections—State Offices, under heading "Farmer-Labor Votes" for these years.)			
COMMUNIST PARTY VOTES, PRESIDENT			
1924, 1928, 1932. (See Socialist Party votes for these years. Note also Workers-Communist Party.)			
COMMUNIST PARTY VOTES, PRESIDENT, MINNESOTA			
(See Socialist Party votes for these years. Note also Workers-Communist Party.)			
COMMUNIST PARTY VOTES, GOVERNOR, MINNESOTA			
(See Farmer-Labor Party votes for governor 1928, 1930, 1932, 1934.)			
PROGRESSIVE (BULL MOOSE) PARTY, 1912, PRESIDENT			
Theodore Roosevelt (Progressive)	4,119,507		
Woodrow Wilson (Democrat)	6,293,019		
William H. Taft (Republican)	3,484,956		
Eugene V. Debs (Socialist)	901,873		
Eugene W. Chafin (Prohibition)	207,828		
Arthur E. Reimer (Socialist-Labor)	29,259		
ELECTORAL VOTE			
Wilson	435		
Roosevelt	88		
Taft	8		
PROGRESSIVE (BULL MOOSE) PARTY OF 1912, PRESIDENT, MINNESOTA			
Theodore Roosevelt (Progressive)	125,856		
Woodrow Wilson (Democrat)	106,426		
William Howard Taft (Republican)	64,334		
Eugene V. Debs (Public Ownership)	27,505		
Eugene W. Chafin (Prohibition)	7,886		
Elmer Reimer (Socialist)	2,212		
PROGRESSIVE PARTY, 1912, GOVERNOR, MINNESOTA			
P. V. Collins (Progressive)	33,455		
Adolph O. Eberhart (Republican)	129,688		
Peter M. Ringdahl (Democrat)	99,659		
David Morgan (Public Ownership)	25,769		
E. E. Lobeck (Prohibition)	29,876		
Total	318,447		
SENATORIAL VOTES, REPUBLICAN PRIMARY, 1916			
C. A. Lindbergh (Labor endorsed)	26,094		
Frank B. Kellogg	73,818		
Adolph O. Eberhart	54,890		
Moses E. Clapp	168,308		
CONGRESSIONAL VOTE, REPUBLICAN PRIMARY, 1916			
Representative in Congress:			
Fifth District:			
Ernest Lundeen (Labor endorsed)	9,887		
George R. Smith	9,413		
Charles L. Sawyer	8,417		
CONGRESSIONAL VOTE, FINAL ELECTION, 1916			
Representative in Congress:			
Fifth District:			
Republican, Ernest Lundeen (Labor endorsed)	19,131		
Democrat, Bowler	11,849		
Socialist, Thomas Latimer	7,526		
Prohibition, Arthur Markue	6,599		

NONPARTISAN LEAGUE IN REPUBLICAN PRIMARY, 1918

Governor:	
J. A. A. Burnquist	199, 325
Charles A. Lindbergh (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	150, 626
Lieutenant Governor:	
Ralph E. Crane (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	123, 751
Thomas Frankson	130, 052
A. D. Stephens	68, 439
State auditor:	
S. O. Tjosvold (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	123, 504
J. A. O. Preus	199, 360
State treasurer:	
Albert H. Fasel (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	133, 571
Henry Rines	178, 698
Attorney general:	
Thomas V. Sullivan (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	153, 192
Clifford L. Hilton	164, 209
Clerk of supreme court:	
Herman Mueller (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	118, 511
Irving A. Caswell	115, 726
George C. Magnuson	80, 013
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Fred E. Tillquist (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	140, 090
Fred W. Putnam	170, 411
Representatives in Congress:	

Fifth Congressional District:

Walter H. Newton	11, 484
Ernest Lundein (Municipal Nonpartisan League and Labor endorsed)	9, 946
William A. Campbell	6, 855
W. D. Washburn	4, 993
Peter J. Youngdahl	3, 972

Seventh Congressional District:

Andrew J. Volstead	19, 552
Henrik Shipstead (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	16, 775

Ninth Congressional District:

Halvor Steenerson	19, 938
Frank M. Barton (Nonpartisan League endorsed)	16, 138

FARMER-LABOR VOTES 1918—FINAL ELECTION

Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, David H. Evans	111, 966
Republican, J. A. A. Burnquist	166, 611
Democrat, Fred E. Wheaton	76, 838
National, Olaf W. Stageberg	6, 649
Socialist, L. P. Berot	7, 795

Attorney general:

Farmer-Labor, Tom Davis	99, 933
Republican, Clifford L. Hilton	180, 877
Democrat, B. B. Gislason	56, 029
National, Lars O. Haug	15, 047

Railroad and warehouse commissioner:

Farmer-Labor, Fred E. Tillquist	104, 283
Republican, Fred W. Putnam	165, 852
Democrat, J. S. Jacobson	68, 391
National, William Hokanson	10, 628

For record of Charles A. Lindbergh, Nonpartisan League candidate for Governor in 1918 primaries, see speech of Ernest Lundein, June 24, 1935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10015, "Charles A. Lindbergh—Patriot, Pioneer, Statesman."

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1920 REPUBLICAN PRIMARY

Governor:	
Henrik Shipstead (Farmer-Labor endorsed)	125, 861
Franklin F. Ellsworth	7, 754
Tom Frankson	27, 421
Samuel G. Iverson	7, 333
Thomas Keefe	5, 060
J. A. O. Preus	133, 832

Lieutenant Governor:

George H. Mallon (Farmer-Labor endorsed)	138, 707
Louis L. Collins	155, 432

Attorney general:

Thomas V. Sullivan (Farmer-Labor endorsed)	117, 799
Clifford L. Hilton	118, 932
John C. Larson	29, 434
Elmer C. Patterson	12, 860
Stelle S. Smith	17, 298

Representative in Congress:

Fifth District:	
Ernest Lundein (Labor endorsed)	15, 179
Walter H. Newton	18, 084
Charles B. Elliott	3, 265

Seventh District:	
O. J. Kvale (Farmer-Labor endorsed)	17, 369
Andrew J. Volstead	15, 059

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1920 FINAL ELECTION

(Independent candidates Farmer-Labor endorsed)

Governor:	
Independent, Henrik Shipstead	281, 402
Republican, J. A. O. Preus	415, 805
Democrat, L. C. Hodgson	81, 293
Socialist, Peter J. Samson	5, 124

Lieutenant Governor:

Independent, George H. Mallon	224, 601
Republican, Louis L. Collins	432, 226
Democrat, James P. McDonnell	79, 414

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1920 FINAL ELECTION—continued

Lieutenant Governor—Continued.	
National, C. H. Hubbell	6, 695
Socialist, Lillian Friedman	10, 629
Attorney general:	
Independent, Thomas V. Sullivan	251, 488
Republican, Clifford L. Hilton	446, 736
Democrat, R. A. McQuat	53, 738
Secretary of state:	
Farmer-Labor, Lily J. Anderson	193, 658
Republican, Mike Holm	434, 130
Democrat, Frank C. Burmaster	79, 941
National, John M. Copeland	7, 608
Socialist, J. H. Hirt	18, 965
Treasurer:	
Farmer-Labor, John P. Wagner	191, 429
Republican, Henry Rines	448, 313
Democrat, H. J. Lueders	68, 621
Socialist, P. H. Phelps	22, 454
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Farmer-Labor, Emil C. MacKenzie	177, 256
Republican, O. P. B. Jacobson	445, 557
Democrat, Ralph W. Robinson	72, 964
Socialist, Tom May	23, 900
Representative in Congress:	
First District—	
Independent, Julius J. Reiter	21, 158
Republican, Anderson	50, 387
Fifth District—	
Independent, Ernest Lundein	9, 573
Republican, Walter H. Newton	54, 962
Democrat, Dahl	8, 357
Farmer-Labor, Lynn Thompson	22, 584
Sixth District—	
Independent, Charles A. Lindbergh	21, 587
Republican, Harold Knutson	47, 954
Seventh District—	
Independent, O. J. Kvale	35, 370
Republican, Andrew Volstead	36, 822
Democrat, Mitchell	5, 358
Eighth District—	
Independent, William L. Carss	32, 395
Republican, Oscar J. Larson	33, 428
(Independent candidates Farmer-Labor endorsed.)	
1922 FARMER-LABOR PRIMARY	
(All Farmer-Labor candidates unopposed except in Ninth Congressional District.)	
Representative in Congress:	
Ninth District—	
Knud Wefald	4, 532
James S. Barnett	4, 144
	8, 676
FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1922 FINAL ELECTION	
U. S. Senator:	
Farmer-Labor, Henrik Shipstead	325, 372
Republican, Frank B. Kellogg	241, 833
Democrat, Anna D. Olesen	123, 624
Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Magnus Johnson	295, 479
Republican, J. A. O. Preus	309, 756
Democrat, Edward Indrehus	79, 903
Lieutenant Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Arthur A. Siegler	269, 417
Republican, Louis L. Collins	322, 700
Democrat, Silas M. Bryan	68, 441
Secretary of State:	
Farmer-Labor, Susie W. Stageberg	247, 757
Republican, Mike Holm	348, 559
Democrat, Claude N. Swanson	66, 616
State auditor:	
Farmer-Labor, Elizabeth Evans Deming	253, 913
Republican, Ray P. Chase	315, 089
Democrat, John E. Casey	80, 021
State treasurer:	
Farmer-Labor, Frank H. Keyes	294, 131
Republican, Henry Rines	339, 832
Attorney general:	
Farmer-Labor, Roy C. Smelker	254, 715
Republican, Clifford L. Hilton	319, 529
Democrat, James E. Doran	72, 157
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Farmer-Labor, W. W. Royster	270, 752
Republican, Ivan Bowen	290, 084
Democrat, William J. North	75, 027
Clerk of supreme court:	
Farmer-Labor, H. T. Van Lear	273, 542
Republican, Grace F. Kaercher	293, 173
Democrat, Frank J. Hebl	74, 285
Representative in Congress:	
Sixth District:	
Independent, John Knutson	4, 550
Republican, Harold Knutson	37, 201
Seberger	19, 365

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1922 FINAL ELECTION—Continued
Representative in Congress—Continued.

Seventh District:	
Independent, O. J. Kvale	42,832
Republican, Andrew J. Volstead	28,918
Eighth District:	
Independent, William L. Carss	28,757
Republican, Oscar J. Larson	32,420
Ninth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Knud Wefald (first Farmer-Labor Congressman)	35,551
Republican, Halvor Steenerson	27,590

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1923 SPECIAL ELECTION

FARMER-LABOR PRIMARY FOR SENATOR

Magnus Johnson	57,570
L. A. Fritsche	38,393
Charles A. Lindbergh	21,811
Total	117,774

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1923 FINAL SPECIAL ELECTION

SENATOR

Farmer-Labor, Magnus Johnson	290,165
Republican, J. A. O. Preus	195,319
Democrat, James A. Carley	19,311

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, PRIMARY ELECTION 1924

United States Senator:

Magnus Johnson	174,343
Michael Ferch	15,254
Hjalmar Dantes	7,548
Total	197,145

Governor:

Tom Davis	55,532
L. A. Fritsche	41,831
Victor E. Lawson	20,784
W. W. Royster	9,083
Floyd B. Olson	55,825
William A. Schaper	8,134
Thomas Vollom	7,245
Total	198,434

Lieutenant Governor:

Juls J. Anderson	38,387
Willis G. Calderwood	33,128
J. S. Christensen	35,966
Emil E. Holmes	41,017
Frank H. Keyes	31,746
Total	170,244

Secretary of state:

Louis Abrahamson	42,967
E. A. Preuss	39,225
Susie W. Stageberg	63,364
R. A. Trovatten	30,087

Total	176,143
-------	---------

Treasurer:

Carl Berg	61,599
William H. Friedell	23,335
John P. Wagner	56,666
Theo. Walstead	31,788

Total	173,388
-------	---------

Attorney general:

S. J. Kroman	9,996
John C. Larson	31,655
R. F. Peterson	19,787
Roy C. Snelker	16,049
Thomas V. Sullivan	103,644

Total	178,131
-------	---------

Railroad and warehouse commissioner:

L. Jonus Altman	12,424
Alex Kanter	8,386
Paul I. D. Ostby	16,074
A. E. Smith	43,021
A. F. Teigen	21,123
O. M. Thomason	30,081
Fred E. Tillquist	30,263
Archie Whaley	12,756

Total	174,128
-------	---------

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, PRIMARY ELECTION 1924—Continued

Representative in Congress:

First District:

Otto Baudler	3,638
Victor A. Christgau	3,668
Julius J. Reiter	4,362
A. L. Spencer	2,465
Total	14,133

Third District:

Talbert Erickson	3,843
J. B. Lokkesmoe	2,676
A. C. Welch	8,518

Total

15,037

Fifth District:

A. G. Bastis	4,911
Thomas P. Dwyer	2,790
R. A. Henning	2,757
John O. Johnson	3,506
Victoria E. McAlmon	4,236

Total

18,200

Sixth District:

Albert C. Bosel	1,966
O. J. Bouma	1,733
Harry A. Bridgeman	1,939
Henry Funkley	1,664
Halver S. Halverson	1,574
A. H. Hendrickson	1,598
John Knutson	1,998
S. C. Shipstead	9,221
D. Stickney	1,481

Total

23,174

Eighth District:

J. O. Bentall	5,306
William L. Carss	6,439
A. H. Kleffman	3,445
William E. McEwen	4,222

Total

17,743

Tenth District, Farmer-Labor primary:

George D. Brewer	5,970
Martin A. Hogan	3,784
Fred D. McMillen	3,000
Martin W. Oland	2,530
I. G. Scott	5,586

Total

20,870

There were no contests in the second, fourth, seventh, and ninth districts, and, therefore, no Farmer-Labor primary votes in these districts.

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1924—FINAL ELECTION

United States Senator:

Farmer-Labor, Magnus Johnson	380,646
Republican, Thomas D. Schall	388,594
Democrat, John J. Farrell	53,709
Independent, Thomas Keefe	4,994

Governor:

Farmer-Labor, Floyd B. Olson	366,029
Republican, Theodore Christianson	406,692
Democrat, Carlos Avery	49,353
Socialist-Independent, Oscar Anderson	3,876
Progressive, Michael Ferch	9,052

Lieutenant Governor:

Farmer-Labor, Emil E. Holmes	345,633
Republican, W. I. Nolan	410,433
Democrat, Fred Schiplin	50,330

Secretary of state:

Farmer-Labor, Susie W. Stageberg	288,946
Republican, Mike Holm	473,577
Democrat, Ole C. Halverson	45,622

State treasurer:

Farmer-Labor, Carl Berg	322,585
Republican, Henry Rines	422,389
Democrat, Henry H. Reindel	48,302

Attorney general:

Farmer-Labor, Thomas E. Sullivan	342,236
Republican, Clifford L. Hilton	417,376
Democrat, Robert C. Bell	43,913

Railroad and warehouse commissioner:

Farmer-Labor, A. E. Smith	334,174
Republican, Frank W. Matson	403,332
Democrat, J. J. Lanin	46,031

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1924—FINAL ELECTION—Continued

Representative in Congress:

First District:	
Farmer-Labor, Julius J. Reiter	28,558
Republican, Allen J. Furlow	41,484
Democrat, L. B. Hanna	7,659
Second District:	
Republican, Frank Clague	45,730
Farmer-Labor, Swanjord	29,901
Third District:	
Farmer-Labor, A. C. Welch	30,093
Republican, August H. Andresen	40,398
Fourth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Julius J. Emme	12,629
Republican, Oscar E. Keller	39,217
Democrat, Dan W. Lawler	30,227
Fifth District:	
Farmer-Labor, A. G. Bastis	36,804
Republican, Walter H. Newton	68,333
Democrat, John S. Crosby	10,987
Sixth District:	
Farmer-Labor, S. C. Shipstead	33,831
Republican, Harold Knutson	39,800
Seventh District:	
Farmer-Labor, O. J. Kvale	43,555
Republican, G. B. Bjornson	30,871
Eighth District:	
Farmer-Labor, William L. Carss	46,926
Republican, Victor L. Power	39,505
Ninth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Knud Wefald	38,248
Republican, Peterson	29,095
Tenth District:	
Farmer-Labor, George D. Brewer	36,490
Republican, Godfrey G. Goodwin	47,749
Democrat, Frank Hicks	4,485

LA FOLLETTE-INDEPENDENT-PROGRESSIVE PARTY

LA FOLLETTE VOTES, 1924—NATIONAL

Robert M. La Follette (Independent-Progressive)	4,667,312
Calvin Coolidge (Republican)	15,749,030
John W. Davis (Democrat)	8,760,557
Herman P. Faris (Prohibition)	48,671
Frank T. Johns (Socialist-Labor)	33,901
William Z. Foster (Workers)	33,605
Gilbert O. Nations (American)	22,873

LA FOLLETTE VOTES—MINNESOTA

Robert M. La Follette (Independent)	339,192
Calvin Coolidge (Republican)	420,759
John W. Davis (Democrat)	55,913
Frank Z. Johns (Socialist-Labor)	1,855
William Z. Foster (Workers)	4,427

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1926

PRIMARY

Governor:	
Tom Davis	70,434
Magnus Johnson	82,002
Total	152,436
Lieutenant Governor:	
Emil E. Holmes	57,216
Lou W. Martin	37,456
Peter J. Seberger	27,426
Henry Wuerzinger	12,697
Total	134,795

Representative in Congress:

Third District:	
August M. Gagen	6,493
J. B. Lokkesmoe	3,741
Total	10,234
Fourth District:	
William W. Meiners	1,919
Thomas V. Sullivan	5,933
Total	7,852

Sixth District:	
O. J. Bouma	2,680
A. H. Hendrickson	2,143
Joseph Himsel	6,325
John Knutson	4,240
Carl E. Taylor	1,836
Total	17,224

Tenth District:	
Ernest Lundeen	8,595
Fay Cravens	3,909
Total	12,504

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1926 FINAL ELECTION

Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Magnus Johnson	266,845
Republican, Theodore Christianson	395,779
Democrat, Alfred Jacques	38,008
Lieutenant Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Emil E. Holmes	236,307
Republican, W. I. Nolan	373,940
Democrat, Chas. D. Johnson	53,189
Secretary of state:	
Farmer-Labor, Charles Olson	217,424
Republican, Mike Holm	449,447
State auditor:	
Farmer-Labor, S. O. Tjosvold	218,074
Republican, Ray P. Chase	413,691
State treasurer:	
Farmer-Labor, Thomas J. Meighen	244,861
Republican, Julius A. Schmahl	400,061
Attorney general:	
Farmer-Labor, Frank E. McAllister	214,781
Republican, Clifford L. Hilton	384,724
Democrat, George Cahill	45,049
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Farmer-Labor, Thomas Vollom	236,131
Republican, Ole P. B. Jacobson	387,677
Clerk, supreme court:	
Farmer-Labor, Minnie Cederholm	227,520
Republican, Grace F. Kaercher	341,597
Democrat, Winnifred McDermott	61,852

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1926 FINAL ELECTION

Third District:	
Farmer-Labor, August M. Gagen	13,636
Republican, August H. Andresen	40,484
Democrat, Kolars	9,825
Fourth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Thomas V. Sullivan	17,355
Republican, Melvin J. Maas	22,976
Democrat, Henry F. Wessell	1,957
Pearson	19,819
Fifth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Albert Bastis	19,647
Republican, Walter H. Newton	47,162
Democrat, Jensen	5,942
Sixth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Joseph B. Himsel	27,076
Republican, Harold Knutson	39,570
Scattering	14
Seventh District:	
Farmer-Labor, O. J. Kvale	41,151
Republican, Howard	28,641
Eighth District:	
Farmer-Labor, William L. Carss	41,766
Republican, Larson	33,606
Ninth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Knud Wefald	32,505
Republican, Selvig	33,477
Tenth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Ernest Lundeen	21,552
Republican, Godfrey G. Goodwin	36,897
Democrat, Finlayson	4,013

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1928 PRIMARY

United States Senator:	
Henrik Shipstead	86,093
William L. Watkins	9,529
Total	95,622

Governor:	
Ernest Lundeen	43,773
L. A. Fritsche	42,949
Total	86,722

Representative in Congress:	
Fifth District:	
Ruby Smith Dehnel	1,546
Vincent R. Dunne	2,366
Ferdinand Johnson	4,274
Total	8,186

Sixth District:	
John Knutson	6,350
Carl E. Taylor	4,285
Total	10,635
Eighth District:	

J. W. Anderson	4,367
William L. Carss	8,507
Total	12,874

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1928 PRIMARY—Continued	
Representative in Congress—Continued.	
Tenth District:	
C. R. Hedlund	5,496
John Gabriel Soltis	3,011
Total	8,507
FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1928 FINAL ELECTION	
United States Senator:	
Farmer-Labor, Henrik Shipstead (reelected)	665,169
Republican, Arthur E. Nelson	342,992
Workers Communist, Vincent R. Dunne	9,380
Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Ernest Lundeen	227,193
Republican, Theodore Christianson	549,857
Democrat, Andrew Nelson	213,734
Industrial, Harris A. Brandborg	3,279
Workers Communist, J. O. Bentall	5,760
Lieutenant Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Thomas J. Meighen	235,133
Republican, W. I. Nolan	526,413
Democrat, Fred Pfaender	180,449
Secretary of state:	
Farmer-Labor, Susie W. Stageberg	178,096
Republican, Mike Holm	625,712
Democrat, Ruth Haynes Carpenter	163,771
State treasurer:	
Farmer-Labor, Peter J. Seberger	205,228
Republican, Julius A. Schmahl	541,986
Democrat, William A. Just	187,950
Attorney general:	
Farmer-Labor, C. F. Gaarenstroom	192,472
Republican, G. A. Youngquist	524,151
Democrat, George Cahill	205,681
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Farmer-Labor, J. L. Peterson	259,823
Republican, Christian J. Laurisch	463,791
Democrat, Viggo Justesen	171,954
Representative in Congress:	
Third District:	
Farmer-Labor, Henry Arens	15,749
Republican, August H. Andresen	52,526
Democrat, Charles C. Kolars	19,844
Workers-Communist, E. B. Ford	1,154
Fourth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Howard Y. Williams	23,068
Republican, Melvin Joseph Maas	39,648
Democrat, John P. J. Dolan	31,521
Workers-Communist, Maurice Powers	506
Independent, Fred A. Snyder	15,365
Fifth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Ferdinand Johnson	24,869
Republican, Walter H. Newton	80,856
Democrat, James Robertson	31,528
Workers-Communist, O. R. Votaw	723
Sixth District:	
Farmer-Labor, John Knutson	28,276
Republican, Harold Knutson	55,663
Seventh District:	
Farmer-Labor, O. J. Kvale	56,029
Republican, Lawrence M. Carlson	27,735
Eighth District:	
Farmer-Labor, William L. Carss	42,508
Republican, William A. Pittenger	43,777
Democrat, Dana C. Reed	9,784
Workers Communist, Thomas Foley	2,989
Ninth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Knud Wefald	36,853
Republican, C. G. Selvig	45,319
Tenth District:	
Farmer-Labor, C. R. Hedlund	23,774
Republican, Godfrey C. Goodwin	60,100
Democrat, Ernest W. Erickson	22,702
FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1930 PRIMARY	
United States Senator:	
Ernest Lundeen	39,589
Knud Wefald	27,661
Total	67,250
Governor:	
Floyd B. Olson	60,455
Carl E. Taylor	11,791
Total	72,246
Representative in Congress:	
Third District:	
John T. Lyons	1,302
F. H. Shoemaker	3,863
Total	5,165

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1930 PRIMARY—Continued	
Representative in Congress—Continued.	
Fifth District:	
Ferdinand Johnson	4,388
Joseph Poirier	4,005
Total	8,393
Tenth District:	
Dwight C. Martin	3,124
Erling Swenson	4,446
Total	7,570
FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1930 FINAL ELECTION	
United States Senator:	
Farmer-Labor, Ernest Lundeen	178,671
Republican, Thomas D. Schall	293,626
Democrat, Einar Hoidale	282,018
Independent, Charles A. Lund	20,669
Communist, Rudolph Harju	5,645
Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Floyd B. Olson	473,154
Republican, Ray P. Chase	289,528
Democrat, Edward Indrehus	29,109
Communist, Carl Reeve	5,594
Lieutenant Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Henry Arens	358,385
Republican, John H. Haugen	341,718
Communist, Andrew Roine	14,719
Secretary of state:	
Farmer-Labor, Anna Olson Determan	209,596
Republican, Mike Holm	487,695
Democrat, Mary C. MacGregor	56,535
Communist, Henry Bartlett	12,326
State auditor:	
Farmer-Labor, Henry G. Teigan	260,272
Republican, Stafford King	385,406
Democrat, Benjamin M. Loeffler	78,183
State treasurer:	
Farmer-Labor, Frederick Miller	271,286
Republican, Julius A. Schmahl	375,946
Democrat, J. Pierce Wolfe	77,894
Attorney general:	
Farmer-Labor, Joseph B. Himsel	256,581
Republican, Henry N. Benson	358,955
Democrat, Walter F. Dacey	86,037
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Farmer-Labor, Elmer Gottfried Johnson	288,553
Republican, Frank W. Matson	323,217
Democrat, August Blomquist	84,593
Communist, Nick Maki	8,753
Clerk, supreme court:	
Farmer-Labor, Roy C. Snelker	337,157
Republican, Grace Kaercher Davis	338,154
Representative in Congress:	
First district:	
Farmer-Labor, Matt. Fitzpatrick	24,357
Republican, Victor Christgau	45,330
Second district:	
Farmer-Labor, L. A. Fritsche	33,092
Republican, Frank Clague	38,431
Third district:	
Farmer-Labor, F. H. Shoemaker	21,118
Republican, August H. Andresen	35,704
Democrat, Joseph J. Moriarity	17,485
Fourth district:	
Farmer-Labor, Claus V. Hammerstrom	16,180
Republican, Melvin J. Maas	48,633
Democrat, Frank Munger, Sr.	6,593
Communist, A. N. Anderson	1,690
Sixth district:	
Farmer-Labor, John Knutson	19,461
Republican, Harold Knutson	44,058
Democrat, P. J. Russell	9,197
Seventh District:	
Farmer-Labor, Paul John Kvale	58,334
Republican, Frank Hopkins	13,506
Eighth District:	
Farmer-Labor, William L. Carss	29,001
Republican, William A. Pittenger	55,802
Communist, Walter Harju	3,318
Ninth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Knud Wefald	32,874
Republican, Conrad G. Selvig	37,531
Tenth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Erling Swenson	37,182
Republican, Godfrey G. Goodwin	38,391
Communist, David I. Moses	1,931
FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1932 PRIMARY	
Lieutenant Governor:	
Benjamin F. Opsahl	46,994
K. K. Solberg	84,164
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Elmer Gottfried Johnson	61,532
Knud Wefald	69,444
(Governor, Floyd B. Olson; secretary of state, John T. Lyons; State treasurer, A. H. Kleffman; attorney general, Harry H. Peterson nominated without opposition.)	

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1932 PRIMARY—Continued

United States Representatives (at large):

John G. Alexander	18,353
Henry Arens	69,777
Albert G. Bastis	24,397
J. Adam Bede	32,613
Albert C. Bosel	11,145
R. T. Buckler	23,506
John S. Crosby	22,320
A. O. Devold	27,949
J. V. Free	18,594
C. F. Gaarenstroom	45,252
A. H. Hendrickson	22,738
Magnus Johnson	93,832
John Knutson	29,436
J. S. Konkel	10,237
Paul John Kvale	72,366
Victor E. Lawson	34,437
Ernest Lundein	77,412
Laura E. Naplin	22,240
Martin W. Odland	24,019
C. J. Oeiseth	11,461
J. L. Peterson	39,475
Emil L. Regnier	22,115
Julius J. Reiter	26,984
Russell C. Riley	19,002
F. H. Shoemaker	37,658
Susie W. Stageberg	27,989
Erling Swenson	33,764
Henry G. Teigan	37,451
Lynn Thompson	30,672
A. C. Townley	50,583
Edward Trombley	10,651
Ralph O. Van Lear	32,935
Mat Wagner	26,176
Howard Y. Williams	29,130
Curtis H. Windsor	9,837

Total vote, United States Representatives 1,121,506

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1932 FINAL ELECTION
Representatives in Congress (at large)

Rank	Farmer-Labor	Repub-lican	Democrat
1. Magnus Johnson	388,618		
2. Paul John Kvale	380,444		
3. Henry Arens	361,724		
4. Ernest Lundein	350,455		
5. Theodore Christianson		337,110	
6. Einar Hoidal			321,949
7. Ray P. Chase		321,092	
8. F. H. Shoemaker	317,100		
9. Harold Knutson		313,221	
10. August Andresen		312,198	
11. W. I. Nolan		306,266	
12. Conrad G. Selvig		304,846	
13. J. A. A. Burnquist		302,356	
14. J. L. Peterson	298,331		
15. Henry G. Teigan	291,887		
16. C. F. Gaarenstroom	291,687		
17. Wm. A. Pittenger		291,487	
18. N. J. Holmberg		287,381	
19. A. C. Townley	261,120		
20. Robert C. Bell			237,881
21. John P. Coughlin			214,462
22. Silas M. Bryan			207,419
23. Emil E. Holmes			205,673
24. James R. Bennett			198,421
25. Donald A. Chapman			190,530
26. Hugh T. Kennedy			186,466
27. John Bowe			184,587
Total	2,941,375	2,775,948	1,947,388

COMMUNIST CANDIDATES AT LARGE, 1932

Rank:	
29. J. W. Anderson (Communist)	16,299
30. O. M. Karson (Communist)	9,573
31. Fred Lequier (Communist)	8,927

Total Communist vote for Representative in Congress, at large 34,799

STICKER CANDIDATES AT LARGE, 1932

Rank:	
28. Victor Christgau (sticker candidate)	82,826
32. Melvin Maas (sticker candidate)	784

Total sticker-candidate vote for Representative in Congress, at large 83,610

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1932 FINAL ELECTION

Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Floyd B. Olson	522,438
Republican, Earle Brown	334,081
Democrat, John E. Regan	169,859
Communist, William Schneiderman	4,807
Industrial, John P. Johnson	1,824

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1932 FINAL ELECTION—Continued

Lieutenant Governor:

Farmer-Labor, K. K. Solberg	429,759
Republican, T. O. Streissguth	314,369
Democrat, Ruth Haynes Carpenter	193,671
Communist, John Lindman	10,159

Secretary of state:

Farmer-Labor, John T. Lyons	342,496
Republican, Mike Holm	451,611
Democrat, Jerry A. Harri	182,065
Communist, Robert Turner	8,180

State treasurer:

Farmer-Labor, A. H. Kleffman	360,498
Republican, Julius A. Schmahl	371,574
Democrat, Timothy J. Doyle	223,651

Attorney general:

Farmer-Labor, Harry H. Peterson	379,418
Republican, Henry N. Benson	345,486
Democrat, Ray G. Moonan	218,076
Communist, Tom Foley	8,585

Railroad and warehouse commissioner:

Farmer-Labor, Knud Wefald	372,105
Republican, Oscar A. Swenson	343,659
Democrat, Matthew N. Kraus	215,980
Communist, Emil Nygard	9,458

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1934 PRIMARY

United States Senator:

Henrik Shipstead	198,951
Francis H. Shoemaker	71,172

Total 270,123

Governor:

Floyd B. Olson	238,821
John Lind	33,268

Total 272,089

Railroad and warehouse commissioner:

Charles Munn	96,364
Charles J. Johnson	85,152
Elmer Gottfried Johnson	33,496
Alex Kanter	21,327

Total 236,339

Clerk Supreme Court:

Russell O. Gunderson	126,352
Laura E. Naplin	107,234

Total 233,586

Representative in Congress:

First District:	
Otto Baudler	8,605
Nellie Miller	5,681
Emil M. Olson	5,317

Total 19,603

Sixth District:

Magnus Johnson	24,907
John Knutson	6,517

Total 31,424

Eighth District:

E. J. W. Kolhase	8,059
Sigmund M. Slonim	14,484
A. L. Winterquist	18,213

Total 40,756

Ninth District:

R. T. Buckler	17,874
Henry Nycklemoe	6,385
A. C. Townley	13,671

Total 37,930

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1934 FINAL ELECTION

United States Senator:

Farmer-Labor, Henrik Shipstead	503,379
Republican, N. J. Holmberg	200,083
Democrat, Einar Hoidal	294,757
Communist, Alfred Tiala	5,620
Socialist, Morris Kaplin	5,618

Governor:

Farmer-Labor, Floyd B. Olson	468,812
Republican, Martin A. Nelson	396,359
Democrat, John E. Regan	176,928
Communist, S. K. Davis	4,334
Independent, A. C. Townley	4,454

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1934 FINAL ELECTION—Continued

Lieutenant Governor:	
Farmer-Labor, Hjalmar Petersen	428,897
Republican, Franklin F. Ellsworth	331,747
Democrat, Arthur D. Reynolds	222,144
Secretary of state:	
Farmer-Labor, K. K. Solberg	359,322
Republican, Mike Holm	477,573
Democrat, H. T. Kennedy	170,545
Communist, Robert Turner	5,791
State auditor:	
Farmer-Labor, John T. Lyons	379,654
Republican, Stafford King	380,302
Democrat, Patrick J. Delaney, Jr.	221,221
State treasurer:	
Farmer-Labor, A. H. Kleffman	377,472
Republican, Julius A. Schmahl	394,228
Democrat, Maynard Bartley	201,608
Attorney general:	
Farmer-Labor, Harry H. Peterson	436,140
Republican, Oscar F. Youngdahl	345,372
Democrat, Alric Anderson	190,049
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Farmer-Labor, Charles Munn	420,117
Republican, Christian J. Laurisch	337,061
Democrat, Robert G. Close	197,264
Clerk, supreme court:	
Farmer-Labor, Russell O. Gunderson	362,148
Republican, Grace Kaercher Davis	336,479
Democrat, Clarence L. Smith	230,457
Socialist, Oscar F. Hawkins	5,751

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1934 FINAL ELECTION

Representative in Congress:

First District:	
Farmer-Labor, Otto Baudler	29,038
Republican, August H. Andresen	51,099
Democrat, John W. Feller	29,581
Second District:	
Farmer-Labor, Henry Arens	37,663
Republican, L. P. Johnson	35,968
Democrat, Elmer J. Ryan	43,677
Third District:	
Farmer-Labor, Ernest Lundein	59,097
Republican, Josiah H. Chase	28,637
Democrat, John W. Schmidt	22,556
Communist, Peter O. Sjodin	632
Fourth District:	
Farmer-Labor, A. E. Smith	30,354
Republican, Melvin J. Maas	37,933
Democrat, John J. McDonough	24,122
Independent, Charles J. Andre	10,180
Communist, Thomas Tracy	497
Fifth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Dewey W. Johnson	42,322
Republican, Theodore Christianson	45,875
Democrat, Sidney Benson	27,814
Communist, Harry Mayville	507
Socialist, George Riedel	317
Sixth District:	
Farmer-Labor, Magnus Johnson	46,346
Republican, Harold Knutson	56,642
Democrat, Frank R. Weber	19,572
Seventh District:	
Farmer-Labor, Paul John Kvale	65,261
Democrat, Richard T. Daly	44,762
Eighth District:	
Farmer-Labor, A. L. Winterquist	25,024
Independent, F. H. Shoemaker	25,386
Republican, William A. Pittenger	39,513
Democrat, Jerry A. Harri	18,707
Communist, Thomas Foley	1,969
Ninth District:	
Farmer-Labor, R. T. Buckler	41,822
Republican, Ole O. Sageng	27,522
Democrat, Martin Oscar Brandon	25,210

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1936 PRIMARY

United States Senator:	
Floyd B. Olson	175,652
Carl E. Taylor	13,952
Governor:	
Elmer A. Benson	126,088
Edgar B. Bernard	7,901
Magnus Johnson	50,503
Adolph W. Olson	6,156
Lieutenant Governor:	
Gottfrid Lindsten	101,737
C. E. Townsend	71,712
Railroad and warehouse commissioner:	
Charles J. Johnson	45,873
Hjalmar Petersen	129,434
Secretary of state: Paul C. Hartig (no opposition).	
State treasurer: C. A. Halverson (no opposition).	
Attorney general: Harry H. Peterson (no opposition).	

FARMER-LABOR VOTES, 1936 PRIMARY—Continued

Representative in Congress:	
First District: Chester Watson (no opposition).	
Second District:	
Henry Arens	9,942
L. W. Samuelson	1,678
Third District:	
Louis J. Altman	2,447
Ernest Lundein	23,777
Fourth District:	
Charles A. Hausler	8,626
Howard Y. Williams	9,348
Fifth District:	
Dewey W. Johnson	19,289
Nat. Ross	3,323
Sixth District:	
John T. Galarneau	5,295
Claus P. Naas	1,670
C. A. Ryan	7,878
Frank R. Weber	5,600
Seventh District: Paul John Kvale (no opposition).	
Eighth District:	
John T. Bernard	17,772
Francis H. Shoemaker	15,713
Ninth District: Richard Thompson Buckler (no opposition).	

PHILIPPINE NEUTRALITY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from General Rivers on Philippine independence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I addressed the House on the subject of Philippine neutrality and independence. At that time I called attention to the useless expenditures of American taxpayers' money in the maintenance of an idle army in the Philippine Islands. I also pointed out that the presence of this army is a menace to future Philippine independence, and its withdrawal would result in considerable saving of money to the taxpayers of the United States. Notwithstanding the fact that the Philippine people have been promised their full freedom and independence in 10 years, there is a growing movement in Manila and also in this country at this time for the revocation of the act for Philippine independence. I have several letters from Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, who spent many years of active service in the Philippines. He is a student of Army and Navy matters and is an expert who fully agrees with my statements on this floor. I take this opportunity to include in these remarks these letters from this expert in order that Members of this House can secure first-hand the impressions of this Army officer on these important matters.

GENERAL RIVERS' LETTERS

The Times Manila dispatch contained an interview with General MacArthur, President Quezon's military adviser, that gives interesting details of the defense plans calculated, the general says, to make the Philippine Islands "invasion proof" at the end of 10 years.

The first law enacted under the new government provided compulsory military training by conscription for youth in the elementary and other schools beginning at the age of 10. The obligation extends to the age of 50 years. All schoolgirls are to receive training for auxiliary service from the age of 10 years. A commission as field marshal is provided for the military adviser.

A regular army of 19,000 and a reserve corps are established. Men drafted at the age of 20 receive their first training of 6 months in reserve centers or for 1 year in the army. Several thousand school teachers are given training in the summer vacation, so as to carry on the military instruction in the schools. The defense plans call for 400,000 trained reserves at the end of 10 years, a 250-plane air force, the regular army, and possibly 100 small defense boats with a speed of 50 to 100 miles an hour, each boat to carry a crew of 8 and 2 torpedo tubes.

COST RUNS HIGH

The yearly military expenditure is estimated at \$8,000,000—about 30 percent of the whole annual income of the Philippine government. America is responsible for the defense of the Philippines until 1946. After the withdrawal of our forces, if the relations of the Philippines with a naval power should become strained, such a power could place 10 cruisers in 10 Philippine harbors, interrupt all shipping of passengers, mail, and goods, and sit tight until the Philippines surrendered.

Contemporary with these defense preparations the discussions advocating our permanent retention of the Philippines continue at Manila and in our Congress. Three Senators who had aided the enactment of the independence law submitted to Congress reports of visits to the islands that had changed their own convictions. Briefly, Senators TYDINGS, MCKELLAR, and E. W. GRISSON reported that they felt the Filipinos would be wise to ask for some amendment to the independence act in order that the islands might remain under American sovereignty in some form of dominion status. The reports of the Senators contained at that time no estimates as to the financial and other cost of such a plan to the American people.

What some of the Filipinos desire is, I assume, continuance of autonomy in all matters of local government, continuance of free trade with the United States, and of the single-handed responsibility of our country for defense. The present extra annual cost to the American people for the forces kept at Manila is but a fraction of what would be required if we were to hold the Philippines. This is because the defense of the islands in the future would require in Manila a far greater fleet and an army of American soldiers equipped for war service. Most students agree that we would need in the Pacific a fleet three times that of any western Pacific power.

History shows how difficult it is to abridge rights once granted to a people. History shows also that dominion status for a distant people is practicable only when the ruling people and the dependency are of one race.

Brief study of a globe—not a map—will show that Japan lies squarely between the United States and the Philippines on the direct and short steamer route—Seattle-Japan-Manila. Japan is just midway between the Aleutians and Manila. This relative position of the three countries is a fact of transcendent importance. There has never been a war between two major nations so far apart as the distance from Tokyo to our Capital—7,500 miles—or from our west coast to Manila—6,000 miles.

Holding the Philippines as a dependency would involve us in such a war—some future revolt in the Philippines against us as alien rulers, or a war with Japan. In either case, the Philippines would be crushed. Though we won a war with Japan at such unprecedented if not impossible distances the conflict would but aid Russia to communize China. A war between ourselves and Japan to aid the Philippines or to aid China would harm both those countries.

OUR ALTERNATIVES

After the war, then what? We remain in China at an expense that would shock us, or we return to our own country to watch the Japanese repopulate as promptly as did the Germans after the Great War.

Among the alternatives to the conscription of the Filipinos for armament—a procedure that may wreck their finances and take funds required for economic study of their needs and for the upkeep of their splendid educational and highway systems—and to the naval race in the Pacific—is to take steps to settle our differences with Japan. We should recognize Japan's position in Manchukuo and in China.

We assert a desire to aid the Philippines and China. This can be done only by peace in the Orient through the employment of constructive statesmanship and the frank recognition of existing conditions.

America has in her foreign trade 488 of the 900 merchant vessels that our fleet would need as auxiliaries in a war across the North Pacific. Japan has not the merchant ships her fleet would need. Neither nation has, of course, the 1,000 or more additional merchant ships that would be necessary to transport an invading army. If there be any idea of transporting the new colonial Filipino army by sea to the western littoral of the Pacific for use as an American expeditionary force, such a plan would be impossible for several good reasons.

With the rapid development of the airplane and the great improvement in submarines, it is now practically impossible to transport a war army overseas where the opposing army has a great fleet and army. This comes also from the immense bulk of the machinery and impedimenta now attached to a war army.

Assuming that Switzerland's neutrality has lasted for a century because it is to the selfish national interests of several nations to preserve that neutrality, an examination of the relative positions of Australia, Java, French China, the Philippine Islands, China, Japan, and Russia will indicate how it is also to the selfish interests of the powers concerned to neutralize the Philippines. The Independence Act of Congress asks the President to take steps to endeavor to secure the neutralization of the islands at as early a date as possible. Many Americans hope that our country will aid such a movement, although it would not be to our selfish national interests to any such great degree.

Those who discussed recently in Congress and the press the Army and Navy appropriations often referred to the need for a national-defense policy—some standard to measure the demands of the Navy and Army authorities. The sums being considered for the two arms total more than \$1,000,000,000. The armed services received about one-third of a billion additional funds from relief moneys over 2 recent years.

A formal appeal on this subject was addressed recently to the President and Congress by several hundred experienced persons who are alarmed at the increase of more than 75 percent in the regular Budget for the combatant forces in 2 years' time. The principal allegations were that "no explanation of this arming, unprecedented in our peacetime history, has been forthcoming.

* * * Common sense demands * * * the immediate projection of a basic policy of national defense * * * with the complete coordination and cooperation of Army and Navy and aviation forces, which cooperation is not now existent. * * * We urge that our national-defense policies be fixed on the basis of the defense of our soil." Now a naval statement announces that we should build a dozen cruisers, when we already have the treaty limit in that class of ships. Great Britain had announced she would build new cruisers—above treaty limits.

FOR LARGER ARMY

Then the Secretary of War stated recently that there is ample justification for the belief that the Army is probably dangerously small. Another authority computes that we have under arms at some time in the year well over 500,000 men—in the Army, Navy, the Guard, the Reserves, and the Coast Guard—in addition to several thousand young men in part-time military training at more than 200 colleges. Also a new term in connection with our military policy recently appeared when a Senator in debate appealed for "dominating" forces of our country.

A military policy evidently depends upon what the people desire to do with armed forces. Our often-repeated assertion is that we arm for defense only. The National Defense Act refers only to the size of the Regular Army and not to the policy for general use of the Navy and Army.

There are two additional sources of confusion in studying our defense expenditures. One is the custom of carrying river and harbor appropriations in the War Department bill. The present bill contains \$138,000,000 for rivers and harbors. The last bill had nothing for this purpose.

Another source of difficulty is in the procedure in Congress, where six committees are considering defense appropriations. These committees hold separate hearings and make independent recommendations concerning the funds for the different forces. Several important nations have taken measures to simplify their procedure by appointing a cabinet minister of defense. This official coordinates and controls the general training and the operations of the armed services and regulates their appeals to the national legislatures for funds.

There is ample testimony concerning the industry, application, and knowledge the able gentlemen in Congress apply to the subject of national defense. In a troubled world their dilemmas double. They cannot always predict what the national policy is to be. For example, the Senate just reduced the sum allowed by the House for fortification work in Hawaii. This was said to be for more extended fortifications in that area. The press comment was that, considering the width of the Pacific, the size of our fleet and other matters, such extensive fortifications there may not be necessary for our defense.

DEFENSE POLICY

A reasonable American national-defense policy would be one that provides for the control of the seas in the vicinity of our country as well as for the protection of our own borders and coasts. In the Pacific it would, of course, include the permanent defense of Hawaii and the Panama Canal. It would not include the permanent defense of the Philippines and Guam. Based primarily on Honolulu, as at present, and thus working on exterior and long lines, it would require an overwhelming fleet to defend our west coast. In contrast to this, a moderate fleet based primarily on the Aleutian Islands, and thus working on interior and shorter lines would be a more effective and less costly defense for our west coast, the Panama Canal, and of Honolulu as a secondary base.

Students generally agree that for the permanent defense of Guam and the Philippines we would require in the Pacific a fleet three times the size of the fleet of any other Pacific power. We would need also a large army in the islands with a vast amount of war impedimenta. Not only would there be needed an increase in the Navy beyond the greatest limits ever yet considered, but the Regular Army would have to be increased to a total above that ever heretofore thought of by the American people. All this would entail for our people an ever-growing expenditure.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPPEL] may extend his remarks in the Record and include therein certain letters, affidavits, extracts, and also a short newspaper item in connection with his appearance before the House Committee on Military Affairs. He has obtained an estimate from the Public Printer.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the House, the citizens of my district, and the American people generally may be apprised of the type of political persecution which prevails here in Washington, I submit the following facts in connection with my indictment and trial here in the District of Columbia. To my own people at home, whom I have endeavored to represent honestly and faithfully, I wish to say that I hope they will, each and all

of them, read the facts in the case, which I wish to be considered as a statement under oath, and judge me accordingly. If, after reading the true version of my persecution, they feel that I have been unfairly treated, I appeal to them to support me for reelection. If they feel, after reading the facts which I present, that I have been accorded justice, then I hope that they will do everything within their power to defeat me. All I ask is a square deal—nothing more—such as I have endeavored to give to all with whom I have come in contact throughout my 55 years of life.

THE BACKGROUND OF MY PERSECUTION

Before entering upon a discussion of the political aspects of my case, I wish to state that, in accordance with congressional etiquette, I shall refer to WILLIAM GIBBS McADOO as national committeeman and not in his capacity as United States Senator.

I was called to the Post Office Department in 1934 to confer with patronage-dispenser Farley and was ushered into his office immediately after McAdoo left there. I was extended a "glad hand" and told to address him as "Jim." Then I was hauled over the coals for exercising an independent attitude in the Congress. Mr. Farley wanted me to commit myself to sphinxlike silence as far as any opposition which I might feel to New Deal measures was concerned, and to pledge myself to support them, regardless of any personal convictions I might have on the subject. I told him that I would vote with the administration on Democratic platform principles and when I considered the proposals advanced to be constitutional and just to the people, but that I would not accept dictation from him or anyone else.

Out of approximately 250,000 patronage jobs dispensed by this administration, I can recall having received only about 5 appointments in the various alphabetical agencies, with the exception of the C. C. C. Following my conversation with Mr. Farley and prior to the 1934 campaign, Mr. Farley gave orders that my post-office appointments were to be given to McAdoo.

Prior to my reelection in 1934, McAdoo recommended for appointment as postmaster at South Pasadena an individual who was not a resident of the city and who had twice voted illegally there, notwithstanding that there was a civil-service eligible list for appointment composed of bona-fide South Pasadena residents. I saw correspondence in the United States Civil Service Commission indicating that Farley and McAdoo violated United States civil-service law in securing the confirmation of this individual who was not even legitimately on the eligible list for appointment. This appointment was made over my own vehement protest and that of the citizens of South Pasadena.

McADOO ALWAYS UNFAVORABLE

The unfavorable attitude of Mr. McAdoo was brought to a climax when I appeared before the House Rules Committee, joining with Congressman SWEENEY, of Ohio, in demanding an investigation of the H. O. L. C., which was operating inefficiently and with little sympathy for the distressed mortgagees in many States. Subsequently, McAdoo berated and threatened me because in my statements to the House Rules Committee I attributed the inefficiency in the Los Angeles agency to the political patronage set-up dominated and controlled by Mr. McAdoo and his henchmen.

POSTMASTER APPOINTMENT INVESTIGATION

Shortly following this, one of Mr. McAdoo's henchmen, George F. Rinehart, whom I defeated for nomination in 1932 and 1934, came to Washington, apparently for the purpose of securing a patronage appointment. I was advised that Mr. Rinehart brought a report to Mr. McAdoo, charging me with selling post offices in my district. Presumably as a reward for service rendered, Mr. Rinehart, who is more than 72 years of age, was then recommended by Mr. McAdoo and appointed to a \$2,600 per annum patronage position as "field representative" in the Federal Housing Administration, the duties of which position appear to be primarily political.

THE POST-OFFICE INVESTIGATION DEVELOPED INTO A FIASCO

Mr. Rinehart, Mr. J. B. Elliott, Mr. James B. Pettit, and other McAdooites, initiated this investigation, using disgruntled office seekers in my district as front men in their attack. As soon as I was apprised of their action, I demanded that the matter be placed before the grand jury but as yet nothing has materialized, and nothing can or will materialize unless this fiasco is reinflated as a political weapon against me in the coming campaign. The investigation, carried on by post-office inspectors for a number of months, at considerable expense to the taxpayers, developed not even a semblance of irregularities, and all the postmasters whom I favored, directly or indirectly, are still serving in their positions, which does not substantiate the implications of the investigation that they were "bribe-givers."

I have in my possession various documents on the subject of this investigation, confirming the fact that it was nothing other than a political move against me. The following extract from a letter on this subject, written by one of the individuals involved in the investigation, is pertinent and revealing:

I further explained that another example of the groundless charges against him (HOEPPEL) is the present post-office investigation in our district which proved conclusively that disgruntled so-called political leaders out here saw fit to maliciously attack his integrity and character by causing such a ridiculous investigation to be made. Personally I was drawn into that investigation by some of those supposed leaders by misstating and distorting facts. And for my part in that matter, I hold sincere regrets to this day.

Personally, I defy any man in this world to show where I, directly or indirectly, at any time, took 1 cent from anyone for an appointment of any kind.

FURTHER PERSECUTION

Back of the succession of events in my case can be clearly discerned a ruthless determination to destroy one who could not be controlled. And so, when the denial of patronage had failed to subdue me, when the most diligent efforts of postal inspectors had failed to reveal the slightest irregularity in the appointments in my district, when the indictment brought against me for alleged conspiracy and solicitation had failed to silence me, I was not surprised to receive a call from a representative of the Internal Revenue Bureau, delegated to investigate my income-tax returns for 1933, the first year in my life that I ever had enough income to require paying more than a few dollars tax.

This type of persecution has been notoriously used by Farley as a political weapon. In my case, it revealed that had I availed myself of my right as a Californian to make a joint return with my wife, I would have been entitled to a refund from the Government. But from the Government's standpoint, I doubt if it paid expenses for it brought a payment of only \$33 as tax on some \$2,000 in donations I had made that year to charity and to the unemployed which, according to my information when I made my return, was exempt! Let us hope, though, that Mr. Farley and his henchmen were satisfied!

FARLEY ESPIONAGE SIMILAR TO SECRET RUSSIAN POLICE TACTICS

The newspaper reports show that Congressmen and Senators who opposed the administration have had their mail opened and their offices rifled. No doubt this has occurred to a number of the national representatives, but it is outstanding in the cases of Senator VANDENBERG, Senator HOLT, and also the late Senator Schall. So obnoxious has been this espionage that it evoked severe criticism from Senator BONE, himself a Democrat from the State of Washington, who sees in methods of this kind a nascent and budding OGPU which might easily become the instrument for political blackmail.

OFFICES OF CONGRESSMEN ALSO RAIDED

My own office was raided and my mail tampered with, according to positive information brought to me by a Government employee, who advised me that my efforts in behalf of obtaining W. P. A. appropriations for the Pomona Fair

Ground Association at Pomona, Calif., were under suspicion and being subjected to the closest scrutiny. Mr. Jack Afflebaugh, president of this association, and one of the outstanding citizens of Pomona, can vouch for the fact that my efforts in obtaining W. P. A. funds for the substantial and worth-while improvements at the fair ground were in nowise connected with the cement industry, which was confirmed by Mr. Farley's own secret investigator.

I not only assisted in obtaining appropriations for this project in Pomona, but also cooperated, in 1933, in obtaining funds for the Pomona Reservoir. I have helped every municipality in my district in its meritorious projects, and my only interest has been to assist in bringing relief to the unemployed through substantial work projects which, at the same time, will be a permanent asset to the community.

The citizens of Arcadia will certainly admit that my efforts in behalf of obtaining the Ross Field recreational center were nothing other than open and honest. The citizens of Covina, LaVerne, Alhambra, Monterey Park, Whittier, and other cities of my district, can attest to the fact that my efforts in obtaining appropriations for post offices, schools, and other public buildings at those places, were motivated by my concern for the unemployed, yet the Farley-McAdoo machine spends the taxpayers' money apparently in an effort to create suspicion as to my integrity and thus discredit me politically.

OTHER CONGRESSMEN'S OFFICES ENTERED

A Representative who has been very active in support of the Townsend plan told me that he has positive information that his office was entered, apparently in an endeavor to obtain information to be used by the inquisitorial Townsend Investigating Committee. Other Representatives have complained and have been suspicious that their offices were also entered.

Such are the tactics employed under the leadership of a boxing promoter who, unfortunately, heads our Democratic National Committee. As a Democrat, interested in the success of our party, I hope that he may be given the kind of "leave of absence" which was accorded to General Hagood, who was penalized for exercising his American right of free speech.

In recounting these facts in connection with my political persecution, I wish to reiterate that as a representative of the people of the Twelfth District of California, no political would-be dictator will control my vote, neither will anyone prevent me from using the voice which God gave me whenever my conscience tells me I must use it in the interest of our suffering people. God help our beloved country if we are to be subjected to a continuance of the Farley domination which has been so evident in the past and which will grow, like a mushroom, adding to the corruption of political life, and thus retard real recovery, unless the leaders in our party return to the sound principles of democracy, free speech, a free press, the free exercise of the ballot, and freedom of worship, vouchsafed to us by the Constitution and so clearly enunciated in the writings of our peerless founder, Thomas Jefferson. As a Democrat, I propose to continue my efforts toward freeing our Democratic Party from the tyranny of selfish leadership.

MY DISCHARGED SECRETARY REWARDED

It was necessary for me to discharge my former secretary because of drunkenness and disloyalty. After his discharge he was contacted by my enemies and used to bring about the indictment against myself and son. He was brought from California by the Government at a cost to the taxpayers of some \$300. He was not called as a witness, however, but was merely used to identify my son for Ives, the complaining witness, who less than 2 weeks before the trial had identified another as my son. My former secretary remained in Washington after the trial and has been rewarded with a job in the Democratic National Committee.

Inasmuch as my secretary brought Ives' application to my attention, and knew that I intended to appoint him, his testimony alone, if he had told the facts, would have exonerated me. As I knew I was innocent, I relied upon the

truth to exonerate me and considered it unnecessary to bring in a witness of dubious value who had made threats against me and had been otherwise disloyal.

REPORTED FARLEY WILL OPPOSE MY REELECTION

I have been authentically informed that Farley and McAdoo are making political trades and commitments on patronage in my district, and, in addition, that they are actually grooming a candidate against me, in an endeavor to prevent my renomination.

A TRAVESTY ON JUSTICE

Clarence Darrow, the famous criminal lawyer, on the occasion of his seventy-ninth birthday, is quoted as saying:

There is no such thing as justice—in or out of the court.

As the trial which I recently underwent was the first experience of my lifetime as a witness or a participant in a jury trial, I am not in a position to controvert the opinion of such a distinguished jurist as Clarence Darrow. I do say, however, that I have the highest respect for the courts of our land and, even though one may err here or there, they are indeed the bulwark of our liberty, and I would be the last man to criticize them, even though I, an innocent man, am in this instance the victim of injustice through the courts. For the Supreme Court, which during the past 3 years has had placed upon it such an increasing burden of responsibility in the dispensation of justice and the maintenance of our free institutions, I have the highest regard, as I consider it the *ne plus ultra* in our proudly acclaimed courts of justice.

AN IMPARTIAL JURY IN WASHINGTON VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR A CONGRESSMAN

It is a recognized fact that the citizens of Washington generally have a prejudice against Congressmen, which is only natural, due to the fact that Washington residents themselves have no political liberty, they are constantly being harassed by congressional legislation, and in addition, Congressmen are extended certain privileges in Washington not vouchsafed to the average citizen. As a consequence, anyone in public life is, in a sense, prejudged, if he can be enmeshed in any manner in the political spider web of the District of Columbia courts.

There was enacted in the last session of Congress a bill authorizing the placing of Government employees, pensioners, and other governmental beneficiaries, on District of Columbia juries. To put it more plainly, patronage appointees were authorized for jury duty under this act, were freely drawn on jury panels, and did actually sit on juries in the District of Columbia in cases in which the Government was a party. Could an unprejudiced hearing reasonably be expected from a jury of this type, in a case where the Government was both judge and prosecutor and the Congressman on trial had invoked Farley's wrath because he would not be a "rubber stamp" in the New Deal? The jury under which I was tried included six individuals who had a direct or indirect contact with the Government.

Juries drawn and sitting, similar to mine, have since been declared unconstitutional by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and individuals, including an accused petty thief, have been remanded back for a new trial or the indictment against them quashed because of the unconstitutionality of the jury which found them guilty. The same Court of Appeals denied the motion of my attorneys for a rehearing on this very same point of the unconstitutionality of the jury, and, therefore, it will be necessary for me to go to the Supreme Court to secure the consideration which the Court of Appeals extended to an accused petty thief.

FACTS ABOUT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND HIS ASSISTANT

In order to get a true picture of my persecutors, it is only fair to state that the present district attorney, Leslie C. Garnett, was appointed on the recommendation of a prominent politician of Virginia who contributed handsomely to the Democratic campaign fund. It is also authentically reported that the national committeeman from California, Mr.

McAdoo, who is socially friendly with the United States Attorney General, Mr. Cummings, had a hand in the appointment of Mr. Garnett. Only last year a subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee voted to remove Mr. Garnett from office because of inefficiency. The matter was the cause of considerable furor in the city of Washington, and a Member of Congress who should know, personally informed me that patronage pressure was exerted by Mr. Farley to prevent the whole committee from asking for the removal of the district attorney. The power of patronage appears to have been very effective, as the report was eventually submitted by the committee with the sting removed, but the criticism of the district attorney's office remaining. The district attorney, therefore, had something to be grateful for.

When the War Department submitted the report to the Department of Justice on the alleged solicitation of a bribe, the best investigator in the Department of Justice was assigned to work on this case. He remained on the case throughout, and apparently, after having manufactured evidence against me, finally resorted to eavesdropping on the deliberations of the jury, the pertinent points of which I will discuss later.

THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND HIS ASSISTANT POLITICALLY AMBITIOUS

The district attorney aspires to a Federal judgeship, and David A. Pine, his assistant, who prosecuted the case against me, aspires to the district attorneyship in Washington. With this in mind, I wish to direct attention to certain facts pertaining to the assistant district attorney, David A. Pine.

In March 1935, several days after my indictment, I was visited at my office by Henry Bradshaw who sympathized with me, berated the indictment as unfair, and advised me that I should use dilatory tactics in going to trial as later on, I could get the indictment quashed for about \$300. He told me at the time that he was the brother-in-law of David A. Pine, the assistant district attorney, and that he himself was an attorney in the department of the Treasury. As my son was in Arizona at that time and I knew nothing of the charge, I told him that I was innocent and that I would pay nothing to quash the indictment, but that I would confer with my son to see whether he had been involved. He left, giving me his telephone number and telling me to call upon him for anything he could do for me. The case was tentatively set for June but as my son was employed in the West and I wished him to keep in employment as long as possible, I asked, through my attorneys, that the case be held over until the next term. Almost immediately after this request for a continuance, I was again visited by Henry Bradshaw, actually the brother-in-law of David A. Pine who prosecuted my case, as I later ascertained. He again suggested delay and that I could, no doubt, get the indictment quashed by paying around \$300.

ATTORNEYS REPORTED NO EVIDENCE AGAINST ME

In the meantime, my attorneys had reported to me that they had reliable information that the District Attorney's office admittedly had no evidence against me, but they did think they had evidence against my son, and my attorneys suggested that I permit my son to plead guilty and take a small fine and thus have the indictment against me quashed. I declined to be a party to such an agreement but, acting on this information, I engaged the services of another attorney to visit the district attorney's office to ascertain whether or not my information was correct and if so, if he could obtain a nolle-pros on the indictment. He reported that the district attorney would not nolle-pros my indictment. I left almost immediately thereafter for California.

Several days later, in my absence, the same Henry Bradshaw, brother-in-law of the assistant district attorney, called at my office and met my oldest son, Raymond W. Hoeppel, and the clerk of the committee of which I am chairman. He did not discuss quashing the indictment for pay with the clerk of the committee, but did suggest to my son that the case be further delayed, as later it would be easy to quash it for an amount.

These facts I transmitted to my attorneys, who advised me to ignore Mr. Bradshaw, which I did. My conclusion, and

apparently the inference which it was desired that I should make, was that Henry Bradshaw was in close contact with his brother-in-law, the assistant district attorney, Mr. Pine, but whether the assistant district attorney was involved in an attempted bribe solicitation, or whether the intention was to entrap me, knowing that there was no evidence against me in the indictment then pending, I can only surmise.

DISTRICT COURT OFFICIALS "FIX" JURY

When the jury in my case was being drawn the prosecution, knowing my veteran activities and my fight for the Townsend old-age-pension plan, questioned the prospective jurors as to their affiliations with the Townsend movement and whether or not they were in receipt of pension or compensation. There were three pensioners sitting in the jury box. One of them was challenged by the prosecution and removed. The bailiff of the court, then in session, approached one of the attorneys for my son and told him to remove from the box two individuals, stating to my son's attorney that these individuals were convicts, or "hangmen", and I could get no justice if they remained. My attorneys knew my veteran background and also knew that I was a veteran of the Spanish-American and World Wars, yet, without mentioning a word to me, my son's attorney removed a disabled Spanish War veteran and my own attorney removed another on the suggestion of the bailiff of the court, who, I believe, was acting under instructions from David A. Pine, the assistant district attorney, who was prosecuting the case.

I spoke later to one of the veterans removed from the jury, and he told me he had not served on a jury in that court before. There was no reason why he should have been accredited as a "hangman." I spoke to the other, who is an ex-marine receiving \$50 per month pension for Spanish War service, and he told me he thought he was removed because he was a veteran. Imagine, if you can, that I should be interested in removing from the jury men with whom I had served in 1898 and who, it might reasonably be anticipated, would weigh the evidence most carefully in a conscientious effort to give common justice to a comrade! I later spoke to one of these veterans removed from the jury, who remained throughout most of the trial, and he indicated to me that from what he had heard, there would never have been a verdict of "guilty" had he been on the jury. I did not discuss this matter with the other.

The verdict was rendered by the jury December 12. On December 14 the court bailiff throughout the trial—the same individual who helped "fix" the jury—called at my office in the House Office Building on three different occasions, which can be verified by five persons. He asked for money to go to the races to meet two of the jurors, indicating that there were irregularities in the jury discussions and that the information he would get would be valuable to me in a new trial. He not only suggested that I give him money, but also made a similar suggestion to the clerk of the War Claims Committee, of which I am chairman. I refused to consider any proposal of his; whereupon he then requested that my son, who was present in the office throughout the discussions, drive him to the races, as it was getting late and he had lost so much time coming to my office on three different occasions in an effort to see me personally. I also refused to permit my son to take him to the races to meet these jurors, as he alleged.

I leave to the judgment of those who read these facts whether or not I was given a fair trial by an impartially chosen jury.

ACTION OF THE JURORS IN THEIR DELIBERATIONS

The jury deliberations, as reported to me by one of the lady jurors, appear to have been very close to what may be considered as "rough-house" methods. I submit herewith an affidavit which was executed by this lady, a prominent lady of the city of Washington, an individual of culture, education, and distinct refinement. Because of the delicate nature of this lady's disability and her high standing in social and political life, her name and that of her husband, are withheld.

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL, FILED JANUARY
10, 1936

CITY OF WASHINGTON,

District of Columbia, ss:

_____, being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says that she was impaneled, sworn, and served as one of the trial jurors in the case of the United States against Charles J. Hoepel and John H. Hoepel, wherein they were jointly indicted on the charge of conspiracy to violate the statute of the United States and a verdict of guilty was rendered in said cause on Thursday night, December 12, 1935, and affiant states that the verdict as rendered was not a true and correct verdict and did not represent the judgment and honest conviction of this affiant but was and now is absolutely contrary to the judgment and conviction of affiant. That said verdict was secured and rendered insofar as affiant is concerned under absolute misapprehension as to the effect of said verdict and was procured under the conditions hereinafter set forth, that is to say:

That during the month of May, 1934, affiant was compelled to and did undergo a serious major operation, and suffered from a very serious major operation, and suffered from a very serious illness for more than a year prior to being impaneled as a juror in said cause; that said operation and her illness seriously affected her nervous system to such an extent that any protracted nervous strain or physical exertion rendered her weak and incapacitated and in such a physical and mental condition that she was unable to clearly consider or reason upon any matters submitted to her; that on the final day of said trial when court convened at approximately 10 o'clock a. m., and continued in constant session until about the hour of 6 o'clock p. m., of said date, except for 1 hour luncheon recess, and after said cause was submitted to the jury for consideration at about the hour of 6 o'clock p. m., she was compelled to remain closely confined with her fellow jurors until approximately 11 o'clock of said date, except for a very short time for supper; that in considering the facts in relation to said case and the law applicable thereto, affiant was kept almost constantly engaged in an argument and discussion in relation to said facts and law up until approximately 11:45 o'clock p. m., of said date, during which time affiant became not only physically but mentally exhausted and due to the hours of deliberation upon said facts and law and to the weakness and physical disability from which affiant was suffering, by reason of her aforesaid operation, it produced and brought about a mental condition thereby rendering her ill and bringing about an embarrassing physical condition seriously affecting her mind and rendered her unable to physically withstand the strain of her confinement and the argument incident to her jury service. Affiant becoming suddenly ill, as above stated, was compelled to leave the jury room and retire to the ladies' rest room where she remained suffering and in a highly nervous state of mind, with cold perspiration standing out almost over her entire body; that the fact of this sudden and embarrassing illness occurring at a time when she was serving on the jury with 10 men and only 1 woman rendered her situation extremely embarrassing.

That affiant was firmly convinced that the defendants were not guilty of the crime charged; and that she had been for hours, to the utmost of her ability, arguing for a verdict of not guilty; that upon being overcome by the illness described and the physical and mental strain under which she was then laboring, she was rendered wholly incapacitated and unable to maintain her position or to withstand longer the confinement under her then condition; that being firmly convinced of the innocence of the defendants, she insisted upon notifying the court that the jury was unable to agree, and in some instances she insisted upon asking for further instructions from the court in view of arguments presented by various jurors which she believed were contrary to the evidence and contrary to the court's instructions, but she was advised that she had no right to call for further instructions or to report the inability of the jurors to agree, and was further advised by the jurors and officers having the jury in charge that unless a verdict was speedily rendered, the jury would be locked up for the night. That at that time affiant was unfamiliar with jury service and believed that the locking of the jury for the night meant the confinement of the entire jury together until the following day; that in view of her then physical condition, and without proper facilities to care for herself, and being then in a highly nervous and serious mental condition, and firmly believing that she would be locked up for the night with all of the jurors together, and it being further stated that unless an agreement was reached within a few minutes, no verdict would be received by the court that night, affiant then stated that the defendants were not guilty, but she would concede that the defendant JOHN H. HOEPPEL had given an address in California where the witness Ives was not then living; that it was then stated by some of the jurors that that was all that was necessary; that if she did that, that would be sufficient.

She then stated that she would vote that he was guilty of that fact only, and any vote or consent to any verdict was simply to the fact that the said JOHN H. HOEPPEL had given that address; that the foreman of the jury thereupon stated that the jury had agreed and were then shortly thereafter conducted into court, where a verdict of guilty was announced; that affiant, then being unfamiliar with court practice and what were her rights as a juror, asked of the juror standing next to her if the verdict as being rendered meant that they were guilty of the crime charged, and being advised that that was what the verdict meant, she then asked if she didn't have a right to state that that was not her verdict.

but the juror promptly advised her that she couldn't change her vote and would have to agree to the verdict; that, relying upon the statements of the jurors, when her name was called and she was asked if the verdict as announced was her verdict, she then reluctantly answered "Yes", at the same time nearly collapsed, and was then in such a nervous and serious physical and mental condition that she had absolutely no control over herself; that upon the jury being dismissed, affiant immediately left the courtroom, accompanied by her husband; that before leaving the building she was in a complete stupor and wholly oblivious to her surroundings, or where she was, or what she was doing, and remained in this condition for practically 1 hour; that she was taken home by her husband and was in a highly nervous and excited condition during the balance of the night and fully unable to secure any rest or to compose herself; that she had for more than a year been under the care of Dr. Charles Suraci, of the city of Washington, and one of the physicians who had assisted at the time of her major operation, but she was unable to communicate with him on that night or the day following, but did finally communicate with him on the second day following the rendering of said verdict in said cause, but prior thereto affiant communicated with Dr. Taylor, who was the surgeon and physician who operated on affiant and who was familiar with her condition, and again sought his advice and assistance in her then nervous and ill condition.

That when she was finally able to confer with Dr. Suraci she was still in a highly nervous and excited condition as a result of said jury service and the fact that she had under the circumstances above stated joined in a verdict of guilty of the offense charged; that Dr. Suraci, on visiting affiant, advised her that she was in no condition for any jury service and that service of that kind had a decided ill effect upon her nervous system and that any further service would seriously jeopardize her health.

That affiant was at the time of the rendition of said verdict and ever since has been absolutely convinced of the innocence of said defendants upon the charge preferred and that said verdict as rendered did not represent her honest convictions and never would have been in any sense consented to except under the circumstances and conditions hereinbefore set forth; that had it not been for her physical condition and extreme mental strain under which she was then laboring and the fact that she was misled by the statements made to her by her fellow jurors she would never have joined in said verdict and that she verily believed when asked by the clerk of the court if this was her verdict that she had no right to state that she did not consent to the verdict and further, affiant states that in her then mental condition she was wholly incapacitated and in no sense capable of exercising her independent judgment in said action:

That the day following the rendition of said verdict, and when she then appreciated the great wrong and injustice of said verdict and the great wrong and injustice she had done the defendants, she, without any solicitation by any person whatsoever, requested her husband to immediately communicate the facts above set forth to the attorneys for said defendants, which she is advised that he immediately did; and within 2 days after said verdict was rendered, affiant, as soon as she felt she was able to talk and discuss the facts in relation to said case and the circumstances under which the verdict was rendered, voluntarily telephoned to Samuel A. King, one of the attorneys for said defendants, and stated that she desired to make known said facts to the court in order, if possible, to right the wrong which she felt had been done to said defendants and each of them; that she communicated all the foregoing facts to said attorney and now makes this affidavit freely and voluntarily and for the purpose of advising the court fully with relation to the circumstances and conditions under which said verdict was rendered.

This affiant further states that she is still firmly convinced of the innocence of said defendants on the charge on which they were tried and now makes this affidavit in order that justice may be done; and further affiant saith not.

Signed (Name withheld.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of January 1936.

GERTRUDE E. ROWEN,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.
My commission expires October 1, 1939.

This affidavit speaks volumes on this subject and it is confirmed on a point of vital importance by the affidavit of 11 of the jurors, which was executed a month after the trial, wherein they state, in reference to the lady, that—

During the course of the deliberations she suggested that the jury obtain the exhibits and transcript and was informed by the foreman that this was not possible.

They further state that—

She suggested that the court give them further instructions as to the three overt acts charged—

which the foreman of the jury would not permit.

Here we have an instance of a jury arriving at a decision without examining the exhibits and transcript of the trial and, apparently, according to their admission, they found my son and me guilty of conspiracy because my son, in December 1933, was appointed to West Point from the same address from which Ives was appointed in May 1934, at which Ives was not actually residing.

The absurdity of this is apparent in view of the fact that the War Department itself prints lists of congressional vacancies for West Point and gives them to interested applicants, indiscriminately, regardless of their districts of residence. Colonel Bamberger knew Ives was not a resident of my district when he sent him to me for assistance, and General Conley knew it when he enlisted Colonel Bamberger's aid in finding a vacancy for the boy, and specifically suggested HOEPPEL. The fact is that the requirement of residence is a mere pro-forma matter, and has never been more than theoretically enforced.

Several days after the trial this lady called up my wife on the telephone and told her that she wished to make amends for the great injury she had done me. She stated that she had joined in the verdict through a misapprehension and had not been able to sleep or rest since the trial, except through the use of sedatives, and that she never at any time believed me to be guilty.

I did not see this lady personally or converse with her until May 26 of this year, and she then informed me that she demanded the exhibits and transcript in order to clarify points in controversy and prove to the jurors that I was innocent, but they refused to ask for this evidence and would not permit her to leave the room when she attempted to see the bailiff.

During the deliberations of the jury she noted that the Government investigator, Mr. Loeb, who assembled the evidence for the Government and who sat throughout the trial with the prosecution, was hanging out an upper window across from the jury room in such a position as to be able to look down upon the jury, apparently listening to their deliberations. She called attention to his eavesdropping attitude and demanded that the bailiff be asked to make this Government investigator withdraw. This was done and after that the jury room window was closed.

The judge, in his charge to the jury, stated:

A conspiracy is a mental thing. It is where two people expressly or informally or tacitly understand and have the understanding between them that they wish to accomplish a project that is unlawful in itself or that unlawful means are going to be used to accomplish it. That is conspiracy. It is a state of mind in common between two parties toward a certain unlawful act or a lawful act to be carried out in an unlawful way.

Can you imagine a jury, headed by a domineering garage mechanic, being qualified to judge as to the mental state between myself and my son when I made this nomination as a favor to ranking War Department officials?

During the deliberations of the jury, according to my information, it was disclosed that some of the jurors demanded a verdict in the fear that a hung jury would imperil their standing as jurors. They thus appeared to be more interested in drawing pay for continued jury service than in arriving at a fair verdict. I am informed that some of the jurors stated, moreover, that the judge had specifically instructed them not to return without a verdict, and they would not call for instructions on this when such were demanded by the lady who executed the foregoing affidavit.

As time wore on while the lady juror maintained my innocence and refused to be influenced by any consideration other than justice, some of the jurors took off their shoes and their coats, unloosed their ties and shirts, and said they could stay all night there if she could stand it. At 11 o'clock the bailiff stated that they were to be locked up for the night, but the foreman requested 5 minutes more. The lady juror states she told the foreman that she would never arrive at a verdict of guilty, as she believed me innocent; but under duress and in fear of being forced to remain in that environment all night, she did agree that the address given was not the actual Ives address, but with the understanding that that was the only point which she did concede. There was no final ballot taken on the question of guilt or innocence, according to the lady juror; and she told me that, exhausted and ill as she was, she did not realize until too late that her agreement on that one point was being used as an agreement to a verdict of guilty. When the jury was polled, this lady failed to answer her name, whereupon one of the jurors nudged her and told her, "Say

"guilty", which she reluctantly did and burst into tears, since she was on the verge of collapse.

This fact is confirmed by the following affidavits of two spectators and could have been confirmed by a dozen. The affidavit of the husband, as to the condition of his wife when the jury was discharged also follows, as well as that of the family physician, their names being withheld in order that publicity may not be directed against this lady who, in the interest of justice, voluntarily made the affidavit quoted.

AFFIDAVIT FILED JANUARY 10, 1936

District of Columbia, ss.:

George K. Frey, Jr., of 1711 Thirteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C., being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says that he was in Criminal Court No. 1 on December 12, 1935, from the time the jury retired in the case of Congressman HOEPPEL until the time the jury was discharged. The jury retired about 5:30 p. m. and were discharged about 11:30 or 11:45 p. m. He was seated in the front of the courtroom when the jury came in to report and noticed that one of the ladies on the jury was crying. When the jury was polled he noticed that this lady hesitated to answer and the man next to her touched or pushed her on the arm and said "say guilty." After some hesitation she answered "guilty" and then broke into tears again. The thing was so noticeable that I called it to the attention of several of the spectators present in the courtroom. He further swears that this description is exactly his version of what happened in the courtroom on the night in question and will be gladly testified to at any time.

GEORGE K. FREY, JR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of January, A. D. 1936.

FRED R. MILLER,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires February 15, 1937.

AFFIDAVIT FILED JANUARY 10, 1936

District of Columbia, ss.:

James J. Laughlin, of 1804 Kilbourne Place NW, District of Columbia, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says:

"I was in Criminal Court No. 1 during the early evening and night of December 12, 1935, awaiting the return of the jury in the above-entitled case.

"I was present in the courtroom when the jury filed in and returned the verdict. In fact, the members of the jury were within 5 or 6 feet of me.

"I recall distinctly that, after the request was made by the attorney for the defense that the jury be polled, and as I watched the response of each member of the jury, a lady on the jury was reached, and I noticed that she was in tears and failed to respond to her name when it was called. The man next to her looked at her sharply and also nudged her and said, 'Say "guilty." ' After some hesitation, she then responded 'guilty' in a very weak and feeble voice and again broke out in tears.

"This is a statement of the actual occurrence as seen and heard by me, and I will gladly testify to this effect at any time and at any place."

JAMES J. LAUGHLIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of January, A. D. 1936.

FRED R. MILLER,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires February 15, 1937.

AFFIDAVIT FILED JANUARY 10, 1936

CITY OF WASHINGTON,

District of Columbia, ss.:

_____, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that he is a citizen of the United States, over the age of 21 years, and resides at Washington, D. C., and is the husband of _____, who served as one of the jurors in the above-entitled case; that he was present in court on Thursday night, December 12, 1935, when the verdict was rendered in said cause; that he was waiting in the courtroom expecting to accompany his wife home in the event a verdict was reached in said cause and she was dismissed from further service in connection with said cause; that he observed his wife as the jury was brought into the courtroom and while she was standing with the other jurors at the time the verdict was rendered and while the jurors were being polled and noticed particularly at that time that his wife appeared to be in a nervous condition, was swaying back and forth as though practically unable to stand and was very pale; he further observed and noted that it was with apparent difficulty that she answered that the verdict as rendered was her verdict and immediately thereafter affiant joined his wife and accompanied her out of the courthouse; that he then found that she was in an extremely nervous condition, and when she got outside of said building was oblivious to her surroundings.

That while she had been attending court for several days prior thereto and had driven her automobile to the courthouse each day and had parked it at the same place each time, she did not know where she was, where her car was, and apparently did not understand anything that was taking place around her; that it was nearly an hour before his wife apparently came to appreciate

her surroundings and before she was able to locate her car; that affiant drove his wife home in her automobile and she was then in an extreme highly nervous and excited condition; that he was required to render her constant care and attention for several hours; that in her then weakened and nervous condition both affiant and his wife endeavored to communicate with Dr. Charles Suraci, who for more than a year had been the personal physician of his said wife and who had been one of the attending physicians at a time about the month of May 1934 when she had to undergo a major operation; affiant further states that as soon as his said wife became in a condition where she apparently understood the nature and effect of the verdict which she had joined in rendering she immediately advised affiant that she did not at any time believe defendants or either of them were guilty; that she had then done a great wrong and insisted that affiant at once communicate with the attorneys for the defendants and advise them of the facts and circumstances under which she had joined in said verdict and that she had never intended to vote for a verdict of guilty.

Affiant further states that after the rendition of said verdict his wife remained in a highly nervous condition for several days and had to have not only the advice and attention of Dr. Suraci but also of Dr. L. H. Taylor, who had been one of the attending physicians and surgeons at the time of her operation.

Affiant further states that in response to the insistent demands of his wife he communicated, on the 13th day of December 1935, the facts above set forth to Samuel A. King, one of the attorneys for the defendants in this action; that affiant has no interest in this case and is in no manner related to either of the defendants or to their counsel, and makes this statement freely and voluntarily and in order that the truth in respect to this matter may be known, and further affiant saith not.

(Signed) [Name withheld.]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of January 1936.

GERTRUDE E. ROWEN,
Notary Public, D. C.

My commission expires October 1, 1939.

AFFIDAVIT FILED JANUARY 10, 1936

Dr. Charles Suraci, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that he is a citizen of the United States, over the age of 21 years, and resides at Washington, D. C.; that he is a duly licensed physician and has been practicing his profession in said city of Washington; that he is personally acquainted with Mrs. ——, who served as one of the jurors in the above-entitled cause; that for many months prior to said service he had rendered professional services to her and knew that she had passed through a siege of serious illness and had undergone a serious major operation which had greatly affected her nervous condition and nervous system; that shortly after her jury service terminated in the above-entitled cause, affiant was called upon professionally to care for and treat her again and then found that said jury service had had a decided ill effect upon her nervous stability and that she was in a very nervous condition and apparently worried and concerned over the verdict in which she had joined in said cause; that affiant, noting her condition at that time, advised against her attempting to render any further service as the same was in no sense conducive to her good health but upon the contrary was greatly detrimental thereto.

Affiant further states that said major operation which she had undergone rendered her extremely susceptible to any nervous strain or excitement and in such a condition, in the judgment of this affiant, she was mentally incapable of rendering proper service in respect to matters of importance and which would of necessity be submitted to her consideration.

Further, affiant states that during the summer of 1935 the said Mrs. —— also suffered from a serious illness that required proper medical attention for several months and the illness from which she suffered was also of such a nature and character as to affect seriously her nervous system and render her easily susceptible to any excitement or worry or mental exertion, and also was of such a nature and character as would weaken her mental resistance and place her in such condition that with a rather prolonged nervous strain, or under conditions where she was required to exercise mental exertion, that would render her in such condition that she could not withstand such strain or mental exertion and would place her in a condition whereby she could be easily influenced or persuaded and where she could not exercise her usual independent freedom of mental judgment.

Affiant makes this affidavit freely and voluntarily in order that the truth in respect to the condition of said Mrs. —— may be known; and further affiant saith not.

CHARLES SURACI.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of January 1936.

GERTRUDE E. ROWEN,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires October 1, 1939.

JUROR THREATENED BY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Through a manner unknown to me, the district attorney's office became aware of the fact that the lady juror intended to submit an affidavit on the subject involved. This lady's husband, at the request of an attorney who is a friend of the family, met another young attorney in a hotel in the

city of Washington, who suggested that the affidavit not be signed as he had been informed that David A. Pine, the assistant district attorney, had warned that if she did sign it she would be indicted for perjury, would be brought into court for the most intimate questioning, and the details of her case spread in headlines in the press. Notwithstanding this threat, this lady and her husband, in the interest of justice, executed the affidavits. Because of the personal confidence between this lady and her husband and their attorney friend, through whom the meeting was arranged in the hotel, and in view of the further fact that the husband of the lady is engaged in a business which might suffer in the event undue publicity was given to this, I have been requested not to divulge names. The facts, however, speak for themselves, and their implication is all too apparent—that the action of the district attorney's office here in the city of Washington is not in the interest of justice in my case, but in the interest of persecution, and I insist that any fair-minded individual must admit that the attempted suppression of information, vital to my interests, is indeed more than reprehensible and unfair.

The attitude of the assistant district attorney, David A. Pine, is further shown by the court record whereby, when the attorneys went to the bench, Mr. Pine was surreptitiously reading the notes of my counsel. My counsel censured him then and there, in the presence of the judge, for such conduct, which any man must admit is highly unethical and dishonorable.

In his final summation to the jury, Mr. Pine twisted my direct statements in order to prejudice the jury. Moreover, in what can only be interpreted as an admission that the case against me would not stand on its merits, he further disregarded the principles of honor and justice, and stated to the jury that I was a "monumental liar and a perjurer of the first water", which remarks he did not withdraw but sought to justify as having been invited by the remarks of my own counsel. The judge instructed the jury to disregard his prejudicial remarks, remarks in which he accused me of a crime without any basis for so doing, but I submit to all honorable citizens whether such remarks made by a Government prosecutor before a jury, with no higher degree of intelligence than some of the jurors in my case exemplified, could be removed from their minds in considering a verdict. In other words, the assistant district attorney was apparently out to make a case and, recognizing that the facts and the evidence would not sustain him in his efforts, he resorted to vilification and unsupported accusations in order to influence the jury against me. I mention these facts so it may be known through what means David A. Pine aspires to a district attorneyship or judgeship through the efforts of Mr. Farley—or was he, perchance, aggrieved because I would not deal with his brother-in-law and pay cash to have the indictment quashed?

THE ATTITUDE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE DEFINITELY UNFAIR

My attorneys acted as gentlemen in their conduct with the office of the district attorney, but that office took advantage of their gentlemanly attitude and permitted us to go to trial, not knowing that they had a secret card up their sleeve which they would use in an unfair manner. My attorneys believed that we were to be tried on both indictments—that is, the indictment charging actual solicitation—and requiring actual evidence—as well as the indictment charging conspiracy—but instead my attorneys were forced to go ahead with the trial on the charge of conspiracy only, which as has been shown rested on the presumption of a "state of mind." The prosecution was apparently afraid to bring me to trial on the substantive offense, as they knew they could prove nothing—that they had absolutely no evidence against me—but they did hope that they might influence a compliant jury to condemn me on the basis of a supposed "mental state" existing between my son and me in connection with this nomination.

Despite my repeated requests for trial on the actual offense, this opportunity to establish my innocence was denied me although when I went into court on May 15 and

demanded trial, the assistant district attorney, in opposing my demands, said, referring to the indictment for actual solicitation:

We still feel that this other case is a case that should be prosecuted.

Notwithstanding this statement, however, they refused to bring me to trial on the substantive offense, and finally, went before the court and quashed the indictment, over my vigorous protest, thus confessing to the world that they had nothing to substantiate their charge. They held the indictment over me for months, however, and only quashed it when the court of appeals sustained the verdict of guilty of an unlawful mental state, which verdict, as I will show later, is completely at variance with the true record of the case. May I ask if the district attorney's office on May 15 still felt that this other case was a case that should be prosecuted, why did they retreat over my vigorous opposition and quash the indictment? For no other reason, it appears, than that they knew, without a question of a doubt, that I was indicted without evidence. Such is the administration of justice in the district attorney's office in Washington, D. C., and the district attorney may be rewarded with a judgeship and the assistant district attorney, David A. Pine, may eventually be appointed district attorney, an office which I am informed he covets before his present boss was appointed.

ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENCE TO SUSTAIN CONSPIRACY VERDICT

As the data which I have presented shows, the jury came to the conclusion of "guilty" on a basis of a similarity of address of my son and Ives, who were appointed 6 months apart, on the trade I made with Congressman Burke and which he admitted that he solicited from me.

It is apparent from the decision of the court of appeals that they did not examine into the question of evidence but relied upon the jury decision, which decision was contrary to the evidence and was arrived at, as I have shown, under duress. I shall not go into the details of the testimony. Suffice it to say that on 35 different occasions, Ives, the principal Government witness, confessed his inability to remember essential facts or contradicted himself. Notwithstanding that he signed his written resignation in my office, he even denied on the stand that the reasons which he subscribed to were those which he gave when he called on me at my office on June 5. The statements which he claims to have made in my office to me on that occasion were denied by me and my denial was corroborated by my older son who was present at the time. Ives' testimony was further impeached by the testimony of the Government's own witnesses, Congressman Burke and Mrs. Redmond, his secretary.

To me one of the most despicable incidents of the entire trial was the attempt of the prosecution to implicate my wife in the case as a party to the alleged conspiracy. Even the prosecuting attorney apparently recognized the absurdity of attempting to involve Mrs. Hoeppel and declined to cross-question her on the stand.

The conversation which Ives had with me in my office occurred on June 5—5 days after his nomination. Yet on this uncorroborated testimony of Ives, which was impeached by my own testimony, my older son's, my wife's, and that of the Government's own witnesses, I was convicted of conspiracy. In other words, the jury accepted the unsupported and contradictory testimony of a boy whom I had befriended, and who, by his own confession, had planned an unlawful transaction, and absolutely disregarded the testimony of myself, my oldest son, my wife, and other Government witnesses. I submit to any reasonable-minded person if this is justice.

Press representatives, who were present throughout the trial and heard the testimony, were so confident of acquittal that while awaiting the jury's verdict they requested from me a preacquittal statement, in order to save time in getting their stories to press when the verdict was announced.

IVES' TESTIMONY FORCED

I have been creditably informed that Ives himself did not wish to prosecute the charge against me but was forced to

continue by the War Department and the Department of Justice.

During the many years of my service in the Army, I was led to respect and honor the officers over me and the enlisted men with whom I served. I wish at this time to reaffirm my respect for them, and to thank the many of them who, in my present difficulty, have expressed their confidence in my integrity.

It is common knowledge, however, that we have bureaucrats in the War and Navy Departments, the same as we do in other Government departments here, who are jealous of their privileges and who ruthlessly purge any individual who comes in conflict with their racketeering raids on the Treasury.

The bureaucrats in the General Staff of the Army, who are opposed to free speech, proceeded against one of their own generals, General Hagood, because he had the temerity to speak the truth before a congressional committee, which injustice was partially corrected through his reinstatement by the President, but the stigma of dictatorial disciplinary action on the part of the General Staff, if not that of the administration, must remain.

THIRTY-EIGHT YEARS' EXPERIENCE WITH THE ARMY

Since 1898, when I volunteered in the Spanish-American War, I have been a close student of the Army. I am a firm believer in national defense but I oppose the profligate spending of the taxpayers' money. In addition, as an enlisted man myself, I have consistently fought for the enlisted men, and I have not hesitated to expose the racketeering methods employed by certain officers who are more concerned with garnering to themselves additional privileges than they are in giving common justice to the enlisted men.

Long before my indictment, certain officers of the War Department betrayed their antagonism to me by frustrating my legitimate attempts to secure information and when the Ives incident arose, they were quick to take advantage of an opportunity to eliminate an individual who knew the racket of the General Staff and who opposed it in the interest of the people.

HIGH OFFICERS WERE INTERESTED IN IVES

Major General Malone of the Third Corps Area at Baltimore was interested in Ives. He sent a personal letter to General Conley, The Adjutant General, who in turn directed Colonel Bamberger to assist Ives to an appointment and out of 435 Congressmen, General Conley only referred to "HOEPPEL" by name. As Colonel Bamberger had been kind to me when I was an enlisted man under his command at Arcadia, and as The Adjutant General was denying me certain rights which I theretofore had enjoyed from the War Department, and as I myself was interested in football and Ives was an athlete, I nominated him to West Point on their request. Ives' application to me carried a footnote in the handwriting of Colonel Bamberger advising my secretary that General Conley was interested in this appointment.

ARMY OFFICIALS ACTIVE IN OBTAINING FOOTBALL PLAYERS

The interest which the Army has in obtaining football stars at West Point is plainly shown in a communication received from Major General Connor, superintendent at West Point, who stated:

Neither can I see that there could be any improper connection whatsoever between an interview of one of our coaches with the coach at Johns Hopkins University, and an effort to obtain an appointment to West Point for Mr. Ives.

The above confirms the fact that coaches from West Point had approached the coach at Johns Hopkins in the interest of Ives and that high Army officials wished his appointment.

It is natural that under these circumstances they should appeal to an Army man in Congress to assist them in behalf of Ives, which I did, for the reasons stated. However, on the witness stand both General Conley and Colonel Bamberger denied any personal interest in Ives. In addition General Conley claimed he was unable to locate any of the correspondence between himself and General Malone which

prompted his action in behalf of Ives, and which doubtless would clearly have established the personal interest of these high officers in the Ives appointment.

IVES CONTRADICTED HIS SIGNED RESIGNATION

Ives tendered to me his written resignation, signed by him, stating that he was resigning "for personal reasons." He repudiated his written resignation on the witness stand. The fact is that shortly after that time he married, which, in my opinion, was one of the personal reasons for his resignation, as married men are not admitted to West Point.

IN SOME INSTANCES WEST POINT AND ANNAPOLIS APPOINTMENTS ARE RACKETS

I have documentary evidence to show the interest that the War Department has in some appointments to West Point, and especially in the sons of some of the high-ranking officers on duty here in Washington. However, in order to maintain the honor and prestige of the Army, with which I have been associated since a youth of 17, I shall refrain from making any specific statements on this subject. I am of the opinion that appointments to West Point should be free and open to all citizens, regardless of pull, prestige, or money, and with this in view I appeared before the Military Affairs Committee long before my indictment, recommending that West Point appointments be taken from Congressmen. I insert in the RECORD at this point an article taken from the editorial page of the Washington Star of February 24, 1935, which article is a direct statement of my attitude on appointments to West Point and Annapolis.

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

By Will P. Kennedy

Proposal to change the method of appointing young men to the United States Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis, so as to require 1 year's service as an enlisted man before any youth would be eligible for appointment, received very serious consideration during the past week by the Military Affairs Committee of the House. It was disclosed that both Chairman VINSON, of the Naval Affairs Committee, and Chairman McSWAIN, of the Military Affairs Committee, are in favor of the proposed change. Several members of the latter committee complained that all that candidates for these two service academies want is a free education in engineering, and that they will take either branch of the service they can make, and have no intention of making a career in either the Army or Navy.

The suggestion was voiced by Representative JOHN H. HOEPPEL, of California, who claims to be a "graduate of the university of hard knocks", and who served in the Army 20 years as an enlisted man and 20 months as an officer. He saw service both in the Spanish-American and World Wars. Rather than burden the retired list of the service with a large number of officers, the possibilities should be considered, HOEPPEL said, of obtaining adequate national defense without undue taxation. He argued that at least 50 percent, if not all, of the appointments to West Point and Annapolis be made from selections within the enlisted ranks. Designation for appointments, he said, could be made by Members of Congress from a selected group of 10 to 20 candidates whom each Congressman would be called upon to nominate for 1-year enlistment in the Army or Navy. At the end of each year competitive examinations could be held of each of these groups, with selection from the three highest for appointment to Annapolis or West Point.

With a procedure of this kind, MR. HOEPPEL urged, only the most deserving and apt would be eligible for a subsequent 4 years' training at the service academies, from which they should emerge as unusually qualified officers, with an experience of inestimable value based on their previous enlistment. This would democratize and popularize the Army and Navy, he told his colleagues. Every high school, college, and university in each congressional district would gladly furnish a list of qualified applicants for such enlisted training and subsequent consideration for entry to West Point or Annapolis. Enlisted men failing to secure appointment to the academies might be reenlisted for an additional year for special training along the lines of the Plattsburg officers' training course, to qualify these young men for commission in the Reserve Corps.

As an incentive for graduates of high schools, colleges, and universities to remain in the enlisted service for a second year for this special reserve training, a substantial increase in compensation was suggested.

Only the most virile, apt, and qualified young men would thus be selected for appointment to the service academies, Mr. HOEPPEL pointed out. The 4,000 or more outstanding American youths in this category, each year absorbing a special 1 year's course of training to qualify them as Reserve officers, would add to the efficiency of the officer personnel and would give to the service a constantly recurring officer personnel whose activities in the interest of defense could be anticipated over a period of at least 30 years, without subjecting the country to an inordinate retirement burden as would occur if additional officer personnel is absorbed into the regular establishments.

During my service as a Representative I have appointed two boys to West Point and three to Annapolis. At this time I have one vacancy for West Point and one for Annapolis. The total number which a Congressman may have at the academies is seven. I thus have two vacancies at the present time.

To this day I have never seen the parent or parents of the boys I appointed to West Point; neither have I seen the boys themselves. I insert here affidavits which speak for themselves on this question.

EXACT COPY—AFFIDAVIT

Before me, a notary public in and for the county of Los Angeles, State of California, personally appears Mrs. Beatrice Frost of 505 North Sunset Boulevard, Temple City, California, who, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

That Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL appointed her son, Joseph H. Frost, to the United States Military Academy at West Point, in 1935;

That this appointment was made as a result of a competitive examination in which her son, Joseph H. Frost, competed;

That the appointment was made by Congressman HOEPPEL without any solicitation on his part or on the part of any representative or agent for him, for any remuneration or consideration for such appointment; and

That neither she nor her son was personally acquainted with or had met Congressman HOEPPEL prior to the time that he appointed affiant's son nor have they met him to this date.

(Signed) Mrs. BEATRICE FROST.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of November 1935.

[SEAL]

(Signed) RURIC A. CHILSON,
Notary Public.

My commission expires October 3, 1936.

EXACT COPY—AFFIDAVIT

Before me, a notary public in and for the County of _____, State of New York, personally appeared Joseph Harold Frost, who, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

That Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL appointed him to the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1935;

That this appointment was made a result of a competitive examination in which he competed;

That the appointment was made by Congressman HOEPPEL without any solicitation on the part of Congressman HOEPPEL, or on the part of any representative or agent for him, for any remuneration or consideration from the affiant or his mother in return for such appointment; and

That neither the affiant nor his mother was personally acquainted with or had met Congressman HOEPPEL prior to the time that he appointed the affiant, nor have they met him to this date.

JOSEPH H. FROST.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of November 1935.

E. D. Post,
Captain, Infantry, Summary Court.

EXACT COPY

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CONSTRUCTING QUARTERMASTER,

UNITED STATES ARMY,

Fort Mason, San Francisco, Calif., November 1, 1935.
Hon. JOHN H. HOEPPEL,
M. C. from the Twelfth District of California,
Arcadia, Calif.

DEAR MR. HOEPPEL: S sometime last spring a representative of the Department of Justice looked me up and said that they had accidentally stumbled on some major at Baltimore that claimed you said I had contributed substantially to your campaign fund. I told the man I had never dreamed of such a thing, and he said he believed you had made some such statement just to get rid of him.

Fact of the matter is you were the logical one for me to apply to for an appointment, as I was originally a resident of your district and my boys were there as infants.

When I received a list of vacancies from the Adjutant General I noticed you still had two vacancies and there was a little red arrow in front of your name.

This is the only communication we have ever had with you relative to the appointment.

With best regards, I am sincerely,

(Signed) S. W. HULSE,
Captain, Quartermaster Corps,
3424 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, Calif.

EXACT COPY—AFFIDAVIT

Before me, a notary public in and for the county of San Francisco, State of California, personally appeared Capt. Seward W. Hulse, who, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

That Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL appointed his son, Allen Douglas Hulse to the United States Military Academy at West Point some time in 1934;

That at no time did Congressman HOEPPEL, or anyone acting for him or as his representative, solicit his son or himself for any contribution of any kind; and

That to this day neither the affiant nor his son, to the best of his knowledge and belief, have ever seen Congressman HOEPPEL. Further the affiant saith not.

SEWARD W. HULSE,

Captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this second day of November 1935.

RAYMOND T. DONOHUE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 14, 1939.

I had under contemplation for appointment to my pending West Point vacancy Merritt L. Hewitt, an enlisted man now on duty at Fort Scott, Calif., who attained the highest rating in my civil-service examination this year. The father of this boy was killed in an airplane accident in the Army. Inasmuch as the boy has now obtained a Presidential appointment through his unusual ability and high scholastic standing, as shown by the following letter, I will continue to have a vacancy for West Point:

WEST POINT PREPARATORY SCHOOL,
Fort Winfield Scott, Calif., May 25, 1935.

The Honorable J. H. HOEPPEL, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEPPEL: I received your telegram this morning. I wish to thank you for your courtesy in looking up that matter for me. Last Tuesday I received unofficial word that I was to be admitted to West Point. That information was contained in a telegram to the school and contained a great many names, and so I believed there was a possibility of an error. Especially since every other candidate whom the telegram said was to be admitted received official word by last Friday. However they were all congressional appointees, and it must be that it takes the War Department longer to prepare the information concerning Presidential nominees.

Needless to say I am very happy to have at last made the grade. My goal has always been West Point. Again thanking you, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

MERRITT L. HEWITT.

Of the three whom I appointed to Annapolis, as shown by the affidavits, I had not seen the father or the boy in one instance and to this day, have not yet seen the boy. I insert here the affidavits in reference to these appointments:

EXACT COPY—AFFIDAVIT

Before me, a notary public in and for the county of Los Angeles, State of California, personally appears Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Ball, of 207 North Temple Street, Temple City, Calif., who, being duly sworn, depose and state as follows:

That Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL appointed their son, Alex Ball, to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, in 1934;

That this appointment was made as a result of a competitive examination in which their son, Alex Ball, competed; and

That the appointment was made by Congressman HOEPPEL without any solicitation on his part or on the part of any representative or agent for him, for any remuneration or consideration for such appointment.

DANIEL N. BALL.
HELEN BALL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of October 1935.

[SEAL]
ROY TEETERS, *Notary Public.*
My commission expires February 20, 1936.

EXACT COPY—AFFIDAVIT

Before me, a notary public in and for the county of Los Angeles, State of California, personally appeared Eleanor Kaysing, of 1109 Fair Oaks Avenue, South Pasadena, Calif., who, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

That Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL appointed her son, Charles Kaysing, to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1935;

That this appointment was made as a result of a competitive examination in which her son, Charles Kaysing, competed; and

That the appointment was made by Congressman HOEPPEL without any solicitation on his part or on the part of any representative or agent for him, for any remuneration or consideration for such appointment.

ELEANOR KAYSING.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of October 1935.

[SEAL]
DORIS M. BUCKMAN.
My commission expires February 20, 1939.

CITY OF ALHAMBRA,
Alhambra, Calif.

AFFIDAVIT

Before me, a notary public in and for the county of Los Angeles, State of California, personally appeared Val Woodbury, mayor of

the city of Alhambra, Alhambra, Calif., who, being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

That Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL appointed his son, William W. Woodbury, to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1934;

That this appointment was made as a result of a competitive examination in which his son, William W. Woodbury, competed; and

That the appointment was made by Congressman HOEPPEL without any solicitation on his part or on the part of any representative or agent for him, for any remuneration or consideration for such appointment.

Affiant further states:

That neither he nor his son was personally acquainted with or had ever met Congressman HOEPPEL prior to the time that he appointed affiant's son.

VAL. WOODBURY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2d day of November 1935.

[SEAL]

EDWARD D. NELSON,
Notary Public.

All of the appointments I have made, with but one exception, were made as a result of a competitive civil-service examination, Mr. Frost, at West Point, heading the list one year, Mr. Ball, at Annapolis, another year, and the others all making high passing marks. Two of the boys whom I appointed are fatherless, one of them being the son of an Indian war veteran.

For my existing Annapolis vacancy I have nominated Norman Krasney, of Belvedere, never having seen either him or his father. It was reported to me that Krasney's father is an invalid and that the boy is working his way through school. He was recommended to me by his instructors and by friends in Belvedere, and I am hopeful that he will be admitted to Annapolis on July 1.

In further affirmation of the fact that I was not concerned with any monetary consideration in making appointments to West Point and Annapolis, I submit additional affidavits on this subject:

POST OF FORT MONROE,

County of Elizabeth City, State of Virginia, ss:

Personally appeared before me one Robert C. Garrett, lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

"That, early in the year of 1933, Congressman J. H. HOEPPEL, of the Twelfth District of California, informed me that the Robert Loghry Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, had requested that he appoint my son to the United States Military Academy. Congressman HOEPPEL stated that he would do everything that he could to secure me this appointment. Later, through the personal efforts of Congressman HOEPPEL, I received a first alternate appointment, with Charles Hoepel appointed as the principal. Congressman HOEPPEL stated that if his son passed the examination that he would appoint my son as principal on another appointment he had.

"Both boys failed in this examination. However, my son failed by such a slight margin that I requested Congressman HOEPPEL to use his influence to have this waived, but, on further consideration on my part, withdrew this request, as I felt my son could not remain at the academy.

"The failure of my son to pass the required examination prevented Congressman HOEPPEL from appointing him to the Military Academy.

"Congressman HOEPPEL offered to appoint my son to the Military Academy without having received, or solicited, any consideration of any kind from either myself or any other member of my family, and to the best of my knowledge and belief was entirely voluntary on his part, having been initiated by the Robert Loghry Post.

"If I were called as a witness in court, I would testify to the above.

"Further deponent saith not.

"ROBERT C. GARRETT,

Lieutenant Colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 5th day of December 1935.

O. B. BUCHER,
Major, Fifty-first Coast Artillery, Adjutant.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

County of Los Angeles, ss:

T. C. Rogers, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That on or about November —, 1932, my son, Carlton Rogers, having finished high school, enrolled in a prep school near Annapolis with the intention of preparing himself for United States Naval Academy. That in November 1932 I was in the eastern portion of the United States, and upon hearing of the election of J. H. HOEPPEL as Congressman for my district, and knowing that M. H. Graham was an intimate friend of his, I requested Mr. Graham to see him as quickly as possible and ask for an Annapolis appointment for my son, Carlton.

That Mr. Graham informed me that Congressman HOEPPEL was willing to appoint Carlton Rogers to the Naval Academy. That thereafter, and on or about April of 1933, I met Congressman

HOEPPEL at his office in Washington for the first time. That at that time I informed Congressman HOEPPEL that my son did not at that time desire the appointment. That the offer to appoint Carlton was made without any solicitation on the part of Congressman HOEPPEL. That at no time was anything said or suggested about a consideration being given for any such appointment. That to my knowledge Congressman HOEPPEL has never met my son, Carlton.

That at the time that the offer of appointment was made I had never met Congressman HOEPPEL, and that to my knowledge the appointment was made at the request of our mutual friend, Mr. M. H. Graham.

Further affiant saith naught.

T. C. ROGERS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of December 1935.

[SEAL]

GERTRUDE STITCH,
Notary Public in and for said County and State.

My commission expires November 18, 1939.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

County of Los Angeles, ss:

M. H. Graham, being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That in the fall of 1932, I received a request from Mr. T. C. Rogers asking me to request Congressman-elect HOEPPEL to appoint his son, Carlton Rogers, to the Naval Academy. That thereafter I did request said appointment from Congressman HOEPPEL, and Congressman HOEPPEL offered to make said appointment. That during my one conversation with Congressman HOEPPEL, nothing was said or intimated that was in any nature a solicitation by Congressman HOEPPEL to make the appointment, and that there was no statement, suggestion, or intimation of any consideration whatsoever in connection with the same.

That it was at my instance and request that Congressman HOEPPEL offered to make the said appointment, and that to my knowledge Congressman HOEPPEL has never met Carlton Rogers.

Further affiant saith naught.

M. H. GRAHAM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of December 1935.

[SEAL]

GERTRUDE STITCH,

Notary Public in and for said County and State.
My commission expires November 18, 1939.

TESTIMONIALS AS TO MY INTEGRITY, HONOR, AND SERVICE

Inasmuch as the jury accepted the contradictory uncorroborated statement of Ives, a confessed conspirator, notwithstanding that his testimony was further contradicted by two Government witnesses, by myself, my oldest son, and my wife, I offer herewith for insertion in the RECORD affidavits and letters covering the past 30 years of my military service, recorded as "excellent" throughout, and my conduct as a citizen since my retirement from the Army.

AFFIDAVIT DATING BACK TO 1906

Mr. J. B. L. Hickerson, who is chief clerk of the Alaskan Telegraph & Radio System, on which system I served approximately 10 years, has submitted the following affidavit, which speaks for itself:

EXACT COPY—AFFIDAVIT

Before me, the undersigned notary public in and for the State of Washington, residing at Seattle, Wash., personally appeared on this day, the 19th day of November 1935, J. B. L. Hickerson, who, being duly sworn, states:

That he first met JOHN H. HOEPPEL, then an enlisted man in the Signal Corps, United States Army, in 1906 or 1907, in Seattle, Wash., when said HOEPPEL returned to the United States from Alaska, where he was the operator in charge of the Signal Corps telegraph office at Fort Egbert (Eagle), Alaska.

That while said HOEPPEL was operator in charge at Fort Egbert, he was the chief clerk of the system at Seattle and all reports from the Fort Egbert station were handled by him.

That Government funds coming into HOEPPEL's possession were properly accounted for by said HOEPPEL and that to his knowledge no question ever arose as to his honesty and integrity.

That said HOEPPEL served at Seattle for a number of years thereafter, also in Alaska, and at no time to his knowledge was the honesty or integrity of Hoeppel brought into question by his superior officers.

That he was a hard-working, conscientious, energetic, and faithful cable and telegraph operator; his character was excellent.

That this affidavit is made for presentation in court and if present in person, he would make the foregoing statement to the court.

J. B. L. HICKERSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me.

[SEAL]

JOHN A. SOULE,
Notary Public in and for the State of
Washington, residing at Seattle.

AFFIDAVIT FROM MY LAST COMMANDING OFFICER

Col. T. A. Baldwin, Jr., who was commanding officer at Ross Field, Arcadia, Calif., at which station I reported for

duty on my return from France in the latter part of 1919, has submitted the following affidavit:

STATE OF TEXAS,

County of Harris:

Before me, the undersigned, an authority to administer oaths, appeared Col. T. A. Baldwin, Jr., Air Corps, United States Army, Houston, Tex., who, after being duly sworn according to law, deposes and sayeth:

That Mr. J. H. HOEPPEL served under my command for a period of 2 years as chief clerk and disbursing clerk in the aerial supply department at the Air Corps Balloon and Airship School, Ross Field, Arcadia, Calif.

Mr. HOEPPEL had access to all the funds at all times, made all purchases, and the property and financial accounts were under his immediate supervision. He fulfilled his trust in a splendid way and had my implicit confidence, which confidence was never betrayed in the slightest manner.

I was commanding officer at Ross Field, and am happy to state that I found Mr. HOEPPEL at all times a gentleman of exemplary habits, both personal and official, a loyal assistant, and a man of the highest character and integrity.

This affidavit is submitted with the hope that it may be presented to the court.

T. A. BALDWIN, Jr.

Colonel, Air Corps, U. S. Army.
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of November, 1935.

GEO. F. ELSENBROICH,

Notary Public in and for Harris County, Tex.

My commission expires June 1, 1937.

AFFIDAVIT FROM LEADING BUSINESSMAN OF MY COMMUNITY

Mr. C. C. Howard, editor and owner of the Monrovia Journal and the Arcadia News, both of which circulate in my community, has furnished me with the following affidavit:

AFFIDAVIT

C. C. Howard, editor and owner of the Monrovia (Calif.) Journal and the Arcadia (Calif.) News, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of the city of Monrovia, County of Los Angeles, State of California, and has been for 12 years last past; That he has known Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL for the past 10 or 12 years;

That during this period Congressman HOEPPEL was postmaster of Arcadia, Calif., from 1923 to 1931, and that from 1931 to the present date he has been the editor in fact of the Retired Men's News, a national periodical;

That the reputation and standing of Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL, with relation to the truth, veracity, and honesty in the community in which he lives is excellent, and that he is generally referred to by those who know him as "Honest John."

That he personally knows that Congressman HOEPPEL has been very active in the past years working in behalf of war veterans and their dependents, and that since his incumbency as a Congressman he has been recognized and is known as a friend of "the underdog."

That he would believe him under oath, and that furthermore, your deponent, were he subpenea as a witness before a court and a jury, would testify as above stated, and that he could amplify this statement even more as a testimonial to the high character and conduct of Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL and his entire family in the community.

Further deponent saith not.

C. C. HOWARD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of November 1935.

[SEAL] F. R. SHALLERT,

Notary Public, County of Los Angeles, State of California.

AFFIDAVIT FROM MAYOR OF MY CITY

I submit further an affidavit from the mayor of my own city, who has lived in my community a much shorter period than myself, but who has known me for approximately 4 years:

OFFICE OF RICHARD KREBS, JR., MAYOR, CITY OF ARCADIA,
Arcadia, Calif., November 7, 1936.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that I have known Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL for a period of 4 years. During this period I have found him to be an outstanding, worthy, law-abiding citizen. He has the respect and the confidence of every citizen of consequence whom I have met in my official duties and in personal contacts.

Congressman HOEPPEL bears a reputation for honesty and a benign interest in helping the unfortunate and has been very liberal in his aid to the unemployed and others in difficult circumstances. There is not a blemish on his character to my knowledge as far as I have been able to ascertain from my contact and association with him here as a citizen of the city of Arcadia.

Congressman HOEPPEL is outstandingly known as a friend of the veterans and their dependents and is reported to have given generously of his time, without any remuneration, for 10 or 15 years in

their interest. In fact, all veterans and their dependents consider Congressman HOEPPEL as their especial friend.

This testimonial is given in the utmost sincerity as a statement of fact. I am not related in any respect or in any way affiliated with Congressman JOHN H. HOEPPEL, in business or otherwise, nor have I ever been affiliated with him in other than projects of civic betterment.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD KREBS, Jr.,
Mayor of the City of Arcadia, Calif.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 16th day of November 1935.

[SEAL]

HILDA M. GRAY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires November 9, 1937.

MY RECORD OF MILITARY SERVICE

I volunteered for service in the Spanish-American War at the age of 17 years, and within 4 months after enlistment, was appointed a noncommissioned officer in the Regular service. I continued in the service until retirement in 1921. I have nine discharges from the Army, eight of which were as a noncommissioned officer, with character "excellent" throughout. I have one discharge from my World War commission as an officer, and my certified record states:

SECOND AVIATION INSTRUCTION CENTER,
Tours, France, April 5, 1919.

First Lt. JOHN H. HOEPPEL has served at this station since its organization in 1917 as post quartermaster. His services have been very satisfactory, resulting in promotion. He is recommended as an excellent officer, capable of performing any duty demanded by his rank.

A. B. JOHNSON,
Captain, Air Service, Adjutant.

During the period of my service overseas, I was quartermaster at the second largest aviation field in France, and was held responsible and accountable for every function of a quartermaster, except that of disbursement, and in this capacity, I handled thousands of dollars in cash and unusually large amounts of supplies, since the garrison, at one time, consisted of 800 officers and 3,300 enlisted men. I had no commissioned assistants until after the armistice. That I performed my duties satisfactorily, without one cent of irregularities, is evidenced by a Treasury Department clearance, dated September 18, 1920.

WAS A MEMBER OF THE FIRST DIVISION

I went to France with the First Division, and while on duty in the training area near Verdun, I was transferred to the Air Service from the Signal Corps. After transfer I reported personally to General Mitchell, a friend of mine, under whom I had served in Alaska in 1901. Because of my radio experience I was immediately detailed to make an inspection of the French aviation production factories, with special reference to their use of radio in airplanes. As a result of my study and report I received the following communication:

AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES, AIR SERVICE,
August 23, 1917.

From: Engineering Intelligence Division.
To: JOHN H. HOEPPEL, sergeant, first class, Signal Corps, Aviation Section.

Subject: Acknowledgment of radio paper.

The receipt by this department is acknowledged of your paper addressed to Major Dodd, dated July 30, on the subject of radio communications as applied to airplanes. We sincerely thank you for this paper and hope that you will forward to this department all information that it is possible for you to gather on the subject of radio, as well as any other subject pertaining to aviation which comes to your attention.

By authority of Colonel Bolling.

EDGAR S. GORRELL,
Major, Aviation Section, Signal Corps.

It was my belief that my report was valuable in the prosecution of the war, and I so reported to my former superiors in the Signal Corps at the Paris office. When I returned from France, I called on Colonel Culver, Chief of Communications of the Air Service, who endeavored to obtain special consideration for me in my reenlistment, as will be shown by his letter, because of the service I had rendered the Government in radio communication and its application to aircraft. He told me then that, as a result of my report, the entire radio program of the French and American units was coordinated and improved and that they closed all radio activities

in America and went posthaste to France for this purpose. His letter, which I now insert in the RECORD, speaks for itself:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF AIR SERVICE,
Washington, October 28, 1919.

Memorandum for Personnel Division.

Subject: First Lt. John H. Hoeppel, A. S.

1. Reference is made to first endorsement, O. D. A. S., dated October 11, 1919 (Personnel Division), on application of Lieutenant Hoeppel for permission to reenlist with a grade of M. E. A. M. after discharge from his present condition. Lieutenant Hoeppel's work with the Air Service during several years past has frequently come to the attention of the undersigned. This work has included certain duties connected with Air Service radio.

2. It is recommended that his request be granted, and that the reenlistment be authorized into the grade of M. S. E., and, on the basis of his electrical training, the grade of A. M., if possible.

C. C. CULVER,
Colonel, Air Service, Chief, Communications.

At the conclusion of my inspection of the French radio as applied to airplanes, I was detailed by General Mitchell to take charge of detachments of cadets coming from America for aviation training. While I was second in charge, the officer in charge was inexperienced and I actually performed the duties of organizing the Second Aviation Instruction Center, which was the second largest American flying field in France. In the primary organization of this field, I was in direct charge of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, who later became the famous ace, and many others who also became well-known aces before the conclusion of the war. During this period, John G. Winant, present chairman of the Social Security Board, came under my command for administration and discipline.

As the field enlarged, I assumed the duties of quartermaster and in this capacity, I exposed a firm of war profiteers who had been reaping a golden harvest at the expense of the American Treasury. At the time I made my report to General Carson, the Chief of the S. O. S., this firm had pending bills against the Government totaling 1,500,000 francs. I insert in the RECORD at this point correspondence from the War Department to confirm my statement in this regard:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 13, 1935.

MY DEAR MR. HOEPPEL: Your letter of May 21, 1935, addressed to The Adjutant General was referred to this office for attention.

Information is furnished that the records on file in this office confirm your statement that a deduction of 10 percent was made from bills rendered by Messrs. Klein-Levy & Fils. A deduction of this 10 percent made a saving to the United States Government of approximately 150,000 francs. Copies of letters pertaining to these transactions are hereto attached.

For the Quartermaster General.

Very truly yours,

R. H. JORDAN,
Colonel, Quartermaster Corps, Assistant.

In a further communication, transmitted to me by Major Ely of the Finance Department, my service is recognized. I insert this communication at this point:

[Third Endorsement]

Maj. E. F. Ely, Finance Department, Headquarters Hawaiian Department, Fort Shafter, Territory Hawaii, July 15, 1935.
To: The Adjutant General, Washington, D. C. (Through: Commanding General, Hawaiian Department, Fort Shafter, Territory of Hawaii.)

The circumstances regarding the matter in question, as I remember them at this late date, follows:

In the spring of 1918, it was decided to move the offices of the chiefs of supply branches and certain other services from Chaumont to Tours and place them under the S. O. S. The large French barracks at Tours, which had been assigned to us to house these activities, had to be renovated, remodeled, and equipped with office furniture and other office equipment within a certain period. At the time the supply of required equipment available in the open market in France being limited, the Quartermaster procurement officer contacted Levy-Klein & Fils, a commission firm, with a view of that firm obtaining and furnishing these requirements. Later, when the firm submitted their bill, it was determined that while all the supplies covered thereby had been delivered, the prices charged in most cases appeared to be excessive. The matter was then referred to the Inspector General, S. O. S., for investigation, with the result that Levy and Klein agreed to make flat reduction on their original bill of 150,000 francs, and payment thereon was accordingly made by me as finance officer, S. O. S.

I remember that Mr. HOEPPEL, at the time a captain, Quartermaster Corps, on duty at Tours, was, to a certain extent, responsible for the investigation which resulted in this savings to the Government; however, whether he initiated this action and was wholly responsible therefor, I am unable to say at this late date.

(Signed) E. F. ELY,
Major, Finance Department.

The positive facts in the case are that I was wholly responsible for and initiated this investigation, which resulted in a saving to the Government at that time of approximately 150,000 francs—\$27,500—and additional thousands in losses which would have resulted in subsequent accounts had not the racketeering of this firm been uncovered.

As a result of my activity in this matter the son of Mr. Levy called on me and berated me for having exposed his firm, indicating that had I remained quiet I could have received compensation, an insinuation which I wholeheartedly resented. At this point I insert in the RECORD a letter which was mailed to all purchasing offices in France blacklisting this firm and prohibiting further purchases from them:

AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
HEADQUARTERS SERVICES OF SUPPLY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF QUARTERMASTER, A. E. F.
July 18, 1918.

From: Chief Quartermaster, A. E. F.
To: C. P. O., Q. M. C., and all camp and post quartermasters.
Subject: Dealing with war profiteers.

1. In accordance with instructions from C. G., S. O. S., you are advised that all dealings are prohibited with the firm of Levy, Klein et Fils, of Tours, also known in Nevers; with the individuals said to compose this firm, viz: Heri Joseph Levy and Gaston Levy, his son; or with any like brokers or others who are not bona-fide dealers in the merchandise they offer.

2. Emergency purchases should be avoided as far as practicable, especially as concerns stationery and office supplies, requisitions being submitted periodically to anticipate wants so far as possible.

3. The C. G., S. O. S., also directs a strict compliance with the laws, regulations, and orders in regard to making purchases, and especially that economy be exercised in the expenditure of office supplies.

By direction, (Signed) CLYDE B. CRUSAN,
Lt. Col., Q. M. C., N. A.

The French authorities also took cognizance of the profiteering of this firm, and in a communication the Chief of Staff of the French Army called for information from American sources on this subject. I insert a letter at this point, confirming this statement:

PRESIDENCE DU CONSEIL,
Tours, le 14 Octobre 1918.

From: General Fillonneau, chef de la Mission du Commissariat General des Affaires de Guerre Franco-Américaines, pres le Q. G. des S. O. S.
To: General Commanding S. O. S.
Mission pres le Q. G. des S. O. S.
J. G. 7043/1135.

Pursuant to the legal action taken by the French authorities against the firm Levy Klein & Co. (Tours and Nevers), charged with asking excessive prices from the American Army, I should greatly appreciate if you would send to this mission:

1. Copy of all invoices originating from the firm Levy & Co., either at Tours or Nevers, concerning goods of all kinds—wood, furniture, stationery, etc.—sold to the American Army.

2. The duplicates of transportation orders given to Messrs. Levy by the American services.

3. If possible, a list of all merchants from whom the above goods were bought by Messrs. Levy & Co.

I beg to call your attention to the fact that the firm in question is likely to have dealings chiefly with the following services:

Chief ordnance officer, chief quartermaster, director general of transportation, chief of engineers, chief signal officer, chief surgeon, chief chemical warfare, and director of motor transport corps.

In the general's absence.

(Signed) [Illegible]
Chief of Staff.

After the Armistice, I received a letter from the Chief of the Air Service which I insert in the RECORD as evidence of the service which I rendered overseas:

AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
November 29, 1918.

From: Chief of Air Service, A. E. F.
To: Second Lieut. John H. Hoepel, Second A. I. C.
Subject: Recommendation for promotion.

The exceptionally meritorious service which you have rendered with the American Expeditionary Forces resulted in a recommendation for promotion in grade submitted by your superior officers. The Chief of Air Service approved the recommendation, but unfortunately instructions from the War Department discon-

tinued all promotions of officers on the 11th instant, making it impossible to confer the reward which you have so well earned.

While communicating the above information, the undersigned takes this opportunity of thanking you personally for the assistance contributed toward the American air successes in the great war now drawing to a close.

MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, N. A., Chief of Air Service.

MMP/HCB.

DECLINED HIGHER PROMOTION OVERSEAS

I was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant before my return to the United States in recognition of my service overseas during the war. I was offered a higher rank in another branch of the service, but as this would have necessitated a transfer from my duties, I declined the opportunity.

With a background of experience and service which I have just described, does any reasonable man believe that at the age of 55 years, I would send my son to Baltimore, under an assumed name, and ask him to solicit money for "an appointment from Congressman HOEPPEL"—as testified—and that I would then be a party to an appointment on that basis, accepting in pay therefor, through my son, a non-negotiable note payable to a fictitious name? This simply does not make sense, but as the jury refused to examine into the exhibits and the record, were coerced in their deliberations by the mechanic foreman, and accepted as "evidence" against me the uncorroborated and contradictory testimony of a confessed conspirator, I am forced to appeal directly to thinking, fair-minded people—not for favor—not for sympathy—but simply for the square deal which thus far has been denied me through the courts.

TO EXTEND EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT TO CERTAIN WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12869) 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, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 10, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 404. That in addition to the suspension of the limitation for the period elapsing between the filing in the Veterans' Administration of the claim under a contract of insurance and the denial thereof by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or someone acting in his name, the claimant shall have 90 days from the date of the mailing of notice of such denial within which to file suit. This act is made effective as of July 3, 1930, and shall apply to all suits now pending against the United States under the provisions of section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; and any suit which has been dismissed solely on the ground that the period for filing suit has elapsed but wherein the extension of the period for filing suit as prescribed herein would have permitted such suit to have been heard and determined may be reinstated within 90 days from the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That on and after the date of enactment of this act, notice of denial of the claim under a contract of insurance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or someone acting in his name shall be by registered mail directed to the claimant's last address of record: *Provided further*, That the term 'denial of the claim' means the denial of the claim after consideration of its merits."

Page 10, strike out line 11 to 15, inclusive.

Page 10, strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object if the gentleman will explain to us whether he believes the President will sign this bill. I understand a similar bill was vetoed some time ago. I want to be sure the President will sign this one.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry, may I say to the Members of the House that there were three amendments put on this bill by the Senate. One of them was to eliminate a provision in the bill that passed the House with respect to uniforms for certain employees in the Veterans' Administration. The other amendment eliminated a provision wherein we provided for payment for official telephone service installed in quarters provided for

employees of the Veterans' Administration on Government reservations when authorized under regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

Without reference to the merit of that provision, the Senate has eliminated it, and I shall move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The other amendment includes a provision to extend the time for filing suits on veterans' insurance claims; and while I am not authorized directly to speak for the White House, as no one else in the House is, I presume, I desire to assure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that, in my opinion, this bill will become a law if these amendments are agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I heartily approve of that provision which extends the time for filing suits on veterans' claims.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this is not the bill that has for its purpose the compensation of widows and dependents of the men who lost their lives in the Florida hurricane?

Mr. RANKIN. That is true.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not true this is a wholly unrelated matter—and I refer to the question of insurance claims? For one, I am not in accord with the views of certain Senators who have been trying for some time to get an amendment through this House which would permit a lot of these old suits to be revived. If there ever was a situation in which the Government was robbed, it was in connection with some of these insurance cases. I do not mean all of them, because most of them were meritorious; but the Government has been robbed in some of those cases, and my opinion is that the Government will be robbed in some of these. I am not in accord with those views.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request or else refuse to concur in the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I will give the gentleman a vote on that amendment if he desires. We passed the bill last year. I was in accord with it then. It was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and reported by the committee. I think it should become a law. Therefore I shall be glad to give the gentleman a vote on that proposition, but I do not want to do anything at this time to jeopardize the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows that a number of officials of the Red Cross and other organizations, including veterans' organizations, charged with the duty of investigating these cases, would go around and discover a large number of cases that were on the border line. Then they would resign as officials of the Red Cross or veterans' organization and connect themselves with some law firm. They would then use the information they had received in filing these suits. A large number of such cases have been thrown out by the courts, and I think they ought to stay out.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not agree with the gentleman's contention at all. These cases, as a rule, involved men who were insured and who had become disabled. Because of disability, these men were unable to carry on and keep up their insurance payments. My opinion is that the number of cases will be very limited.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Government is fairly well protected when these cases are tried in the Federal courts. There is a district attorney in every district, and besides there are attorneys connected with the Veterans' Administration. I think the gentleman is unduly apprehensive about the effect of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. I may say they had about 10 or 12 years in which to file these suits.

Mr. RANKIN. That is true.

Mr. PATMAN. They had 10 or 12 years. This is to grant a further extension and revive a lot of these old cases.

Mr. RANKIN. As the gentleman knows, there are many border-line cases. Many of these men were presumptive cases. Some of them did not know what their rights were under the law until the time for filing suits had expired. As I stated, in my opinion there are a great many of these cases that are meritorious.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONNERY. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Mississippi. These men have been paying for their insurance, and it is merely a question of removing the statute of limitations, permitting them to file suits on their insurance for total or permanent disability, and for the payments that go with it. As the gentleman from Mississippi stated, this is a question for the courts. The Government has its legal experts, and it is up to the Government to fight the case if it is an unjust one.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts it will be much better to determine these cases in the courts than to have the House flooded with bills to pay the individual claims.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman if it is not the fact that this does not apply to cases where they are paying the insurance, but only applies to cases where they came out of the Army 17 or 18 years ago and did not keep up their insurance at all and paid no premiums whatever; and now, 17 years after the war is over, we are to give them the privilege of going back and saying that they did have a disability which they did not contend for.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I will say to the gentleman from Texas that it applies to those men who came out of the service so badly disabled that they were not able to pay their insurance. These are the men that this section applies to.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. PATMAN. I shall object unless we may have a separate vote on the matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I promised the gentleman that we would have a separate vote.

Mr. PATMAN. If we may have a separate vote, it is all right.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall move for a separate vote on each amendment if that is desired.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 404. That in addition to the suspension of the limitation for the period elapsing between the filing in the Veterans' Administration of the claim under a contract of insurance and the denial thereof by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or someone acting in his name, the claimant shall have 90 days from the date of the mailing of notice of such denial within which to file suit. This act is made effective as of July 3, 1930, and shall apply to all suits now pending against the United States under the provisions of section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; and any suit which has been dismissed solely on the ground that the period for filing suit has elapsed but wherein the extension of the period for filing suit as prescribed herein would have permitted such suit to have been heard and determined may be reinstated within 90 days from the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That on and after the date of enactment of this act notice of denial of the claim under a contract of insurance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or someone acting in his name shall be by registered mail directed to the claimant's last address of record: *Provided further*, That the term 'denial of the claim' means the denial of the claim after consideration of its merits."

Page 10, strike out lines 11 to 15, inclusive.

Page 10, strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments, and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, section 319 of the World War Veterans' Act is the section that is referred to in this amendment, is it not?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure about that.

Mr. PATMAN. I had never heard of this amendment until this morning, and I did not know the Senate had put on the amendment. I was hopeful the gentleman would call the committee together and let us consider this matter, and I believe that would be a fine thing to do now.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. We considered it last year, and passed it out unanimously.

Mr. PATMAN. We did not pass it out unanimously, so far as I was concerned, because I have opposed this all the time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman was certainly notified of the meeting, and if was not there, it was his own fault.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me state just what this means, and if the House wants to do this, all right.

There are a few law firms in this country that have been soliciting this particular business. There is one such firm in Los Angeles, Calif., and the main member of the firm used to be the regional manager of the office out there, and by reason of his contacts he got inside information about all these cases. They have a large number of these suits. Just a few firms in the country handle these particular lawsuits, and by reason of having this inside information it is easier for them to get judgments against the Government. In other words, they select cases that the Government cannot answer by reason of the lapse of time and the loss of evidence by reason of length of time and for other reasons.

Section 319 does not refer to the case where a veteran has actually paid his insurance and is asking the Government to carry out a contract. No; for 10 or 15 years after the war was over these veterans had the privilege of going into the courts, under section 319 of the World War Veterans' Act, and showing that, although they did not keep up their insurance as they should have done in order to have any benefits, they were really suffering from a disability which they probably had not even claimed in 10 or 15 years; but they come back and say that they were suffering from a disability and by reason of such disability they were entitled to draw as much from the Government as it would have taken to have paid their insurance premiums, and therefore their insurance should now be considered to be in effect.

Where a claim is meritorious it should be paid. If any of these claims have been denied that have merit in them, I would be very glad to vote for any one of them, but I am not willing to grant by a blanket law the privilege to all these law firms that have gone out and have been soliciting these cases, and have even paid money to get these cases in their offices. I am not willing to further grant them these special benefits to which they are not entitled under existing law.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am wondering if it would not be a good thing for the veteran's neighbors to pass on his case. They know him. I am not arguing against the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. That question is not involved here, and should not be involved in any case. This is a meritorious bill with the exception of this amendment, and every meritorious case that would be reinstated by that amendment I would be very glad to vote for myself, but we do not know what we are doing. How many cases are involved? Ten thousand dollars is involved in practically every case. We do not have the facts before us that will enable us to properly pass on this matter, and since it is in no way related to the bill under consideration, it should come up on its own merits. If I should be convinced that any veteran is denied a square deal under existing law, I would certainly vote to correct it.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 minutes more.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we do not know how much is involved in this. Who is getting the money out of it, what is behind these cases? So I say, take up this original bill, the bill passed by this House to grant aid to the widows and dependent children of these men who lost their lives in the Florida hurricane and pass it. Why should we let the Senate put on entirely new subject matter, something not related to this subject in any way; and since it is not, we are perfectly within our rights in demanding that that amendment be stricken out, and then let them present a bill that contains

meritorious cases which they hope to reach by this amendment, and I, for one, will be very glad indeed to vote for every one of these meritorious cases. I am not willing to open the floodgates to a bunch of shyster-lawyer firms in this Nation who have used unlawful means and deceitful methods and underhanded tactics in order to get these lawsuits. I am not willing to put a premium on that kind of practice in this country, and I ask Members to vote down the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], so that we will force the Senate to take out this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, we passed this bill out of the Veterans' Committee, reported this same amendment last year in the form of a bill, and that passed the House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] speaks of shyster lawyers. In the first place, all of the lawyers are tied down for remuneration to 10 percent of the claim. That is all they can get, if they win the case. The gentleman from Texas, like the rest of us, no doubt has gone to the Veterans' Bureau; and if anyone thinks it is easy to win a compensation case with the Veterans' Bureau, let him go down and try it himself; try it on cases of men permanently and totally disabled and see how far he will get, because the position of the Veterans' Bureau, perhaps justly, from their point of view, is that they are supposed to keep down the expenditures and protect the money of the Government at all costs. They are not going to give any break to the veteran if they can help themselves. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] suggested that it is far better for the veteran to be tried on insurance cases by a jury of his neighbors in his home district because they know whether he is totally disabled. They see him walking the streets or in a wheel chair or in his bed; they know what his services were and whether he is entitled to win his insurance. We passed on this in the Veterans' Committee. The Senate merely added it onto this bill. The gentleman from Texas says he agrees with all the other parts of the bill. Personally I am glad to see the Senate add this amendment, because in most cases with veterans' insurance policies, in 9 cases out of 10, the doubt has been resolved against the veterans in favor of the Government; and we have been trying for years since the foundation of the Veterans' Committee to get a break for the veteran—to have the doubt resolved in favor of the veteran.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The simple effect of this act would be to lift the statute of limitations for a period of 90 days only.

Mr. CONNERY. That is all. It gives the veteran a chance to file his suit.

Mr. MAY. It gives him recourse to the courts in the district in which he resides.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance has its litigation lawyers—lawyers who fight these cases for the Government. They are supposed to be leading lawyers, and they defend the Government against the veterans in these cases.

Mr. MAY. They take the Government's side all the time?

Mr. CONNERY. All the time, no matter what their personal feelings may be.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. Time and again we have extended the statute of limitations for civilians who had claims against the Government, sometimes amounting to millions of dollars.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. THURSTON. So that if we do it in this instance we would only be according the veteran the same privilege that we have given to private individuals.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; you are dealing with disabled men, because in order to file on their insurance they file for permanent, total disability and for payments under that.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. We have also extended the statute of limitations for corporations in many private bills that have come into this House?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; and we should do it for the veteran. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use the 5 minutes granted me. As the membership of the House knows, I feel that this bill does not go nearly far enough. I was in the committee when Mr. STARNES' bill granting this special provision was voted out last year. I thoroughly approved of it. It is only fair to give these men their day in court. [Applause.] After all, those of you who work on veteran cases know that there are still many men over the country who do not know their rights. It is only fair to give them 3 months more to get their insurance claims adjusted. It is not enough, but I earnestly hope and I know the Members of the House will vote for it.

When this bill extending the time for filing suits passed the House and Senate last session I was very much pleased, for I personally know of many cases where the disabled veterans have been denied their day in court through their lack of knowledge of the regulations.

When the President allowed the matter to die by way of a pocket veto, I felt much the same as I did when he cut the disabled veterans so cruelly by his Executive orders. The membership of the House trusted the President in his promise not to cut the disabled, but apparently he had extremely bad advice and cut them ruthlessly. The disabled veterans have been sadly neglected in the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses. Repeatedly I have asked for hearings on my bill to increase the pensions for widows and orphans—without result. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has become noticeably inactive to the needs of the disabled. Prior to March 4, 1933, disabled veterans had a full and complete opportunity to present their problems to the committee. Since then such has not been the case.

As I stated on the floor of the House during the discussion on this bill for the relief of the Florida hurricane sufferers, due to the fact that it was brought up under a suspension of the rules, no change could be made in it. I voted for it, although I did not, and do not now, believe it goes far enough.

The hearings held on the subject were a whitewash, as everyone knows who has had the opportunity to read the transcript of evidence. The United States Government had a responsibility to face in the death of these men. It was most evident that it was the purpose of the committee to minimize that responsibility.

Such has seemed to be the consistent policy of the committee. The blind veterans have been denied hearings; the widows and orphans likewise; the administration has obviously been hostile to giving disabled veterans' problems the careful, humane, and sympathetic consideration they deserve.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, this amendment passed the House by unanimous consent in the form of a bill at the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress. It simply extends the statute of limitations for 90 days to those cases where there has been some dispute as to whether or not there had been a denial of the veteran's claim by the Veterans' Administration in order for him to bring his suit. No liability to the Federal Government can arise unless and until a jury of the veteran's peers has passed upon his claim.

I think it is meritorious. The House passed it by unanimous consent, and I hope at this time the House will concur in the Senate amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRISWOLD].

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the gentleman from Texas voted on the Economy Act, but he may recall that when we passed that act we took away from the veterans for 1 year the right to file these insurance claims and to sue them out in the courts. We placed the matter in the hands of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and took it out of the hands of the courts from the date of the passage of that act until the Supreme Court held that section invalid and again gave these men the right to go into court. By this act we correct an error of the past and take from the records the penalty Congress imposed on the veteran.

The pending bill does nothing more than to give back to these men 20 percent of the time we took away from them in that invalid section of the Economy Act.

I admire the efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in behalf of the Treasury. Many times I have voted with him, but when he advances the argument that we should not continue this right to the veterans because there are a few crooked lawyers in the country who might profit, I cannot follow him. The amount involved in this bill is approximately as much as we have given to two world's fairs, one in the State of Texas. I am willing to take that much money out of the Treasury even though a few crooked lawyers may benefit rather than see one just claim of a veteran thrown out. It is not proper to penalize the veteran and deprive him of that to which he is justly entitled under his contract of insurance because we have a few shyster lawyers who might chisel a part of the money received by the veteran. The proper procedure to correct that evil would be to pass a law that would prevent the lawyer taking advantage of his veteran clients. The gentleman from Texas does not suggest such a law. He merely opposes the measure on account of the lawyer and to prevent the lawyer taking advantage of the veteran would prevent the veteran from having that to which he is entitled.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, the only argument that seems to have been made against this bill is that if we extend the statute of limitation so these veterans can file their claims, a few crooked lawyers might dig up an unjust claim and bring it into court. I, of course, am not an attorney; but I am surprised that if the two gentlemen from Texas who just spoke in opposition to this amendment, who are attorneys, have the facts that certain lawyers in this country are digging up such suits and soliciting claims against the Government that they do not report these facts to the bar associations of the respective States in which these attorneys reside. It would seem to me to be a shame that because a few lawyers have used the law dishonestly we should vote down a just bill for the veterans. I hope this amendment is adopted overwhelmingly. It is not the duty of Congress to keep lawyers honest, but it is the duty of the bar and its members to do so.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, if the gentleman will permit, that no case handled by any of these able lawyers can be put through unless it has been handled before a local jury of friends and neighbors. Who better knows and understands the veteran and his case than a jury of his neighbors?

Mr. O'MALLEY. It is a poor argument to say that because some lawyers abuse and degrade the law we should deprive the deserving veteran of his fair day in court. This forum is no place for settling the squabbles of attorneys over their own shortcomings as a class. It is a place where all our citizens should be able to come for justice. This amendment brings justice to the veterans and should be passed; and no injection of the misdeeds of lawyers or the abuse of our laws by some of them who took oath to uphold should blind us to the rights of those who fought for this country. It has been suggested occasionally that only attorneys should be elected to Congress. God help the people of this country

if some of them would do in Congress what the gentleman from Texas says they do on veterans' claims.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot permit the statements and insinuations that have been made here to go unanswered.

In the first place, these appeals are not coming from "shyster" lawyers, as the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. BLANTON and Mr. PATMAN] seem to think. There may be more "shyster" lawyers in Texas than I think there are, but I do not believe they are as thick over the United States as has been intimated here today. [Applause.]

This bill extends the time for only 90 days for these men to file their suits. They must come before a court and run the gauntlet of all the legal proceedings. They are not only under the eagle eye of the Federal judge but they are opposed by a district attorney and an assistant district attorney. Then they have to convince a jury of 12 men. If the Government is injured in any way, it has the right to appeal to the circuit court of appeals and then to the Supreme Court of the United States. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that all this talk about "shyster" lawyers getting in on these cases, as an argument against this provision, is not fair to these disabled veterans whom we are trying to assist by the passage of this act.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not construe my remarks as meaning that only shyster lawyers favor this.

Mr. RANKIN. I know.

Mr. PATMAN. I merely mentioned this incidentally as an illustration. A committee I was on investigated some matters relating to this and we uncovered the situations I have disclosed.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but there has been more said about "shyster" lawyers than about all the others put together. Bacon once said that the pencil of the Holy Ghost had labored more in depicting the miseries of Job than it had in describing the felicities of Solomon. The gentlemen from Texas [Mr. PATMAN and Mr. BLANTON] have spent most of their time talking about the "shyster" lawyers who have handled a few cases for these disabled veterans. For this reason I call attention to the fact that the lawyers who have written me, and whom I know personally, are not "shyster" lawyers, and the veterans themselves who have written me, of course, were writing in their own behalf. So let us not obscure the merits of this measure by holding up a few "shyster" lawyers as if this legislation were designed to assist them, and them alone.

We certainly have gone the limit, I may say to the Members of the House, in passing all kinds of omnibus bills to pay claims for alleged injuries to civilians and never heard "shyster" lawyers mentioned. If these were any other kind of claims, I wonder if the question of "shyster" lawyers would be raised as a defense. I wonder if the question would be raised if these claims for injuries to civilians were caused by being run over by a C. C. C. truck, or something of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, I have not regaled the House very much recently in connection with veterans' affairs. I started in 1930 to try to take care of the disabled veterans who had come out of the war afflicted with tuberculosis, cancer, paralysis, and other chronic constitutional diseases which were slowly but surely eating away their lives. A bill of mine which passed in 1930 was vetoed, and another one passed which took care of these men in a small measure. However, it left out their widows and orphans. This bill puts the widows and orphans of those presumpitives back so that we can take care of them, and at the same time it wipes out the vicious misconduct clause insofar as it affects them.

There were men who, just as brave as any soldiers who ever faced a firing line, came out of the war with these incipient diseases which have been constantly eating away their existence. Many of them did not know for years that they were suffering from any of these diseases. Many of them lived off out yonder and did not know of their rights,

and therefore let the time for filing expire. Many of them are now helpless and feel that they are entitled to their insurance.

All we are asking is that these men be given the right to go into court and present their claims. I say when we do that we are acting in response to and in accord with the wishes of 99 percent of the American people who understand this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the further Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment no. 2: Page 10, strike out lines 11 to 15, inclusive.

Senate amendment no. 3: Page 10, strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the other two Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that all Members have general permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD unless it is desired to include some extraneous matter in their remarks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being granted this time, in which I simply want to call attention to the fact that in spite of all the ballyhoo that attended the adoption of a particular plank in the Republican platform, which was adopted a few days since, demanding the extension of the civil service, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] presented a bill for consideration the other night that would accomplish exactly that purpose, it was Republican opposition and objection which prevented the consideration and adoption of the bill which sought thus to extend the civil service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENTRY UNDER BOND OF EXHIBITS OF ARTS, SCIENCES, AND INDUSTRIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there was passed by the House the other evening, the bill (S. 3843), 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. It seems there was a misapprehension at that time, in that it was stated that the Senate bill was identical with the House bill, which had received the approval of the House. On account of the fact there is a difference between the two, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the Clerk of the House be directed to request the Senate to return to the House the bill S. 3843.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what bill is this?

Mr. CELLER. It is S. 3843 and concerns an exhibition to be held in the Port of New York Authority Building.

Mr. SNELL. This is not the lobbying bill?

Mr. CELLER. No.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House the bill S. 3843. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING

MR. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11663) to require reports of receipts and disbursements of certain contributions, to require the registration of persons engaged in attempting to influence the legislation, to prescribe punishments for violation of this act, and for other purposes, for further consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MR. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

MR. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider the famous, or infamous, Smith bill. The administration, not content with gagging the Members of Congress, putting every Member on the spot, now reaches out to gag their constituents.

This Smith bill is a report of a special committee—or, I should say, the Rules Committee—to investigate the pernicious activities of the lobbyists in connection with the Wheeler-Rayburn bill of last year, a measure designed to curb the vicious holding companies. This great committee has labored and brought forth a mouse in the instrumentality of the Smith bill, designed to send everybody to jail who spends over \$10 in trying to influence their Congressmen to vote for any meritorious legislation. It is designed to affect the American Federation of Labor, the Farmers Union, the veterans' organizations, and a host of others, but is particularly aimed at the National Union for Social Justice and the Townsend movement.

You know there are many groups in this country today that are fast coming to realize that this is not the Congress of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mark you that! This is not the Congress of Franklin D. Roosevelt or any other Chief Executive, and they have a right to have their day in court. Whether you believe in the philosophy of Dr. Townsend and other groups or not, they have the right to be heard in behalf of proposed legislation they are supporting. A denial of the right of petition and the opportunity of many groups in this country to be heard in their Congress is an assault on democracy itself and a decided drift toward dictatorship and fascism.

People of this great country are Congress-minded. I am satisfied that no one knows this better than the Members of Congress, who each day in their official life receive numerous communications from their constituents relative to the measures before the Congress of the United States. This country is not ready now, and I hope it never will be ready, to cast aside the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and follow in the wake of many of the European nations who in this day of world change have forfeited their political and religious freedom. This freedom America long fought for, and attained after years of struggle and bloodshed, and no American wants to exchange it for the concentration of power in the hands of any one man, the power to wield as he sees fit.

In what I am going to say now I have no desire to be at all offensive toward the Chief Executive of the United States Government. I have a personal respect for him and the high office with which he has been entrusted by the people of this Nation. In 1932 I was one of the three delegates from Ohio at the Chicago convention of the Democratic Party who supported him on the third ballot, which decided his nomination at that convention. I had observed his career as Governor of the State of New York and the war he waged against the power interests; his public pronouncement against gag rule in legislative bodies, while he was Governor of the Empire State. This excited my admiration for him, and on the eventful third ballot I left the Ohio delegates, who were secretly ready to cast their vote for Newton D. Baker, the dark horse of Wall Street, and who, except for the result obtained on the third ballot, would have been

the nominee of the Democratic Party in 1932 for the President of the United States.

Following this convention I returned to my home community, and I do not say this in the spirit of egotism at all, but as a fact. I organized a substantial group of citizens in northern Ohio who made possible Franklin D. Roosevelt carrying the Buckeye State in the election that followed by a plurality of approximately 70,000 votes over his opponent. What I am going to say now is not for the comfort of the sunflower side of the House, who are enthusiastic over the candidacy of Alfred Landon, Governor of the State of Kansas. I think if Landon is elected it will be a national calamity. It will be returning to the laissez-faire days of McKinley, of Harding, of Coolidge, and of Hoover, with the gold standard tie-up, and the private control of money in the hands of a few.

I say to you now, the State of Ohio, which went 70,000 for Roosevelt in 1932, in my opinion, will be lost to him by over 100,000, and I am willing to wager a bet with anyone in this House on that proposition. [Applause.] No; I repeat, this statement is not made to give any comfort to those who are sponsoring the candidacy of a reactionary for President of the United States. The standard bearer of my party, in my opinion, is going to lose the Buckeye State, because there are hundreds of thousands of people in my State, and I am certain similar conditions exist in other States, who know what is going on in the National Capital. They know the story of the attempt for over a year to block consideration of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill to aid the stricken farmers of the Nation; they know the camouflage behind the investigation of the Townsend plan; they know that the committee appointed to investigate the activities growing out of the lobby in connection with the consideration of the Wheeler-Rayburn legislation, to which I referred a moment ago, dare not bring back a report to this House identifying and disclosing the activities of certain public-utility lobbyists. I repeat, they dare not make such a report, because it may involve some lawyers and lobbyists close to the national administration, who have been reported in the public press to receive in many cases in excess of \$25,000 as fees for their services.

There are enough statutes in the criminal laws of the Federal Government to warrant the indictment and conviction of some of these men, and I am certain the committee, many of them intelligent lawyers, are cognizant of this fact.

I am not going to sit idly by in this House as a Democrat and see men appointed to office under this administration who were indicted subsequent to the World War for fraud and irregularities in the granting of war contracts, and indicted as a result of congressional investigation. Today these men are placed in high position of trust and responsibility in the present administration. I am not going to sit idly by and see the Chairman of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, deny to Members of the House of Representatives information and cooperation, as he did last year when we were seeking an investigation to disclose the political favoritism and corruption in that agency of the Government, which was brought to our attention by our constituents. At least, 25 Members of the Congress made complaint against this Corporation and its State agencies. I am certain you all remember what I am talking about. Many of us sought to inquire why more than 20 State managers of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were removed during a period of 1 year after its inception. This information has not been forthcoming to date, nor has any consideration been given to the resolution to investigate this organization, which resolution is now pending before the Rules Committee of the House. I make the challenge now this committee dare not report out this resolution because any investigation would be equivalent to political dynamite for the present administration.

I am glad I can make this statement as a Democrat—one who believes in the philosophy of the Democratic Party, but who cares more for its principle than its label. The Democratic Party only comes to power once every quarter of a

century, and it generally goes down to defeat because it forgets the principles and becomes autocratic instead of democratic.

I want to see an Executive in the White House whose word is his bond. [Applause.] I do not care for your applause. I want to see an Executive who when he stood on the steps of the Capitol yonder in his famous inaugural address, which I characterized on March 4, 1935, in this very House as an address comparable to Lincoln's second inaugural address. On that marked occasion President Roosevelt said:

I am going to drive the money changers from the temple.

There has been no driving of money changers from the temple. Private control of our monetary system is still the accepted order, and will be until the people rise in their wrath and demand that Congress be again restored to its constitutional right to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see a President of the United States one day walk down one side of the road with the Chamber of Commerce and the next day walk down the same side of the road with organized labor. I do not want to see a President of the United States who walks down the side of the road with the war veterans one day and with the enemies of the veterans the next day. This is a day for plain talking. I do not pretend to criticize the New Deal in its entirety, but some of us know how this game is being played. Some of us know that those who sit at the table of the mighty and play the political game of poker generally have a hole card, which, when turned to the surface, is always the ace of political expediency.

The people of this country, victims of a man-made depression, expect more than political expediency as a solution of the serious problems confronting them. They have a right to insist that the proper adjustment be made in our capitalistic system to insure a more equitable distribution of wealth and an annual living wage for the laborer, cost of production plus a profit for the farmer, and a real measure of social justice in lieu of governmental dole administered primarily in the cause of political allegiance and prospective support.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly in appearing before my constituents declared that I would rather be defeated for public office than become a rubber stamp in the Congress of the United States. Despite machine opposition, I have been successful because of the faith my constituents have reposed in me. I believe every Member of this Congress can do the same if he meets the issue in a courageous manner and lifts himself from the morass of ancient political tradition and custom. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [MR. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, how much longer will you ladies and gentlemen of the Congress permit Mr. Jesse Jones to ignore the will of the people as you have unanimously expressed it in the passage of the flood-loan bill?

More than 2 months ago this House acted to make available for industries crippled by the March floods emergency loans from the R. F. C. by passing unanimously the Kopplemann R. F. C. flood-loan bill, H. R. 11968. To date the R. F. C. has not disbursed a nickel in Hartford, Conn., or my district, under this bill, despite the pleas of manufacturers and merchants suffering from the worst catastrophe in the district's history, despite the applications for loans amounting to \$267,000, and despite the fact that the R. F. C. has approved, from these applications, loans totaling \$40,000.

The emergency flood-loan law as it was passed by the House and as it was later amended by the Senate, is the most liberal bill authorizing emergency loans of Federal funds ever enacted. It was an emergency measure. Immediate action to relieve human suffering was its sole purpose. Nearly 9 weeks have elapsed, and the R. F. C. has not yet sent a nickel to Hartford. The Honorable Jesse Jones, Chairman of the R. F. C., offers no explanation to me or to other Congressmen in whose districts businessmen are experiencing similar difficulties in procuring R. F. C. funds even after loans are approved by Mr. Jones' board.

The only amendments offered from the floor by both sides was for the purpose of making this measure sufficiently liberal to insure loans to every worthy applicant.

I desire to call to the Members of the House certain correspondence and developments relating to the bill and to the law.

I quote a letter I received from Louis M. Bingham, editor of the Connecticut Industry. His letter is dated March 31, 1936:

However, from the very start of R. F. C. loaning to industries, I have felt that too little importance was placed upon a man's business and credit reputation and his past business contact. If he has carried on successfully in the past and his business seems to have a future, it would seem that these two items added together should weigh heavily in considering his application for a flood rehabilitation loan. The workability of any legislation rests primarily upon the rules and regulations, their interpretation and application by the administrative agency.

On April 1 I replied to Mr. Bingham:

This morning I had a session with Jesse Jones. The point you make in your letter about the importance which should be placed upon a man's business and credit reputation and his past business conduct is one which I have been emphasizing all along.

I now quote from a letter I wrote to the mayor of Hartford, Thomas J. Spellacy, dated April 2:

From my talks with Mr. Jesse Jones, chairman of the R. F. C., and with other members of that Board, I am quite hopeful that all deserving cases in my district will be given serious and immediate attention just as soon as the bill is passed in the Senate and signed by the President.

I then went on to urge that all those in distress make application immediately so that action on their applications could be expedited.

On April 7, to my amazement, the following news story appeared in the Hartford Times:

WASHINGTON.—Hope that the R. F. C. will liberalize credit regulations for emergency loans to flood-crippled industries was killed by Chairman Jesse Jones.

The Walsh-Kopplemann bill which the House passed last week in an attempt to extend Government credit to industries affected by floods was described by Mr. Jones as "permitting us to lend money on a man's signature." That means, he interpreted, "we can make personal loans if the person has good and sufficient collateral."

MUST HAVE SECURITY

Indicating clearly that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a banking and not a relief organization, the chairman declared: "If a person walks into a bank, he has got to have certain collateral. If he comes to us for loans, he similarly must have reasonable security."

Told of statements describing the R. F. C.'s idea of "reasonable security" as a man's "right eye and left eye", Mr. Jones smilingly asserted, "and sometimes the eyes aren't good enough."

The R. F. C. does not propose to do any extensive loaning on secondary liens, he indicated, "although this liberalization of R. F. C. regulations is the purpose of the bill and was vehemently demanded in the House."

NO AID FOR LITTLE FELLOW

The small merchant without real estate or security stands little chance of securing R. F. C. loans, it was evident from Mr. Jones' assertion that "if a man rents his store and has no security, it's going to take him a long time to repay."

Denying assertions that \$25,000,000 will be insufficient for the purpose of the bill, he declared that he could not understand why framers of the measure set the amount of loans permissible at \$25,000,000.

On April 9 I sent the clipping to the Honorable Jesse Jones and asked him if he had been quoted correctly. I received from Mr. Costello, secretary to Mr. Jones, a note advising me that immediately upon his return to Washington Mr. Jones would answer my question. For the information of the House, up to the present time Mr. Jones has ignored my letter.

On April 17, with the President's signature, the bill became law.

At the request of the mayor of Hartford, myself, and others, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation branch was opened in Hartford within a few days after the President had signed the bill.

On April 21 I received a letter from Joseph P. Carney, manager of the Boston R. F. C. office, advising me that approval had been given to the application of one of my constituents. I was elated over the fact that such approval

had been given 4 days after the bill had been signed. I felt confident that the loan would be consummated shortly after. To my surprise, on May 13—3 weeks later—I received word from my constituent, advising me that the conditions of the loan were such that if they could meet them "they would have no need for the loan."

In the meantime, the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, expressed his fear that the help which Congress intended to give through this special emergency legislation would not be forthcoming, and in support of his fear he sent me the following letter, which he had received from the chairman of the R. F. C., dated April 28:

DEAR JOHN: Your letter of April 25 has been received and noted.

We are endeavoring to make loans authorized by "An act authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the repair of damages caused by floods or other catastrophes, and for other purposes", according to the act, which reads that such loans shall be so secured as reasonably to assure repayment thereof.

We cannot predetermine what constitutes such security in advance of the application but will give sympathetic consideration to all phases of every application and do our best to give relief, within the limitation of the law.

With best wishes, sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES.

Complaints continued to reach me. On May 25 the mayor of Hartford advised me that "no cash as yet" had been disbursed. The rest of his letter follows:

However, for your information there have been 62 applications returned to the district office. These applications total \$267,000. Of these, 44 have been forwarded to Washington. Of the 44, Washington has actually worked on 21, approving 9 applications totaling \$36,000 and disapproving 12 applications totaling \$65,000.

Again, out of the 44 applications the Hartford branch office approved 18 and rejected 26.

I talked with Mr. Barlow, of the Hartford branch office, and he informs me the legal information in connection with the applications is quite extensive, and they are endeavoring to cut out as much of the data required as possible.

I am sorry that I am not able to advise you that some of the applicants have actually received their money.

On May 28 I wrote the following letter to the R. F. C.:

GENTLEMEN: My interest in the bill for loans to flood sufferers in my district and throughout the country is just as keen today as when I voted and worked for its passage.

Naturally, I am interested to know what money has thus far been disbursed in my own district in Connecticut. I would appreciate any information you have up to the present time.

I received the following tabulated information regarding the authorization of loans with this significant comment, "Disbursement of these loans has not been consummated":

STATISTICAL AND ECONOMIC DIVISION,
May 28, 1936.

Loans authorized in Connecticut to finance the repair of damage by flood or other catastrophe, under the act approved Apr. 13, 1934, as amended, as of May 26, 1936

City	Name	Date authorized	Amount authorized
East Hartford	Anthony Puia	May 22, 1936	\$700
Do	Charter Oak Machine Co.	Apr. 22, 1936	3,500
Do	Harry F. Goodwin	May 18, 1936	1,000
Do	Dexter P. Mather, trading as D. P. Mather & Son Sand Co.	May 13, 1936	2,200
Hartford	Double B Products Co., Inc.	Apr. 23, 1936	5,000
Do	Grace T. Edmonds	May 22, 1936	500
Do	Mrs. Rose Mary Hurwitz	May 20, 1936	1,500
Do	Paramount Grille, Inc.	May 11, 1936	500
Do	James D. Pinto and Nicholas J. Pinto	May 8, 1936	1,000
Do	Michele Tuccitto	May 25, 1936	700
Norwich	Millbrook Woolen Mills, Inc.	May 18, 1936	22,000
West Hartford	Marguerite Long Pallotti	May 20, 1936	1,400
Total			40,000

The next day I received a letter from Charles P. Bloome, executive vice president of the Wearing Apparel Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa., with which he enclosed his statement as it appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 28, scoring the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for its failure to carry out the intent of the flood rehabilitation loan bill as it was passed by Congress.

I submit Mr. Bloome's letter and the news report of his statement:

MAY 29, 1936.

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN,
Congressman, First District of Connecticut,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The enclosed news item speaks of a new tragedy. It appears that all of the sympathetic interest and humane feelings on the part of the President of the United States and the great Congress dissolved itself into an idle gesture and blighted hopes.

Billions for relief which degrades sturdy Americans but not one penny for concrete and practical help to the bulk of the merchants and manufacturers who make up the massive fortifications of American industrial, commercial, civic, and patriotic life of this great Nation. Some day someone will pay the penalty for this to-ture and cruelty.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES P. BLOOME.

[Enclosure]

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 29, 1936]

FINDS FLOOD LOANS ARE NIL—APPAREL ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE CLAIMS R. F. C. IS BEING TOO STRICT

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is not following Congress' instructions for character loans, but is sticking to rigid collateral loans, of which I have not found one in my 3,000 miles of traveling through the flood area of Pennsylvania and New York State", Charles P. Bloome, executive vice president of the Wearing Apparel Board of Trade of Philadelphia, said last night.

"When Congress appropriated \$80,000,000 for flood loans, and President Roosevelt issued a statement that he was sending relief to the flooded areas, the President stressed that the loans to retailers were to be made on character", Mr. Bloome continued. "I have found literally thousands of small merchants, many of them in business 25 to 50 years, who have been unable to meet the R. F. C.'s rigid requirements. It takes a certified public accountant to fill out the questionnaire the R. F. C. demands in applying for the loan and most of the merchants affected don't have the money left from the flood to pay the accountant. In fact, most of the merchants don't have the records of their businesses, but they do have the good will of their neighbors, which was what I believe Congress intended should be the basis for the loans."

Mr. Bloome said that he had found no loans made in Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Williamsport, or any of the other towns affected, and that the R. F. C. men sent into the field to receive applications did not have one request for loan filled out, although there were many applications for forms.

He said that when he returns to Philadelphia on Friday he will ask the organization's directors to canvass the Philadelphia Congressmen and Senators, to have them request the R. F. C. to follow the original intent of the flood-relief bill.

On June 2 I presented the situation to the President. The next day I received this letter from a constituent:

We have been reading in the newspapers that the R. F. C. is going to close their office here in Hartford because they do not receive enough applications for emergency flood loans. As a matter of fact, they have made it so difficult to get a loan that no one seems to have the courage to apply.

We lost in the flood about \$2,000 worth of leaf tobacco. Right after the flood we made application to the local office here for a loan of \$2,500 for a period of 3 years. We offered as collateral \$4,500 worth of accounts receivable, also our personal guaranty and present cash value of our insurance policies, which amounted to an additional \$1,500. The loan was refused to us on the grounds that they did not feel we could pay it back. We cannot help but feel that the whole set-up here was a joke and that no one that was hit by the flood and really needed help was given any. Naturally those firms that have ample bank credit do not need the R. F. C. to help them, but companies like ourselves with limited capital, when hit by a catastrophe like the flood, are refused aid from our Government. We have worked hard to build up the business we are doing now, and it has meant a living for two families. Our name in Hartford is clean, and no one has refused to give us credit.

When you sponsored the bill in Congress to help the small businessman who was hurt by the flood, we saw a ray of hope that we would get some help. Certainly, when we see our Government spend money on causes which are less worthy, we cannot help but feel that the small businessman is discriminated against.

On June 3 I sent my constituent's letter to the President. His answer is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOPPLEMANN: Your letter of June 3 with enclosure has been forwarded to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with the suggestion that an effort be made to expedite loans to flood and tornado sufferers.

Thanking you for bringing this particular matter to my attention,

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

So you see the President joined in the effort to have this law properly administered.

I then received from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones the following letter, dated June 6:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOPPLEMANN: Your letter of the 3d to the President, with which you enclose a letter from J. R. Gans Co., of Hartford, has been given consideration, and I am authorized to advise you that a loan to the applicant was declined because, in the opinion of our Board, the security offered was not such "as reasonably to assure repayment."

This requirement is in the act which Congress passed authorizing such loans.

As you know, we opened an office in Hartford for the purpose of making these loans and have authorized a few, although, due to failure by the applicants to execute the necessary papers, none have actually been disbursed.

We have made some changes that we hope will result in expediting this service. If any other complaints come to you we shall be glad to have them and shall do the best we can to meet them.

Very truly yours,

JESSE H. JONES, *Chairman.*

The last chapter thus far written on this particular subject is the following letter, which I addressed to the President under date of June 12, in comment on the letter I received from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

When I left your office the other day I told newspapermen that at last loans were going to be made under the flood and tornado loan bill, which you were good enough to sign. But to be perfectly frank, I am even more disgusted with the situation than I was when I saw you.

Today I received a letter from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, in which, to use the language of the streets, he thumbs his nose at all of us.

My best wishes to you.

It is now June 17 and still not a nickel has been disbursed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we have all been very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]. The things he said about this conference report are pertinent, but I am sure that more interest attaches to his revelation concerning the attitude of the great State of Ohio toward the New Deal, and his prophecy that President Roosevelt will lose Ohio in the coming campaign by at least 100,000 votes. Now, ordinarily, one might consider suggestions of that kind mere political talk. However, when coming from so distinguished, so well-informed, and so potent an Ohio Democrat as the political leader from Cleveland, certainly much significance attaches to the statement. Personally, I can only say that Michigan will do even better than that.

I am not going to talk politics, because my time is limited, and I shall confine what I have to say to the Black-Smith antilobbying bill, as embodied in the conference report now before the House. The Smith bill passed the House several weeks ago. Those opposing the bill were unable to secure a roll call. In fact, little study and consideration were given to the bill by the general membership of the House. It bore the name "antilobbying", and that was sufficient to warrant its passage. We are all opposed to pernicious lobbying. Yet I feel sure that the vast majority of the House want to encourage, rather than discourage, helpful suggestions from whatever source received, especially from our constituents back home. At the time the Smith bill was up in the House I was one of the few who spoke in opposition to the bill, and I will not repeat what I said then. Those remarks are found on page 4536 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of March 27, 1936. The Smith bill, if not aimed directly at, would at least primarily affect groups and organizations like the Father Coughlin group and the Dr. Townsend group. It would make the functioning of such organizations a physical and financial impossibility if all of the details required in the Smith bill were complied with. I realize that in the view of many a cessation of these activities might be advisable, yet we must not lose sight of the fact that this is free America; that the legislators are but the hired men of the constituents; and that it should not only be the privilege but the duty of the average voter to present to his Representative in Congress his views on any

legislative matter. It matters not how much we may disagree with the views of any group or bloc, under our Constitution that group or bloc has certain rights, and the enforcement of the Black-Smith bill would virtually deny to many citizens the right of petition.

I have been unable to ascertain any great demand or sentiment for this bill. Everybody, of course, is against lobbyists. Yet few people have any definite conception as to what is meant by the term "lobbyist." As I have heretofore said to the House, personally, I am not afraid of lobbyists. My door is always open. The person who is afraid of lobbyists is liable to be influenced by them, and is more valuable to his nation in the role of a private citizen rather than in the capacity of one presumed to enact legislation. I know of no organization or group of our citizens favoring this bill. I do not speak for any organization. Yet when an organization presents facts to me concerning proposed legislation, I feel called upon to present those facts for what they are worth.

This morning I received a communication from Mr. N. P. Alifas, a representative of the American Federation of Labor. This communication states in a concise way the reasons why the American Federation of Labor is opposed to this conference report, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert in the RECORD the communication received from Mr. Alifas.

I also ask unanimous consent to include excerpts from the constitution of the American Federation of Labor, from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, and from the constitution of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America. I make this request because these excerpts so clearly show that the Smith bill will be applicable to these organizations.

The letter of Mr. Alifas, of the American Federation of Labor, is as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The representatives of organized labor have recently held a number of conferences at headquarters of the American Federation of Labor to discuss the apparently disastrous effects which the enactment of the pending antilobbying act, H. R. 11663, may have on organized labor, and as one of the representatives of organized labor I beg to submit herein a few of the reasons why we believe disastrous effects upon labor unions may follow the enactment of this legislation unless it is returned to conference and so amended as to definitely eliminate labor unions from its fines and penalties.

The term "person" is defined in the act as including individuals, committees, or group of persons. Therefore the A. F. of L., its affiliated unions, and the locals of those unions are persons within the meaning of the act, and all contributions made by these union agencies to influence legislation or departmental matters of interest to organized labor must be reported to the Clerk of the House between the 1st and the 10th of each month. The filing of such a report, containing both receipts and expenditures, involves practically a complete audit of many organizations' accounts once a month and means a heavy financial drain on labor unions, to say nothing of the risk of incurring heavy fines and imprisonment due to inadvertent errors or omissions.

While the provisions of section 6 of the act make it unnecessary for some unions to file a list of all the names and addresses of their members who pay dues, the labor unions which consist exclusively of Government employees and legislative agencies to which unions in general contribute would under this section be compelled to keep records and file all of this volume of information once a month. It is no small task to impose upon a Government-employee union with forty or fifty thousand members the requirement that the names and addresses of all these members paying dues must be tabulated once a month.

Section 7 provides that any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any pending legislation or appropriation by Congress shall register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate and file a complete audit of receipts and expenditures every 3 months.

Section 8 provides that any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration to attempt to influence any official in the administration of any governmental duty so as to give any benefit or advantage to any private corporation or individual shall file with each of such Federal agencies with whom he attempts to deal a statement disclosing the subject matter in respect of which such person is interested, the amount of his compensation, his expenditures, etc., before he undertakes to take up such matters with Government officials.

We have several hundred Federal agencies with which labor officials deal. Many labor officials in the course of a year contact all of these agencies. This would require the filing of several hundred reports by many of these representatives of labor. Apparently a labor-union official could not request the restoration of a discharged employee or discuss conditions of employment affect-

ing individuals without running afoul of the law unless he first registered and gave all details of his standing.

On the other hand, the antilobbying act would permit persons of wealth and independence to come to Washington and engage in lobbying activities without having to comply with the provisions of the act.

In similar manner the act also permits individuals to appear before committees of Congress without having to register. This would permit the captains of industry, commerce, and finance and their paid attorneys to influence legislation at its inception without having to register or otherwise comply with the terms of the antilobbying act or to be otherwise stigmatized as lobbyists.

The antilobbying act, in fact, appears to be so worded that even a secretary of a local union receiving a nominal salary for his services, who writes a letter to his Congressman, his Senators, or any official of the executive departments or any of its agencies, upon instructions of his organization, for or against pending legislation, or for or against any matter within the discretion of Government officials, would be considered a lobbyist, and before he undertook to write these letters, would be required to register.

Furthermore, it would appear that one of the principal purposes of this proposed act is to discourage lobbying by means of heavy fines and imprisonment, under complicated procedure, before American citizens may attempt in any way to influence affairs of the Federal Government, thus making it exceedingly risky for the officers and members of labor unions to exercise their constitutional rights.

The penalty for violation of any of the provisions of this act is up to \$5,000 or 12 months' imprisonment, or both, and if a report is filed and contains inaccurate statements, the individual is subject to imprisonment for perjury for a period up to 2 years.

We feel that this legislation violates many of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, and sincerely trust that the conference report will be sent back to conference for such modifications as will definitely exclude labor unions from the provisions and penalties of this act.

Thanking you for your interest, I remain,

Very respectfully yours,

N. P. ALIFAS,
President, District No. 44,
International Association of Machinists.

Sections 1-5 of article 2 of the constitution of the American Federation of Labor are as follows:

SECTION 1. The object of this federation shall be the encouragement and formation of local trade and labor unions and the closer federation of such societies through the organization of central trade and labor unions in every city, and the further combination of such bodies into State, Territorial, or Provincial organizations to secure legislation in the interest of the working masses.

SEC. 2. The establishment of national and international trade unions, based upon a strict recognition of the autonomy of each trade, and the promotion and advancement of such bodies.

SEC. 3. The establishment of departments composed of national or international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, of the same industry, and which departments shall be governed in conformity with the laws of the American Federation of Labor.

SEC. 4. An American federation of all national and international trade unions to aid and assist each other; to aid and encourage the sale of union-label goods; and to secure legislation in the interest of the working people and influence public opinion, by peaceful and legal methods, in favor of organized labor.

SEC. 5. To aid and encourage the labor press of America.

Article 1 of the bylaws of the National Chamber of Commerce is as follows:

This organization shall be known and designated as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America. It is formed for the purpose of encouraging trade and commercial intercourse among the States, the Territories, and the insular possessions of the United States of America and with foreign nations and of promoting cooperation among chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and other business and industrial organizations of the United States, increasing their efficiency and extending their usefulness. It is intended to secure cooperative action in advancing the common purposes of its members, uniformity and equity in business usages and laws, and proper consideration and concentration of opinion upon questions affecting the financial, commercial, civic, and industrial interests of the country at large.

Section 1 of article 2 of the constitution of the National Association of Manufacturers is as follows:

SECTION 1. The general objects and purposes for which the said corporation is formed are the promotion of the industrial interests of the United States, the fostering of the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, the betterment of the relations between employer and employee, the protection of the individual liberty and rights of employer and employee, the education of the public in the principles of individual liberty and ownership of property, the support of legislation in furtherance of those principles and opposition to legislation in derogation thereof.

It will be observed that at least one of the objectives of each of the above organizations is to secure legislation in the inter-

est of the membership of the organization and to influence public opinion in support of legislation in furtherance of the principles for which the organization stands. In this debate it has been, or will be, insisted that this legislation will not affect these organizations. A reading of the above excerpts fully answers any such argument.

The American Federation of Labor's letter, which I have quoted, states in a clear and succinct way just what effect this legislation will have on the American Federation of Labor if it ever becomes a law. What is true of the American Federation of Labor is also true of the other groups above mentioned. Indeed, it does not end there. The law would be applicable to all farm organizations, all patriotic organizations, all women's clubs, all peace societies—in fact, to every group or organization which might, directly or indirectly, be interested in the passage or in preventing the passage of any given legislation. The Members of this body will realize the magnitude and far-reaching effect of any such proposition. Yes; someone near me has suggested that it would even include the birth-control propaganda now so prevalent in our midst.

It is true that the Congress did pass this Smith bill. It is equally true that the Members of the House had little knowledge as to what the effects of the bill would be. The very type of lobbying which this legislation might prevent has in this specific instance brought to the Members of the House the facts regarding the Smith bill; and if I do not miss my guess, this House is going to reverse the action taken a few weeks ago when the roll is called today.

Under the parliamentary situation, if you are opposed to this conference report, then you should vote against the adoption of the conference report. After the conference report is voted down, then a motion will be made either to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary or to place the Senate amendments and the conference report on the table. That is, the first vote will be against the conference report. The second vote will be to lay the report on the table. If this procedure is adopted, then the matter will be at rest for the remainder of this session, and, in the meantime, thorough investigation may be made by any of those doubting the statements which I have made here today.

In making this plea against this bill I am speaking for free speech and the right of petition. As I said before, I am representing no group or bloc, but here is one time when all individuals, organizations, groups, and blocs should be united against legislation that will in effect take away from our citizens the rights which they have always enjoyed—to communicate with, to advise, and possibly sometimes to attempt to command their Representatives in the Congress, without the fear of going to jail and without the necessity of complying with a lot of rules and regulations. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], out of whose committee this bill came, I join with him in urging the defeat of the conference report. After the conference report is defeated I urge the support of a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration, or to a motion to lay the Senate amendment on the table, whichever is made. I assume that the motion in order will be for the House to recede and concur, and if that is made it will be necessary to vote that motion down, after which a motion to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary the Senate amendment, or lay it on the table, will be in order. In any event the bill in its present form should be defeated.

Mr. RANKIN. I suggest to the gentleman that the proper motion would be to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I followed this bill with a great deal of interest. If there was a roll call on the bill when it passed the House, I would have voted against it, because it is too broad in its scope. The bill does not accomplish the objectives sought and desired. It eliminates the representatives of the utilities lobby and lobbies of that kind, and strikes at groups that none of us had the least intention of affecting.

It was admitted by my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. CELLER] the other day that this bill would not affect the groups it was intended to affect and those that it was aimed at, but that it would affect groups of citizens interested in legislation one way or the other whom none of us had the least intention of subjecting to the law. Furthermore, there is a possibility under the construction of this bill that it would include the Knights of Columbus, the Masons, the U. M. C. A., the Kiwanis, and other similar organizations of that kind, in addition to the National Union for Social Justice, the Townsend movement, and organized labor, if they supported or opposed pending legislation.

The other day my friend said that labor would not be affected, but labor will be affected, because labor, while not particularly engaged in the business of lobbying, has an organization of its own particularly for that purpose. Because of that fact organized labor will clearly and manifestly come within the purview of this bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wood] and I visited Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, this morning, and he says the American Federation of Labor is absolutely opposed to this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my good friend for his contribution.

Now, there is a desirable objective sought, but this bill does not accomplish it. The machinery used is too broad. We do not want to undertake to affect certain groups of citizens who are earnestly and legitimately engaged in trying to obtain the passage of legislation or in opposing it. The objectives that we seek are not accomplished by this bill. It eliminates those that should be legislated against or covered by law, and includes those who should not be included therein. It is too broad in scope, amazingly so. The bill in its present form should be defeated. Reference has been in the able argument of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to other objections to the bill, with all of which I am in agreement.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. This would even affect any small fraternal organization which might want to come here and get a bill passed for memorial purposes?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is quite likely it would come within the purview of this bill.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As a matter of fact, the purpose of this legislation was aimed at those organizations who work in the dark—under cover?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A public-utility holding company is not principally organized for the purpose of influencing legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman himself brought that out clearly on Monday.

I do not think it is fair to convey the impression that President Roosevelt proposed this bill. It is absolutely inconsistent with the facts. We want to be honest with ourselves. I want to be honest with myself. I have to be honest with myself before I can be honest with my fellow men. President Roosevelt did not recommend this bill and that fact should be understood and appreciated. This bill came out of the Committee of the Judiciary, undoubtedly as the result of the recommendation of the special committee appointed by this House to investigate the lobbying that was

going on in connection with holding companies. As far as I know, I have never heard of President Roosevelt expressing an opinion on this bill, one way or the other.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. SWEENEY. Does the gentleman know who did recommend it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not, but I do not think the President did.

Mr. SWEENEY. Does the gentleman know whether the President is opposed to it or not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot tell the gentleman that. The gentleman from Ohio and I agree on the contents of this bill, and in this respect we have the same reasons for opposing it. As far as this bill is concerned, our reasons are the same. I join with the gentleman from Ohio in his opposition. I hope and urge that the bill, in view of its present form, will be defeated. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Does this bill exempt lobbyists for railroads, banks, holding companies, and utilities?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. It does not.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House is just threshing over old straw. The argument here in regard to the acceptance or rejection of this conference report is the same argument that we had pro and con when the bill was passed sometime ago. Nothing has been done to it except certain provisions, including administrative departments, are now in the bill under the report. Otherwise it is just what the House passed but a few weeks ago, and we are simply threshing over old straw.

I must express my astonishment at the amount of confusion that has been injected into this debate. This bill does reach the power companies. It does reach the American Federation of Labor. It does reach patriotic organizations or anyone else who hires and sends a lobbyist to Washington to influence legislation either way. It does not purport to prohibit the individual, the farmer, for instance, from coming here and advocating or opposing legislation. It cannot do that. If it cannot prohibit a laborer or a farmer from coming here as such in his own right, it cannot prevent a bank or a power company or the American Federation of Labor from coming here in its own right as such. But when any of those agencies or corporations or individuals or associations or what not spend money to send representatives here for the purpose of influencing legislation, they do have to file their accounts and show what money they have expended and to whom it was paid, as provided in this bill, and it does not make any difference who sends them here. The bill is universal in its application. If you except from it all of the various and sundry organizations that have been mentioned, you would not have any antilobbying bill at all. I repeat, the bill does reach the power companies. If they send a paid representative to Washington to advocate or oppose legislation, he must show how much money he has gotten or will get, who he got it from, and what he did with it. Then, when you send a committee out, as you did last year, to investigate a situation of that kind, it will have something on which to start to work. Every dollar that any power company spent in an attempt to influence legislation would be shown up in the statement of the representative himself, who must file it with the Clerk of the House. Now, that is one feature of the bill, and it applies to all alike, as it should do.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. The objection to the bill, as I understand it, is not that the representative of any organization or movement would have to register and state what they got and who they got it from, but that these great

popular movements would virtually have to register their entire membership in Washington and every cent that all members contributed to the movement.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I am coming right to that. One feature of the bill, as I have already mentioned, is that any paid lobbyist, and I am using this term in a nice sense, who comes here must register. He must file a statement of expenses, he must show how much money he got and what he did with it, to whom he paid it.

The other feature of the bill, and the only other feature, is that those organizations throughout the country whose principal business is to influence legislation, and who collect money for this purpose, whose principal business is to collect money and use it for the purpose of influencing legislation, must show from whom they collected it, how much they got, and what they did with it.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit me, the gentleman must realize that that would be impracticable. We might just as well pass a law prohibiting them from lobbying and be done with it.

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

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MOTT. Does this bill undertake to regulate or restrict the operation of paid lobbyists of the administration such as Cohen, Cochran, and many others I might mention who come into our committees, come onto the floor, and come into our offices in an attempt to influence legislation for the administration?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. It does not.

Mr. MOTT. Why does it not?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. The gentleman can offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. MOTT. Would the gentleman accept such an amendment?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I am afraid we have passed the amending stage. I may say to the gentleman from Oregon that there is some divergence of views about that.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman will recall that when the bill was under consideration in the House such an amendment was offered from this side but was voted down by a strictly party vote.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Then, that is the answer to the gentleman's question as to why it is not in here.

Mr. MOTT. What objection is there to having such an amendment in the bill?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I cannot undertake to answer a party question in the limited time I have.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman states that the other feature of the bill would require organizations whose principal business is to favor or oppose legislation to register and state every contribution they got.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. No; they can show how much money they collected.

Mr. O'MALLEY. And from whom.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Yes; if their principal business is the collecting of money and using it for the purpose of influencing legislation. If these organizations cannot account for the nickels and dimes and quarters, they ought not to collect them.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Then the gentleman knows that this would make an impossible task for certain organizations, for they would have to register a million people who gave a million quarters. We might as well pass a bill to put them out of business.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, not a speech.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Such a requirement would put them out of business.

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

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Not just now. I will yield later if I have time.

Mr. Speaker, so far as the American Federation of Labor is concerned, it would not, in my judgment, be touched by this bill unless it sent paid representatives to Washington for the purpose of lobbying. If they do this, there is no reason why they should be exempt.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. WOOD rose.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is well known that the American Federation of Labor has a legislative bureau whose sole purpose is to influence legislation, which, in my opinion, is a laudable purpose. In this respect the American Federation of Labor comes within the purview of this bill.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I doubt it.

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

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I cannot yield until I answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MICHENER. I think I speak for the Judiciary Committee when I say that no one doubted but that these various organizations would be included.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I have great respect for the Committee on the Judiciary, but I am not bound by them in my own views. I think that an individual coming here in his own right would not be affected by this bill. If the American Federation of Labor is affected by legislation, it has a right to come here and exercise its influence for or against it. This would not be any more lobbying than it would be for the farmer to come here on legislation which directly affected him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD. Does the gentleman mean to tell this House that this bill does not affect the legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor and also the legislative representatives of the American Legion, and the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars? These organizations have paid representatives here not only during the session of Congress but have a national legislative representative bureau here all the time.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I think that if they have a paid representative here seeking to influence the passage of legislation one way or the other they would come under the bill in this way, that the representative would have to register and show how much money he got and how he spent it, just like anybody else would.

Mr. WOOD. Then, according to the provisions of the bill that legislative representative would have to render an accounting of all the money he spent during the year whether he was here or elsewhere.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. If he was lobbying, he would have to, and there is no reason why he should not.

Mr. WOOD. Not only while he was here but throughout the entire calendar year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the argument made by the gentleman who just preceded me tells the whole story. The purpose of the pending bill is to outlaw Father Coughlin's Union for Social Justice, the American Federation of Labor, and the Townsend organization. These three organizations, whether you agree with them or not, represent a great proportion of the working people of the United States. This bill will prevent them from coming to their representatives in the Congress of the United States and saying: "We favor legislation for social justice", or "We favor labor legislation", or "We favor old-age-pension legislation", and, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, this would include disabled veterans. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans must not send representatives here; they must not pay the expenses of anyone to come before the Congress of the United States and say, "We want justice for the men who served their country in time of war."

Mr. CITRON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CITRON. Certain public utilities in their annual reports to stockholders are attacking and criticizing the Members of Congress for having voted for the Wheeler-Rayburn bill. In other words, public utilities are playing politics. They are doing more than to try to influence legislation; for they are trying to intimidate and browbeat and punish Congressmen. Such conduct is a menace to our country and its parliamentary bodies. Does the pending bill reach those people?

Mr. CONNERY. Oh, no. This would not stop the big power companies. This bill hits the Union for Social Justice, the American Federation of Labor, the Townsendites, and the veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the conference report will be voted down and that a motion will be offered and agreed to referring this entire matter to the Judiciary Committee or else laying it on the table.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this bill also affects organizations of unemployed. The power companies are not organized principally for the purpose of influencing legislation; therefore only in cases where they send a representative down here must he register and give an accounting, but under this bill they do not have to account for all of their other nefarious lobby practices, nor do they have to account for the contributions received for the purpose of broadcasting propaganda, nor do they have to give a list of their contributors. But all other organizations which are working in the open, such as the Workers' Alliance, the National Union for Social Justice, the Townsend group, the American Federation of Labor, and organizations of that sort, whose primary purpose is to influence legislation, would have to give a list of contributors and account for every single cent they receive. I opposed this bill when it was originally before us. I oppose it now. The joker in this bill is now obvious to all. This bill punishes mass organizations and exempts the utility holding companies, whose activities should be curbed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the pending conference report I find myself in a most embarrassing position, because I have for years been an advocate of the regulation of lobbying activities. I feel one of the greatest curses existing at the present time is the fact certain people are using their efforts in support of or in opposition to legislation pending before the National Congress or before the various State legislatures without disclosing from whence the money comes or what influence is back of their activities.

There have been certain disclosures within the past year that have convinced the public that an antilobbying measure should be enacted into law, but the very lobbying organizations the activities of which have caused public opinion to demand this type of legislation are exempt from complying with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no evil, as I see it, in the activities of the American Federation of Labor, the various veterans' organizations, the Townsendites, or the Coughlin organization in their support of or opposition to legislation. We all know where their money comes from. We know that these organizations are supported largely by small contributions of individual citizens throughout the country. That is all the information we need. There is no necessity for having these people register or having them file their accounts, including the names and addresses of each contributor of a dime, a quarter, or a few dollars, because we know where the money is coming from and for whom they speak. The evil of lobbying lies chiefly in the fact that very often large amounts of money are spent in support of or in opposition to legislation, when the identity of the persons making such contributions are not known to Members of Congress or to the public. I believe we should regulate such lobbying, but this bill exempts those whom we should regulate and binds those who do not need regulation. Let us enact a real lobbying bill

in the near future. However, we should not enact this bill, because it is unfair to those whose identity is already known and permits those who have so far succeeded in working under cover to continue such practices.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a real lobbying regulatory bill and should be defeated.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this law will accomplish more than many speeches because of the fact that the masses are our superiors and employers. This law is a veiled attempt to check the people and prevent them from expressing their wish. If the people are to be checked in telling us what they want, they will simply crash the door. They will show us they are the master. That is as it should be. Many Congressmen think they are knighted by some special privilege, whereas in fact they are but delegates of the people. This law is vicious and should be defeated.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of this so-called infamous bill. I was astounded this morning to be told by my colleagues on the floor some of the things that they said were in my mind when I wrote this bill.

I want to say to the House first, because I have but very little time, that I deny specifically one statement that has been repeatedly made here by gentlemen who either do not understand this bill or do not want to understand the bill, or who are opposed to any antilobbying legislation.

It was stated by the gentleman from Connecticut that the bill was aimed at the American Federation of Labor, the Townsend plan, and the Coughlin plan. This statement is entirely without foundation. It is not aimed at any specific group or organization but is aimed fearlessly at all groups who undertake by insidious propaganda and lobbying methods to influence the action of Congress. I may say further emphatically that the statement that the American Federation of Labor would have to report its entire receipts and disbursements is entirely without foundation, as anyone who will read the bill will readily observe.

When you come right down to the crux of the situation, there is only one question which confronts us, and we might as well meet it squarely. Are you going to do something about this antilobbying proposition that you have been alternately condemning and condoning for the last 20 years, or are you going to do nothing about it? This is the first lobby bill that has ever passed this House or gotten as far as a conference report, and this is your opportunity to make good or not to make good. This is the same bill this House voted for overwhelmingly 2 months ago, after full debate and before some interested organizations opposed it.

If the Members had studied this bill, they would know what was in it, and they would not be dependent upon statements made by other Members on the floor who do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been considered by three committees of the House and by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and by a conference committee of the two Houses, composed of some of the best lawyers in the United States.

Mr. SWEENEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot yield now, but I will yield to the gentleman later when I have completed my statement.

There is not anything in this bill that any honest organization should be opposed to, because any honest organization that is attempting to influence legislation in this House or in the other House ought to be ready to put its cards on the table and tell the public where they are getting their money and what they are doing with it.

This bill, instead of being what some of these gentlemen have tried to make it out to be this morning, and I do not know what their motives may be, originated with the utility investigation. It was aimed at the utility lobby which was investigated by the Rules Committee, of which I was a member. We have found out that these lobby investigations

have been, and will continue to be, a case of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen until we get a bill of this kind enacted into law, and we wanted to forestall that proposition because we found out that millions of dollars had been raised for the purpose of defeating legislation on this floor. And all this bill does is to say, "You will come out in the open and say where you are getting the money and to whom you are paying it."

If this bill had come in here when all this utility lobby was going on last year you would have passed it in 5 minutes and not a single one on this floor would have dared to vote against it. What changes the picture today? Conditions are the same today as they were then, men are the same, their motives are the same. They are trying to get legislation through this House. Where is there a man on this floor who will say that any organization should be permitted to come here and undertake to pass legislation and be afraid to say who is supporting them and who is paying their expenses and where the money is coming from and to whom he is paying it out? Is there anybody on this floor opposed to that? This is all that the bill does.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot yield at this time. I will yield later when I have finished my statement.

I want to make it clear that this bill is uniform and is not aimed at any particular group, but grew out of the conditions the Rules Committee found to have existed by reason of the utilities lobby. Someone has said this will not affect the utilities. That is exactly what it is intended to affect. They raised a huge sum of money in an organization which was formed for the very purpose of defeating the utility bill. This sum of money ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. They raised it from all the utility companies and put it in the hands of an organization which expended it in an effort to defeat utility legislation. Under this bill they would have to report every dollar of that money, where they got it and what they did with it, and if they had done that you would not have had the row you had here about the lobby on the utility bill. Are you willing today to put the stamp of your approval on such conduct by voting against this bill?

We could not write a bill here and say that it shall apply to the utility companies, but that the bill shall not apply to the Townsend plan or the Coughlin plan or some other plan. Why should it not apply to everybody equally? Are gentlemen prepared to say that we want a bill that will apply to the utilities and yet will not apply to somebody else who is doing the same kind of thing. Are gentlemen prepared to take that position on the floor of this House?

The American Federation of Labor is not affected. I want to make this statement positively because the American Federation is not organized for the principal purpose of effecting legislation. Any organization that is formed for that specific purpose, whether they are good, bad, or indifferent, has got to report, but there is not anything in this bill that stops anybody from doing anything that they can lawfully do today. The only thing the bill says is that if you are playing this game of lobbying here, you must put your cards on the table and let Members of Congress know where this propaganda is coming from, and if they know where it is coming from they will know how to vote intelligently.

It has been said by the uninformed that the bill would interfere with the rights of free speech, with the rights of lawful assembly, with the freedom of the press, with the right of petition, and sundry other things equally absurd.

I will state in the first place some of the things that the bill does not do:

First. It does not prohibit any person from any sort of activity, either lawful or unlawful.

Second. It does not curtail the right of free speech or freedom of the press or the right of petition by any possible stretch of the imagination.

Third. It has no application of any kind, character, or description to the publishers of newspapers, magazines, or other publications.

Fourth. It has no application to persons who appear openly and frankly before the committees of Congress and engage in no other activities to influence legislation.

Fifth. It does not require any reports of any persons or organizations now required to report under the provisions of the present Corrupt Practices Act.

Sixth. It does not apply in any manner to persons who appear voluntarily without compensation.

Seventh. It does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed.

The bill was framed principally to curb the growing evil of organized attempts to influence legislation by the stimulation of false propaganda designed through avalanches of inspired letters and telegrams to impress upon Members of the Federal Congress that a great surge of public sentiment exists for or against the passage of proposed legislation. The effort to secure such legislation arose out of the recent investigation of the lobby on the utilities bill. During the consideration of that measure Congress was flooded with fake telegrams and inspired letters in every conceivable form to impress upon the Members of Congress that the public sentiment in their respective districts was violently opposed to the legislation.

This class of lobbying was universally condemned, and out of this incident and the ensuing investigation emanated the Smith antilobby bill which passed the House. That it happens to apply to others who are engaged in the same vicious practices merely emphasizes the need of the legislation.

The bill applies chiefly to three distinct classes of lobbyists:

First. Those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of letters and telegrams, many of which have been proven to be forgeries, and others based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons and organizations will be required under the bill, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful influence over Members of Congress. These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence. The bill in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of their employers with respect to legislation, which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment.

The provisions of the bill under attack today relate to persons, firms, corporations, or organizations formed for the principal purpose of attempting to influence legislation or the election of Federal officers. The bill does not in any wise seek to curtail their activities or prevent them from doing any of the things they are now doing. It merely requires them to disclose the sources from which their collections come and how they expend the money. This portion of the bill merely parallels the existing Corrupt Practices Act, which requires all candidates for Federal office to disclose their receipts and expenditures in seeking to bring about their elections. If they, as candidates for public office, are required to disclose their receipts and disbursements for public inspection, there can be no earthly reason why voluntary organizations formed for a similar purpose, or for the purpose of influencing legislation, should be permitted to operate secretly and clandestinely.

How anyone could object to any such thoroughly democratic and American policy of open and fair dealing, it is beyond me to understand.

No honest person or organization ought to object to the bill, and the dishonest ones should be exposed to the public gaze.

I shall now be pleased to yield to any Member who may desire to ask me a question.

I yield first to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia if this will affect the postal organizations, the civil-service organizations, and the navy-yard organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If they are formed for the sole purpose of trying to effect legislation, then they have got to report. The bill does not prohibit them from doing anything they can do now, but they will have to report their receipts and disbursements.

Mr. MEAD. They are not formed for that purpose, but they have a legislative representative here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then that gentleman would have to register, and that is all that would have to be done.

Mr. MEAD. Would he have to give the names of all the contributors?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; just what his organization pays him. If they paid him \$10,000 a year, and so much for expenses, he would have to report that.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman has stated that this bill will not apply to the American Federation of Labor, if I understood him correctly. Is that true?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right, except if they have a representative here.

Mr. FADDIS. Then my question is this: To what extent will labor organizations, fraternal organizations, and so forth, have to register? Will they have to register their membership, their dues, and the receipts and expenditures?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at all. Just the paid lobbyist who is here in Washington would have to file a statement saying that he was employed by such and such an organization; that they paid him \$10,000 a year, or whatever the salary is, and so many thousand dollars a year expenses.

Mr. FADDIS. Then the organization back of the representative would not have to register?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 37, noes 123.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty Members present, not a quorum. This is an automatic call. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 77, nays 265, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—77

Barden	Chandler	Creel	Faddis
Bland	Clark, Idaho	Cross, Tex.	Ford, Miss.
Blanton	Clark, N. C.	DeRouen	Gillette
Boland	Colden	Dobbins	Greenwood
Buchanan	Cole, N. Y.	Doughton	Gregory
Buck	Colmer	Doxey	Guyer
Cannon, Mo.	Cooley	Driscoll	Hill, Ala.
Castellow	Cooper, Tenn.	Driver	Hill, Samuel B.
Celler	Cox	Duffy, N. Y.	Hobbs

Hook	Moran	Richardson	Utterback
Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor	Robertson	Vinson, Ky.
Jones	Oliver	Secrest	Walter
Kerr	Patman	Smith, Va.	Warren
Lambeth	Patton	South	Wearin
Lewis, Colo.	Pettengill	Starnes	Whittington
McGhee	Powers	Steagall	Wilcox
McLaughlin	Ramsay	Tarver	Zimmerman
McReynolds	Randolph	Thom	
Mahon	Rankin	Thomason	
Miller	Reilly	Umstead	

NAYS—265

Adair	Eckert	Kocialkowski	Reed, Ill.
Allen	Edmiston	Kopplemann	Rich
Amie	Elcher	Kramer	Richards
Andresen	Ekwall	Kvale	Risk
Arends	Englebright	Lambertson	Robinson, Utah
Ashbrook	Evans	Lamneck	Rogers, Mass.
Bacharach	Farley	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, N. H.
Bacon	Fenerty	Lehbach	Rogers, Okla.
Barry	Fish	Lesinski	Romjue
Beam	Fitzpatrick	Lord	Russell
Beiter	Flannagan	Lucas	Sanders, Tex.
Bell	Fletcher	Luckey	Schaefer
Biermann	Focht	Ludlow	Schneider, Wis.
Blackney	Ford, Calif.	Lundeen	Schulte
Bloom	Frey	McAndrews	Scott
Boehne	Fuller	McCormack	Sears
Bolleau	Fulmer	McGrath	Seger
Boykin	Gambrill	McGroarty	Shanley
Boylan	Gasque	McKeough	Shannon
Brewster	Gavan	McLean	Short
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	McMillan	Sirovich
Brown, Mich.	Gehrmann	Maas	Smith, Conn.
Buckler, Minn.	Gifford	Main	Smith, Wash.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Mansfield	Smith, W. Va.
Burdick	Gildea	Mapes	Snell
Burnham	Gingery	Marcantonio	Snyder, Pa.
Caldwell	Goldsborough	Marshall	Spence
Carlson	Goodwin	Martin, Colo.	Stack
Carmichael	Granfield	Mason	Stefan
Carpenter	Gray, Ind.	Massingale	Stubbs
Carter	Gray, Pa.	May	Sullivan
Cartwright	Green	Mead	Taber
Cavicchia	Greever	Merritt, Conn.	Taylor, Colo.
Chapman	Griswold	Merritt, N. Y.	Taylor, S. C.
Christianson	Gwynne	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Church	Haines	Millard	Thompson
Citron	Halleck	Mitchell, Ill.	Thurston
Cochran	Hancock, N. Y.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Tinkham
Coffee	Harlan	Moritz	Tobey
Cole, Md.	Hart	Murdock	Treadway
Connery	Harter	Norton	Turner
Cooper, Ohio	Hartley	O'Brien	Turpin
Costello	Healey	O'Day	Vinson, Ga.
Cravens	Hennings	O'Leary	Wadsworth
Crawford	Hess	O'Malley	Wallgren
Crosser, Ohio	Hildebrandt	O'Neal	Welch
Crowe	Hill, Knute	Owen	Werner
Crowther	Hoffman	Palmisano	West
Culkin	Holmes	Patterson	Welchel
Cullen	Hope	Pearson	White
Cummings	Houston	Peterson, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Curley	Huddleston	Peterson, Ga.	Williams
Daly	Hull	Peyser	Withrow
Darrow	Imhoff	Pfeifer	Wolcott
Deianey	Jacobsen	Pierce	Wolfenden
Dempsey	Jenckes, Ind.	Pittenger	Wolverton
Dickstein	Jenkins, Ohio	Plumley	Wood
Dietrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Polk	Woodruff
Dingell	Kahn	Quinn	Woodrum
Dirksen	Keller	Rabaut	Young
Dockweiler	Kelly	Ramspeck	
Dondero	Kennedy, Md.	Ranson	
Dorsey	Kennedy, N. Y.	Reece	
Doutrich	Kenney		
Duncan	Kinzer		
Dunn, Pa.	Kloeck		
Eaton	Knutson		

NOT VOTING—81

Andrews	Ditter	Kniffin	Robison, Ky.
Ayers	Drewry	Lanham	Ryan
Berlin	Duffey, Ohio	Larrabee	Sabath
Binderup	Dunn, Miss.	Lee, Okla.	Sadowski
Bolton	Eagle	Lemke	Sanders, La.
Brennan	Ellenbogen	Lewis, Md.	Sandlin
Brooks	Engel	McClellan	Sauhoff
Bulwinkle	Ferguson	McFarlane	Schuetz
Burch	Fernandez	McSwain	Scrugham
Cannon, Wis.	Flesinger	Maloney	Sisson
Cary	Gassaway	Martin, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.
Casey	Greenway	Maverick	Stewart
Claiborne	Hamlin	Monaghan	Summers, Tex.
Collins	Hancock, N. C.	Montague	Terry
Corning	Higgins, Conn.	Montet	Tolan
Crosby	Higgins, Mass.	Nelson	Weaver
Darden	Hoeppel	Nichols	Wilson, La.
Dear	Hollister	O'Connell	Zioncheck
Deen	Johnson, Okla.	Parks	
Dies	Kee	Rayburn	
Disney	Kleberg	Reed, N. Y.	

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Dunn of Mississippi (for) with Mr. Lemke (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Hollister.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Bolton.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Stewart.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. McFarlane with Mr. Engle.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Ditter.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Andrews.
 Mr. McClellan with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Sauthoff.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts.
 Mr. O'Connell with Mr. Clalborne.
 Mr. Gassaway with Mr. Binderup.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Crosby.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Darden.
 Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Disney.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Terry.
 Mr. Maverick with Mr. Farley.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. Nelson.
 Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Lewis of Maryland.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Sisson.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Sandlin.
 Mr. Cary with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Montet.
 Mr. Deen with Mr. Larrabee.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Bulwinkle.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Sanders of Texas.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Wilson of Louisiana.
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. Monaghan with Mr. Flesinger.
 Mr. Ellenbogen with Mr. McSwain.
 Mr. Duffy of Ohio with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
 Mr. Ayers with Mr. Parks.
 Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Berlin.
 Mr. Hamlin with Mr. Kniffin.
 Mr. Eagle with Mr. Brennan.

Mr. BOEHNE, Mr. WHEELHEL, Mr. ROMJUE, Mr. CROWE, changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DUFFY of New York and Mr. RANKIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin, advises me that he is unavoidably absent and if present he would vote "no."

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. KEE, is unavoidably absent. Had he been here and voting, he would have voted "no."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, is absent on account of illness. If present, he would have voted "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That any person who shall engage himself for pay, or for any consideration, to attempt to influence legislation, or to prevent legislation, by the National Congress, or to influence any Federal bureau, agency, or Government official, or Government employee, to make, modify, alter, or cancel any contract with the United States Government, or any United States bureau, agency, or official, as such official, or to influence any such bureau, agency, or official in the administration of any governmental duty, so as to give any benefit or advantage to any private corporation or individual, shall before entering into and engaging in such practice with reference to legislation as herein set out register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, and shall give to those officers his name, address, the person, association, or corporation, one or more, by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works as aforesaid. He shall likewise state how much he has been paid, and is to receive, and by whom he is paid, or is to be paid, and how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included, and set out his contract in full.

"Sec. 2. Any person, before he shall enter into and engage in such practices as heretofore set forth, in connection with Federal bureaus, agencies, governmental officials, or employees, shall register with the Federal Trade Commission giving to the Federal Trade Commission the same information as that required to be given to the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate in section 1 of this act.

"Sec. 3. At the end of each 3-month period, each person engaged in such practices as aforesaid shall file, either with the Federal Trade Commission or the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, as required herein, a detailed report of all moneys received and expended by him during such 3-month period in carrying on his work as aforesaid, to whom paid, and for what purpose, and the names of any papers, periodicals, or magazines in which he has caused any articles or editorials to be published.

"Sec. 4. All reports required under this bill shall be made under oath, before an officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

"Sec. 5. Any person who may engage in the practices heretofore set out without first complying with the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 6. Any person who shall make a false affidavit, where an affidavit is required in this act, shall be guilty of perjury and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 2 years.

"Sec. 7. A new registration shall be required each calendar year on or before January 15."

Mr. MICHENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate amendment be laid on the table.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, that the conference report and the Senate amendment be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MICHENNER. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the rule is that the motion suggested by the gentleman from New York is not preferential.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan has priority. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to lay the Senate amendment on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was laid on the table and to lay that on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress it shall be in order for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules and pass bills and resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that during the remainder of the present session the Speaker may have the right to entertain motions to suspend the rules and pass bills and resolutions. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Has the gentleman from New York consulted with the minority leader about that request?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have. Of course, under the rules during the last 6 days of the Congress that can be done. We have never known for some sessions when those last 6 days occur. We could bring in a resolution to that effect. I talked to the minority leader this morning and it was agreeable to him. He did say to me, however, that he would appreciate it if he could know, as far in advance as possible, what suspensions would be taken up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we adopted by unanimous consent about 10 days ago an order which allows the Rules Committee to make a report and call up its report at once, and we still are quite uncertain as to the final adjournment of the House. I wish the gentleman from New York would withdraw his request at this time. I think before we adopt any such order as that we ought to know a little more definitely than we know now when we are likely to get through.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, I might say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], we are striving our utmost to get through at the end of this week.

Mr. MAPES. I understand that; but my information is that our strife is quite likely to be in vain.

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

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

AMENDMENT OF REVENUE ACT OF 1932

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report from the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill (H. R. 12324) to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

SWAMPLANDS IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3405) for the relief of Capt. James W. Darr be recalled from the Committee on Military Affairs. I make that request with the approval and consent of the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will propound a question to the gentleman. What does the gentleman propose to do with the bill when it is recalled?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Lay it on the table.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the reading of the Journal I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on Friday next.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I regret to do so, but at this stage of the session we cannot permit these speeches. I object.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE ANSWER TO THE TOWNSENDITES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican national platform gives the answer sought by those who believe in old-age security.

It calls for a pay-as-you-go policy, requiring of each generation the support of the aged and the determination of what is just and adequate, and it provides for assistance by the Federal Government in proportion to the amount contributed by the States.

It offers the opportunity for all of those who really believe in old-age security to get behind a plan which is sensible, practicable, and which will not impose undue burdens upon the people as a whole. It offers something which can be attained. It does not propose to take from one class of citizens a disproportionate amount of their savings or their earnings and to give it to another class.

If enacted into law and properly administered, it will protect against want and privation, but it will not enable one group to live in idleness and enjoy benefits not attainable by their neighbors who are working or conducting their own businesses.

It will not provide \$200 a month to everyone who has reached a certain age, regardless of his other income, of his needs, as advocated by Dr. Townsend. No longer is there excuse for any woman or man who is earnestly seeking adequate old-age security to advocate the Townsend plan.

The insincerity of Dr. Townsend has been disclosed by his own followers and by his recent conduct.

June 2, 1936, Hon. JOHN S. McGROARTY, Congressman from California and father of the McGroarty bill, called attention of his fellow Congressmen to the fact that, for many, many months there has been a feeling on the part of Congressmen favorable to the movement that Dr. Townsend "was not sincerely working in the interest of the movement." Mr. McGROARTY said:

I wonder if Dr. Townsend's refusal to come to Washington and work with the Congress here for the passage of the McGroarty bill

could possibly mean that for one reason or another it was not his sincere desire that the McGroarty bill be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

The charge has frequently been made that Dr. Townsend did not sincerely desire the enactment of his plan into law, for the reason that if it was enacted his source of revenue—that is, his collections from club members—would end. Mr. McGROARTY has evidently now reached the same conclusion that many others entertained months ago.

Mr. McGROARTY also cites the fact that Dr. Townsend, in his foreword to a book written by his now right-hand man, Sheridan Downey, is abandoning the transaction tax and is advocating a \$10,000,000 bond issue to finance the Townsend plan.

Mr. McGROARTY also calls attention to the fact that in this same foreword, signed by Dr. Townsend, he suggests that the age limit start at 75 instead of 60, and he continues:

The fact that Townsend has done nothing to promote the passage or increase the interest in Congress of the McGroarty bill at this session should prove to any thinking person that Townsend has abandoned the McGroarty bill and is subverting the approved official legislative effort of the entire Townsend movement to the ideas and personal political ambitions of one man.

He then states that the true reason back of the breach between himself and Dr. Townsend was the doctor's insistence that a third party be organized.

Of his own efforts to promote this legislation and of the lack of cooperation on the part of Dr. Townsend, Mr. McGROARTY further says:

Dr. Townsend's frantic opposition to my well-meant intentions came without so much as a note of inquiry, much less a conference with him as to my purposes. I could not understand his attitude at the time, but I have since learned that my announcement came only a few days prior to a long-planned announcement by him declaring himself for the Presidency of the United States. When I learned these facts, I well understood that Townsend's opposition was caused by the jealousy that is born of thwarted desire. Unlike Dr. Townsend, I have no political ambitions, and never did have, and I have never deserted the Townsend movement, but he did when he went over to the Downey plan.

In this same connection it will be recalled that within the last week Dr. Townsend has announced that a President could not be elected without the Townsend votes, and at the same interview he declared that Townsendites would support neither Candidate Landon nor Candidate Roosevelt. Evidently the doctor thinks that he will be drafted as a candidate for President of the United States. This is in line with the letter written by him on September 4, 1935, to Mr. Clements, in which, among other things, he said:

The cry everywhere I go is, "Why don't we have our own party?" Now, that is just the thing I believe we should begin to do, talk about the Townsend party, not wait in the foolish hope that one of the old groups will adopt us. * * * To hell with them.

The doctor has advocated a third party several times. He has as often changed his mind. But now, surrounded as he is by the new advisers, he may go through with the idea.

Mr. McGROARTY makes further disclosures which indicate that the doctor is not conserving the resources of the organization. Mr. McGROARTY said:

At the time of Clements' resignation, April 1, 1936, there was \$130,000 in the treasury of the O. A. R. P. and no debts. Dr. Townsend testified on May 20, 1936, that there was only about \$60,000 of that amount left. In other words, this "great national board", when once given access to the cash, not only spent all receipts taken in during the period but spent over half the total cash reserve within 6 weeks. * * * The spending of the money is bad enough within itself, but the condemning charge against this national board and its mismanagement is that all during this time when over \$100,000 was being spent by them not a finger was being lifted toward assisting the enactment of our legislation. Not a single member of this new board nor a representative of the O. A. R. P. have made even the slightest effort in this direction.

Apparently Dr. Townsend has now joined forces with Rev. Gerald Smith, of share-the-wealth notoriety, and it is stated that these two groups, the Townsendites, the share-the-wealth group, and a third organization, will join forces and advocate the adoption of their program and the election of a President, in accordance with Dr. Townsend's desires. Certainly such a movement will clarify the issue, and it is at

least an honest way of obtaining an expression of what the people really desire.

In years gone by the Republican Party has given expression in legislation to those principles which have brought this country to the forefront among the nations of the world. About that statement there can be no argument. Its truth may be determined from the history of our country.

Notwithstanding all that has been said about the wickedness, the selfishness, of the members of that party, of all that has been uttered about the depression we are in, the suffering, the want, and the lack of opportunity of our people, the indisputable fact remains that today the average citizen in America is beyond comparison the best fed, housed, and clothed individual in the whole wide world; that he enjoys advantages as to living conditions, the attainment of knowledge, and what is commonly called culture undreamed of in other countries; that he has and uses as common necessities those things which in other countries are termed luxuries and to nine-tenths of the population of those countries unattainable.

Advocacy of \$200 a month may be the bait to use to catch unthinking voters, but most Americans think and have common sense, and practically all realize that looking for the rainbow's end gets us nowhere.

It would seem that we have had enough of wild talk, enough of promises, which are not only insincere but impossible of performance, enough of shouting and wild accusations, and that all those who really and sincerely desire the enactment of an old-age-security plan which will give something other than promises have no longer any excuse for failing to get behind the Republican candidates, who stand upon the Republican platform and who can be relied upon to work in accordance with the principles of that great party, which will produce results rather than false hopes.

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

THE TOWNSEND PLAN—ITS ORIGIN—THE AVOWED PURPOSE—THE REAL PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MOVEMENT HAS BEEN USED—METHOD OF PROCEDURE OF ITS ADVOCATES—ITS COST—BY WHOM IT WOULD BE FINANCED—ITS BENEFITS AND THE RESULT OF ITS OPERATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a short summary of the testimony so far taken by the special committee investigating old-age-pension plans may be placed in the RECORD either today or tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Any statement on so controversial an issue should quote facts from authoritative sources, hence frequent reference will be made to, and quotations taken from, the testimony of the persons above named, as well as others, and, that such references may be verified, pages of the record, preceded by letter, will indicate the source. Figures preceded by S., indicate Senate hearings before the Finance Committee; preceded by H., indicate House hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, in February of 1935; preceded by S. C., indicates Select Committee hearings. Where page numbers are not given in parentheses it is because the testimony has not yet been printed.)

ORIGIN OF THE PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is currently reported that as Dr. Townsend, a physician, who had lost his position about October 2, 1933, as health officer in his local city because of a reorganization in that department, was standing by his window, he saw two aged women poking in a garbage can, and straightway there came to him the idea of a pension for the aged; that this was the origin of the Townsend plan, to the development of which he says he has unselfishly devoted his time.

Others, however, point to the existence of a similar idea many years ago, and, as late as August of 1931, C. Stewart McCord copyrighted (entry C, no. 5595) a plan entitled "Mercy Death for Surplus Labor", which contained the idea of an annuity of from \$50 to \$80 per month and provided for the elimination from the field of competitive labor by retirement of those between the ages of 50 and 55 years, the exact age to be determined by the amount of labor required in industry. Under the McCord plan, the old-age insurance was to be financed by a sales tax.

It will be noted in passing that the Townsend plan provides for a pension of \$200 per month (Townsend Weekly, Dec. 30, 1935) for those over 60, although the doctor once testified (S. C. 1036) that the age limit would be reduced to between 40 and 50; again, to between 45 or 50 (H. 751); again, 55, then 50 (S. C. 1064); while, in his foreword to the recent book of his present adviser, Sheridan Downey, Dr. Townsend suggests that the pension begin at the age of 75, instead of 60; financed by a pyramided sales tax (S. C. 1018) (the term "transaction tax" being used to avoid the feeling against a sales tax—that is, 2 percent each time a dollar's worth of commodities changes hands), while the McCord plan provided a pension of from \$50 to \$80 for those who had reached the age of 50 or 55, and was to be financed by a straight sales tax.

Still more recently Dr. Townsend announced, in his foreword to Downey's book, that he was "not entirely committed to the transaction tax" and makes reference to a \$10,000,000,000 bond issue to finance social dividends of not less than \$200 per month.

There are other points of similarity between the two plans, sufficient, in fact, to lead to the conclusion that if the Townsend plan is not simply a restatement of the McCord plan, it is but another version of the essential features of previous plans.

THE AVOWED PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

As stated by the Townsend publications, the purposes of the plan are, briefly:

- (a) To "restore prosperity", and
- (b) To "provide security for all persons who have reached the age of 60 years."

For the plan it is claimed that its operation will afford work for all employables, provide a constant purchasing power for American products, maintain a balance between consumption and production, stimulate ambition, reduce crime, furnish opportunity to the young, reduce the burden of taxation, and render unnecessary the maintenance of many public institutions; in short, that it provides a remedy for all our economic and social ills.

There has been, and it is obvious there can be, no criticism of the purposes so stated.

Whether the accomplishment of these purposes is practical is quite another matter. Its desirability is so evident that no sane person would hesitate to adopt and advocate it if there appeared to be a reasonable chance of bringing it to successful accomplishment.

THE REAL PURPOSE FOR WHICH THE MOVEMENT HAS BEEN USED

The testimony of JOHN S. McGROARTY, Congressman from California, author of the McGroarty bill and former leader of the Townsend movement in Congress, and who testified in substance and to the effect that Townsend himself had made no effort to have his theory—i. e., \$200 per month to everyone over 60, and so forth—enacted into law; of Jack Leasia, former State manager for Michigan (S. C. 426-445); of Juanita H. Jackson (S. C. 571-580, 749-769) and Rev. David B. Moore (S. C. 565-571), formerly active Townsend organizers and workers in Michigan; of Otto Moore (S. C. 451-464, 467-471) and others formerly on the congressional action committee of the organization; of Edward E. Gordon, State area manager of southern California (S. C. 485-491, 495-502); of Frank L. McWade, churchman and resigned member of a Rochester, N. Y., club, and who said of the Townsend movement, "The leaders are racketeers and have turned the pension movement into a racket"; of Rev. Alfred J. Wright, of Cleveland, Ohio, a member of the Townsend board of directors until he was ordered by Dr. Townsend not to testify before the committee; of Charles M. Hawks, who resigned as Massachusetts manager of the O. A. R. P., Ltd., when ordered by Townsend not to appear, shows conclusively that the movement has been used by Francis E. Townsend, Robert E. Clements, Edward Margett, and certain others who were parties to the collection of upward of a million dollars as a "racket" to enrich themselves and to advance the political fortunes of certain hangers-on, some of whom are no more, no less, than professional organizers.

Dr. Townsend, when upon the stand, stated, in substance, that organizers and so-called managers had received sums which he considered to be excessive and of the payment of which he was not cognizant.

It was further established that, while Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements had testified in previous hearings that they were receiving but \$50 per week and expenses for their services in connection with the movement, Mr. Clements had received upward of \$69,000 in a period of a little more than 2½ years, and, in addition, his living expenses, and he stated that Dr. Townsend had received a like amount.

The doctor testified that, in addition to his living expenses, he had received between \$68,000 and \$69,000.

Further evidence that the collection of funds, rather than the enactment of legislation, was the purpose is found in the statement of Hon. JOHN S. McGROARTY.

M'GROARTY SAYS TOWNSEND DESERTED THE MOVEMENT

Congressman McGROARTY, Dr. Townsend's one-time floor leader in the House, in a speech delivered June 2, 1936, said:

I wonder if Dr. Townsend's refusal to come to Washington and work with the Congress here for the passage of the McGroarty bill could possibly mean that for one reason or another it was not his sincere desire that the McGroarty bill be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

And, further answering Dr. Townsend's charge that he, McGROARTY, had political ambitions, said:

I have since learned that my announcement (to run as a Presidential candidate in the California primaries) came only a few days prior to a long-planned announcement by him declaring himself (Dr. Townsend) for the Presidency of the United States. When I learned these facts, I well understood that Townsend's opposition was caused by the jealousy that is born of thwarted desire. Unlike Dr. Townsend, I have no political ambitions and never did have, and I have never deserted the Townsend movement, but he did when he went over to the Downey plan.

THE MOVEMENT HAS A POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE

In this same connection it will be recalled that, within the last week, Dr. Townsend has announced that a President could not be elected without the Townsend votes, and at the same interview he declared that Townsendites would support neither Candidate Landon nor Candidate Roosevelt. Evidently the doctor thinks that he will be drafted as a candidate for President of the United States. This is in line with the letter written by him on September 4, 1935, to Mr. Clements, in which, among other things, he said:

The cry everywhere I go is, "Why don't we have our own party?" Now, that is just the thing I believe we should begin to do, talk about the Townsend party, not wait in the foolish hope that one of the old groups will adopt us. * * * To hell with them.

The doctor has advocated a third party several times. He has as often changed his mind. But now, surrounded as he is by the new advisers, he may go through with the idea.

In many congressional districts and in some States, candidates for Congress and for the Senate are using the Townsend movement as a means to provide themselves with the necessary votes to attain office, although privately many of these men will acknowledge the impracticability of the Townsend plan.

Mr. McGROARTY makes further disclosures which indicate that the Doctor is not conserving the resources of the organization. Mr. McGROARTY said:

At the time of Clements' resignation, April 1, 1936, there was \$130,000 in the treasury of the O. A. R. P. and no debts. Dr. Townsend testified on May 20, 1936, that there was only about \$60,000 of that amount left. In other words, this "great national board", when once given access to the cash, not only spent all receipts taken in during the period but spent over half the total cash reserve within 6 weeks. * * * The spending of the money is bad enough within itself, but the condemning charge against this national board and its mismanagement is that all during this time when over \$100,000 was being spent by them not a finger was being lifted toward assisting the enactment of our legislation. Not a single member of this new board nor a representative of the O. A. R. P. have made even the slightest effort in this direction.

Moreover, Dr. Townsend recently issued an appeal to the members of the Townsend clubs for a \$75,000 fund, alleging that the investigating committee intended to impound the

funds of the O. A. R. P. Upon the witness stand he said that he had no foundation for such intimation, but, nevertheless, the appeal went out.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE OF ITS ADVOCATES THROUGH AN ORGANIZATION (O. A. R. P., LTD.)—THE PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION, ITS FORM, AND ITS REVENUES

The only justification for any organization working under the auspices of the Townsend old-age-pension organization is an honest purpose to enact into law the essential features of that plan, as stated by its author and cofounders; hence it becomes material to glance at the form of the organization, its activities, and any subsidiary depending upon the parent organization to ascertain whether it lends itself merely to the collection of revenue, the advancement of the political fortunes of its founders and organizers, or is devised to make the Townsend idea a legislative enactment.

The Townsend organization may roughly be divided into three parts. The Old Age Revolving Pensions, Ltd., is a so-called nonprofit corporation, organized on January 24, 1934, under a statute peculiar to the State of California, by Dr. Townsend, Walter Townsend, and R. E. Clements (S. C. 308).

No money or other assets were put into the corporation except \$100, which was contributed by Dr. Townsend (S. 1047).

These three—Dr. Townsend as president, Walter Townsend as vice president, and R. E. Clements as secretary and treasurer—were the sole owners of the O. A. R. P. until June of 1935, when Walter Townsend, the doctor's brother, was succeeded as a director and vice president by Judge Tyrrell (S. C. 309), who was succeeded as director and vice president by Gomer Smith, candidate for Senator in Oklahoma, early in 1936, although, as a matter of fact, the organization's records being what they are, legally speaking, it may be stated that Dr. Townsend and his brother Walter are still the controlling factors in the O. A. R. P.

Nor should it be forgotten that the directors are the creators of the incorporators. They may be removed or replaced at will; hence Dr. Townsend and Walter Townsend still remain in sole control.

Dr. Townsend and R. E. Clements were the only two salaried directors (S. C. 310).

R. E. Clements submitted his resignation as secretary-treasurer and director, to become effective April 1, 1936.

The directors of the corporation, on April 22, 1936, were Dr. Townsend, Gomer Smith, Gilmore Young, Dr. Clinton Wunder, Jack Kiefer, Dr. A. J. Wright (since resigned), Nathan Roberts, Frank A. Arbuckle, and Baxter Rankine (S. C. 324), but the incorporators, hence the owners, are Dr. Townsend and Walter Townsend, and, upon dissolution of the corporation, they are entitled to its assets (S. C. 324-325).

The stated purpose of the organization was to obtain, through Congress, the enactment of legislation embodying the essential features of the Townsend plan. To influence Congress to pass such legislation Dr. Townsend, Glen J. Hudson, and Dr. Robert R. Doane, the latter two economists, called by Dr. Townsend, appeared in February of 1935 before the House Ways and Means Committee, and Dr. Townsend, Mr. Clements, and Dr. Doane before the Senate Finance Committee, which were then considering the Social Security Act, the two former advocating the passage of a bill which had been introduced at their solicitation.

To induce Congressmen to vote for the legislation desired by Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements, they conceived the plan of organizing throughout the country local "Townsend clubs", from which they could obtain the necessary funds to carry on their campaign and whose members might be induced to wire and write their Congressmen, urging them to support the plan.

As to these local clubs, Mr. Clements testified (S. 1056):

They are entirely independent organizations. We exercise no control over their finances whatever. * * * We do not exact a list or roster of their membership at all.

Notwithstanding this statement by Mr. Clements that the national organization exercised no control over the finances of the local clubs, the contrary is true, for in the Weekly and in their bulletins they insisted that all money, dues, quotas, or that received by way of contributions, be forwarded immediately, through State area headquarters, to the national organization (bulletins nos. 16, 30, and 47, issued by O. A. R. P., Townsend Weekly of May 11, 1936).

As proof that Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements intended at all hazards to retain absolute control of the financial transactions of all of these organizations, one need but to read the permit issued by the O. A. R. P. to all local organizations. It reads as follows:

Date _____. Club no. _____. City _____. State _____. District _____. No. _____. PERMIT OF THE OLD AGE REVOLVING PENSIONS, LTD.

Permission is hereby given the above-described Townsend club of the old-age revolving pension movement to organize and operate in accordance with the rules and regulations now existing or as may be changed by the parent organization located at Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, Calif.

The duly elected officers of the above-described Townsend club hereby pledge themselves to well and faithfully serve their organization in all honorable ways and to adhere strictly to the tenets and rules of procedure as issued from the parent organization above mentioned.

The following duly elected officers of the above-described club hereby accept their duties and agree to serve in their respective capacities until their successors are elected.

Permittee:

OLD AGE REVOLVING PENSIONS, LTD.,
F. E. TOWNSEND, M. D., President.
R. E. CLEMENTS, Secretary.

TOWNSEND CLUB,
_____, Club President.
_____, Club Secretary.

Thousands of these permits were issued, thousands of clubs were formed, and many members—just how many it has been impossible to ascertain—joined the clubs. The number of members is variously estimated at from five to thirty million, but the investigation has disclosed that nowhere, either within the Townsend organization or elsewhere, so far as the committee has been able to learn, is there in existence even a purported list of all members.

Strenuous efforts were made, through local clubs, to obtain signatures to petitions requesting Senators and Congressmen to vote for a \$200-a-month pension, and millions of such signatures were undoubtedly obtained, but these petitions were stored away in a warehouse in California and were never presented to individual Senators or Congressmen, nor to the Senate or House, and it was not until the investigation was well under way that the petitions were brought to Washington. The real purpose in obtaining them is still a mystery, for they were never used for the announced purpose for which the signatures were secured.

Revenue was to be obtained by a membership fee of 25 cents; a monthly quota of 10 cents per member, which, however, was not obligatory; dues of \$1 a month obtained from legionnaires, an auxiliary organization; the sale of literature, buttons, and various other items; contributions, donations, and various funds raised by suppers, dances, and other forms of social activities, the funds from the latter source being usually retained by the local organizations.

The national organization insisted that all funds received from legionnaires be paid direct to that organization; that funds received from the 25 cents membership fee and from the 10 cents per month contribution, which was designated a "quota", while paid to the local organizations, should, in all instances, be forwarded in their entirety to the national organization, which later returned to the regional, area, and local, for operating expenses and the payment of organizers, 15 cents out of each 25-cent membership fee and 40 percent of the 10-cent fee.

Organizers were paid 5 cents per member. Local, area, and regional organizers, managers, and directors were paid various sums, ranging from \$25 per week upward; Margett, a State area manager, wiring from California, in answer to the charge that his commissions were from \$1,800 to \$2,000

per month, that he was receiving from \$500 to \$600 per month more than that, but also claiming that he was "thousands of dollars out of pocket" (S. C. 97-98).

Figures taken from the regional office at Chicago (S. C. 398) show that from July 1, 1935, to November 11, 1935, 4 months and 10 days, E. J. Walker, State manager for Michigan, received \$2,597.49, while from November 19, 1935, to February 7, 1936, 2 months and 19 days, F. N. Goldsberry, as State manager for Michigan, located at Detroit, received a salary of \$812, with commissions of \$3,386.82, or a total of \$4,198.82.

Through the Townsend Weekly and so-called bulletins, containing instructions and news items issued by the national organization to the local clubs, those organizations were continuously reminded of the necessity of organizing new clubs, writing their Congressmen and Senators, and paying to the national organization their quota.

Demands for funds were so incessant and clubs responded to such an extent that, in a period covering 3 months, approximately \$350,000 was collected (S. C. 65, 73) and, from January 1934 to December 31, 1935, a total of \$771,964.09 (S. C. 81), and a grand total, since the inception of the movement to March 27, 1936, of all revenues from all sources, of approximately \$951,946.09 (S. C. 82). Dr. Townsend admits that more than a million dollars has been collected, while others insist that over a million and a half has been received by the organization. He further testified (S. C. 600):

We are endeavoring to raise millions of dollars in this campaign. We must have it and we are going to get it.

Over the funds so collected and in their expenditure the local clubs had no voice whatever, except as to the portion which was refunded to them by the national organization. All moneys sent to the national organization during the period above referred to were either disbursed or retained by Dr. Townsend and R. E. Clements, except those items referred to above, which were returned to the local organizations.

There was no way by which the local clubs or the members of the local clubs could possibly receive any material, practical benefit unless and until the Townsend plan was enacted into legislation, and their part in the plan was solely that of collecting and transmitting funds and exerting pressure upon Congressmen and Senators by means of telegrams, letters, and personal solicitation.

The third unit in the organization was the Prosperity Publishing Co., a corporation organized under the laws of California in September of 1934, by Dr. Townsend, R. E. Clements, and an attorney, Claud Doyle, who merely acted as a third necessary director (S. C. 163, 313-314). There were 25,000 shares of stock of no par value, 10 of which were issued to Dr. Townsend and 10 to R. E. Clements (S. C. 164), thus making the two the owners of the corporation and of all of its assets.

For 3 or 4 months prior to the incorporation of the Prosperity Publishing Co., a weekly newspaper, known as the Modern Crusader, published by Chester McDonald, had been advocating the Townsend plan. Dr. Townsend and Clements secured the subscription lists of the Modern Crusader and published the Townsend Weekly, which made its first appearance on January 21, 1935.

Official Bulletin No. 17 contained the announcement—

First issue of the Townsend Weekly, only official organ of the Townsend plan, will be out January 21, 1935.

The revenue derived from this publication was obtained principally from its sale to local Townsend clubs and their members and from advertising, although, later, other official publications were issued, which were sold to members, an illustration being a booklet costing a cent and six mills which sold at 25 cents (S. 1057).

Neither Dr. Townsend nor R. E. Clements put any money into the Prosperity Publishing Co., other than the incorporation expenses (S. C. 165), which did not exceed \$250 (S. C. 167-168). After that paper became known as the "official" publication, it sold so rapidly that, by March 13, 1935 (S. C. 166), Dr. Townsend and Clements stated that it had a paid circulation of over 100,000 copies, and they transferred it to

the Prosperity Publishing Co., the corporation owned by them.

The money to build up this paid circulation of over 100,000 copies and to publish this paper came, prior to March 13, 1935, from Townsend clubs and their members.

The Prosperity Publishing Co. continued to issue the Townsend Weekly, various bulletins, and some other literature.

Early in 1936 the Prosperity Publishing Co. declared a dividend of \$50,000, \$25,000 of which was paid to Clements and \$25,000 to Dr. Townsend. About this dividend Mr. Clements testified (S. C. 317):

Mr. HOLLISTER. \$2,500-a-share dividend?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLLISTER. On stock which cost neither of you—Clements or Townsend—anything?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Dr. Townsend thereafter purchased Clements' interest in the Prosperity Publishing Co. for \$25,000 (S. C. 316), so that for his interest in the Prosperity Publishing Co., into which he and Dr. Townsend had put no money whatever, except about \$250, and which issued its first publication of the Townsend Weekly on January 21, 1935, and which had an existence of about 15 months, Robert E. Clements received \$50,000 in addition to a previous dividend of \$6,650 (S. C. 84).

From the foregoing it will be seen that the organization consisted of three units:

First. The O. A. R. P., Ltd., originally owned by Dr. Townsend, a "dummy", and R. E. Clements. Apparently it is now owned by Dr. Townsend and his brother.

Second. The Prosperity Publishing Co., which publishes the Townsend Weekly and other official publications which sell principally to members of local clubs.

Third. Local clubs, possessing no legal entity, consisting of members who purchase the publications of the Prosperity Publishing Co. and contribute dues to the O. A. R. P.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE OF ITS ADVOCATES—THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ORGANIZATION

Dr. Townsend's stated purpose of restoring prosperity and giving security against want to the aged was to be accomplished by the enactment into law of his theory of giving to those over 60 who met certain qualifications a pension of \$200 per month, obtained by the imposition of a pyramided 2-percent sales tax and the collection of certain other inheritance, gift, and income taxes.

It has been pointed out that through the formation of the O. A. R. P., Ltd., corporation, the Prosperity Publishing Co., and the organization of local clubs, over a million dollars was collected on the theory that such sums were necessary to obtain the enactment of this legislation, although it also appears that the major portion of this money was used for the benefit of the author, the cofounder, and certain organizers and managers.

One of the usual methods of getting an idea enacted into law is to maintain in Washington a lobby which will inform Congressmen of the merits of the plan and solicit their support.

For this purpose the Townsend organization collected \$23,490 (S. C. 715-716), and \$1,804.96 was spent by this lobby (S. C. 716). The lobby was then dissolved and its members returned to their homes, but, notwithstanding this fact, an urgent appeal for further funds, intimating that the amount first collected had been exhausted—although but \$1,804.96 had been spent—was made, and upward of \$11,000 additional was collected to promote the passage of this legislation. But none of that sum was used for that purpose here in Washington.

While the Townsend Weekly, the bulletin issued by the O. A. R. P., Ltd., the organizers and the lecturers and Dr. Townsend himself were insisting upon a pension of not less than \$200 per month, the only bill pending before Congress was H. R. 7154, the so-called McGroarty bill, which, briefly, provides for the levying of a 2-percent transaction tax upon practically all financial transactions, for increases in the gift, inheritance, and income taxes, and for the distribution, after deduction of administration expense, of the proceeds among those persons 60 years of age or upward who have

net incomes of \$2,400 per year or less, who are American citizens, not habitual criminals, who refrain from gainful occupations and who spend the amount so received within the confines of the United States during the month in which it is received.

No hearings have been held upon this bill; no committee has reported upon its merit or lack of merit; there is no information before the House as to the amount of revenue which might be raised by the taxes imposed by it, the amounts required for administrative expenses, or of the amount which would be paid to the beneficiaries.

Nevertheless, the Townsend organization, with its claimed millions of members, has been demanding that Congressmen bring it upon the floor of the House and enact it into law. The Townsend Weekly, which is the official organ of the Townsend movement, and the bulletins issued from time to time by that organization, and the organizers and speakers sponsored by it, while demanding that Congress pass the McGroarty bill, have, at the same time, persistently and insistently demanded of us that we vote for a bill which will guarantee to the beneficiary \$200 per month. Yet everyone knows there is no such bill before this House. A typical illustration of this propaganda is seen in the issue of December 30, 1935, of the Townsend Weekly, in which it is stated that the demand of the Townsend organization is for a pension of \$200 per month, and where Congressmen are told:

That there has never been, nor will be, any compromise on the \$200-per-month provisions in the Townsend demands. Now you can take our orders or—get out.

This uncompromising demand is continued each week in the Townsend Weekly and in the last issue of that official publication it still stands, and Dr. Townsend, upon the witness stand, on May 19, 1936, stated that the amount of the pension called for by his plan was \$200 per month. (S. C. 649-650.)

A further statement of Dr. Townsend, oft repeated, was that men like Henry Ford, Rockefeller, and Morgan should receive the benefits of this pension. The McGroarty bill contains no such provision. One of the limitations imposed upon the pensioners is that no one with an income of more than \$2,400 can participate.

The Townsend leader on the floor of Congress, as has been stated, was John Steven McGroarty and, under oath, before the committee he stated that he never knew of Dr. Townsend visiting Congressmen or making any effort to get his bill pushed in Congress or passed. He testified:

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You got your understanding of their impression by the general conversations that you heard among the men who were here actually working for the bill?

Mr. McGROARTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That they knew that Dr. Townsend did not want the bill passed, but wanted it prolonged in order to keep revenue coming into his organization? That was the general, common knowledge among the people who actually came down to work for the bill, was it not?

Mr. McGROARTY. It was certainly the impression that the men you mentioned had.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that the real reason why these men left the movement was because they learned that Dr. Townsend and his close associates who were getting rich out of the movement were opposed to the passage of the bill and would not cooperate with them in helping to push the bill in Congress? That is a fact, is it not?

Mr. McGROARTY. It was their impression. I am not making that as my statement, but that was my impression.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. McGroarty, that impression was obtained from the experience they had had with Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements here in Washington in their attempt to get H. R. 7154 passed?

Mr. McGROARTY. Yes; that was their impression, probably gained from that; but now, if you mention Mr. Clements, I want in all justice to him to say that he was very diligent, very industrious, and very active in trying to force a vote on H. R. 7154.

In his speech of June 2, 1936, Mr. McGROARTY said:

I have never deserted the Townsend plan, but he (Dr. Townsend) did when he went over to the Downey plan.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE OF ITS ADVOCATES—OBTAINING FUNDS BY FRAUDULENT STATEMENTS

Each reader may determine for himself whether or not the methods used to induce individuals to pay a 25-cent membership fee, a 10-cent-per-month quota fee, \$1 per

month as a legionnaire, and to purchase literature, are fraudulent.

In a leaflet entitled "This Way to Victory", by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, a statement of the various purposes for which money was needed was given. These covered the usual organization and operating expenses of a movement of this character. Among other things, Dr. Townsend stated:

The fact that we propose building a national organization with a quota of 10 cents per member per month, or \$1.20 a year, is causing astonishment everywhere. * * * We ourselves know that thousands of people in our movement cheerfully give their time and energy without thought of compensation. * * * Ours is mostly a labor of love. And to this labor of love we will add the club quota. * * *

We found some months ago that we could not enact the Townsend plan into law with a financial structure based on 25-cent membership dues.

Accompanying this statement, when it was sent out, was another leaflet, which contained the following statements:

TOWNSEND PLAN VICTORY CHART

(Chart based on Townsend plan becoming law of the land)

THE MIRACLE OF 10 CENTS

(In action for annuitants)

Quota investment on monthly basis: Original investment 10 cents, returns on investment (after first few months), \$199.90; life returns on investment (after first few months), \$200.

Quota investment on yearly basis: Original investment, \$1.20; returns on investment (after first year), \$2,398.80; life returns on investment (after first year), \$2,400.

THE MIRACLE OF 10 CENTS

(In action for nonannuitants)

A permanent well-paid job or position until 60, then \$200 monthly, \$2,400 yearly for life.

A circular sent out in February 1936 from the Chicago office and addressed to all area managers, contained the following:

If every member will pay his or her 10-cent quota promptly each month during 1936, and we win the next Congress, that means the 12 monthly quotas plus the 25 cents membership fee, a total of \$1.45, is all it costs to win an annuity of \$2,400 a year—\$200 per month and assured employment at living wages for every worker. Do you know of any investment, anywhere, that will yield such value that costs so little? No matter what any club member's circumstances may be, it would seem the part of wisdom to make a real sacrifice to pay this small monthly quota of 10 cents.

Questioned about the latter statement, Floyd R. Moody, area manager for 37 counties in Michigan, testified at Battle Creek, Mich., on a hearing there that, in his opinion, the statement would create the impression that, by the payment of \$1.45, an individual would get the annuity of \$2,400 per year and so be induced to contribute, and that he knew that such a proposition could not work out, that there was no possibility of it (S. C. 546), and that he personally would not hold out such an inducement because his conscience would not let him. He was asked (S. C. 546):

Question. And your judgment would be that inducing a member to join, pay 25 cents and then 10 cents a month, on any such statement or promise as that, would just be a misrepresentation or fraud?

Answer. It would seem that way to me.

However, this was the inducement, as is shown by the literature sent out by the Townsend organization, which was used to obtain members and to cause members to pay a 25-cent membership fee and monthly dues of 10 cents.

Dr. Townsend testified, in May of 1926, that the organization needed millions and further said that they were going to get them (S. C. 600).

The phenomenal growth in membership and resources of this movement is easily explainable, if it be remembered that statements like the foregoing, holding out to people in distress the thought that upon payment of \$1.45 per year an annuity of \$200 per month could be obtained, were broadcast throughout the land.

The interest and support of those under 60 was obtained by the statement in the article The Miracle of Ten Cents that the enactment of the plan would bring "a permanent well-paid job or position until 60, then \$200 monthly, \$2,400 yearly, for life."

METHOD OF PROCEDURE OF ITS ADVOCATES—OBTAINING SUPPORT BY DEIFYING DR. TOWNSEND

Almost from the beginning of the organization, there has been a studied and persistent effort to "build up" Dr. Townsend. A typical illustration is found in his Speakers' Manual of 1935, wherein, on the first page on the inside, his picture appears as one of the three great emancipators of history, where he, the publisher of this manual, ranks himself with Washington and Lincoln, modestly placing his picture at the bottom of the three. His followers have said of him—and the statement has been printed in his official publication, the Townsend Weekly, of which he is co-owner—that he was "ordained of God" to carry on this plan.

In the Townsend Weekly of December 30, 1935, this statement is made:

But God has built a higher platform of human rights by sending Dr. Francis E. Townsend and his plan. We ask that preachers and priests and church officials give the inspired Townsend plan careful consideration and study.

It is also stated in the same issue (p. 2):

Since its inception the Townsend plan has been recognized as a direct plan from God for the welfare of His children.

Always in the time of need has our God selected a leader to show us the way and the leader of this age is our Dr. Townsend.

Because of his preparation and fitness, God answered his prayer and showed him a plan.

The truth is, as stated, that the essential elements of his plan appear in a publication, copyrighted in August of 1931, by C. Stewart McCord, entitled "Mercy Death for Surplus Labor." (S. C. 758-764.)

In a letter written to him in December 1935, by the secretary of a Michigan club, he was informed (S. C. 605):

So many of our citizens have gone so far in their faith in you as to declare, "Dr. Townsend is the embodiment of Jesus Christ."

He approved of the picture appearing in the Speaker's Manuals where he was depicted as the equal of Washington and Lincoln. He made no reply to the woman who stated that many of their people believe he is the embodiment of Christ. He makes no protest at being thus, by his own publication, exalted to a high position in history. He does not suggest to his worshipful followers that it may be sacrilegious to intimate that he should be ranked with the Deity. He does not refuse the crown extended toward him.

His solicitation of funds, his acceptance, and use of those funds, and the fact that, notwithstanding his testimony that he now had but \$500, he is still, practically, with his brother, the owner of the O. A. R. P., which, he said, has upward of \$60,000 in its treasury, and of the Prosperity Publishing Co., which, he said, if it continues to live and develop and grow as he anticipated, is "worth millions of dollars" (S. C. 616), indicates to the man upon the street that, instead of possessing all the virtues of a saint, he "is of the earth, earthly."

Coming from an atmosphere where he was regarded as one of the great men of our country, where he had linked himself with Washington and with Lincoln, where he was referred to as inspired by and ordained of God, it is not surprising that, when called before the committee and confined to actualities, to things as they are, when required to explain and to give the details of his plan, when confronted by the realization that the committee, instead of blindly accepting his hopes as statements of fact, were insisting that he take his plan apart, show its mechanism, put it together and give a demonstration as to how it would operate, he became impatient and angry.

Being unable to explain away the injustice of his plan and confronted with his own contradictory statements of essential features of his plan, as given at previous hearings, and having admitted to the committee (S. C. 673-674) that he had given false testimony before this committee, he finally concluded to, and did, refuse longer to testify, and left the committee room.

Just prior to this action on his part he had heard read into the record the facts and the figures showing the solicitation of the \$11,000 for further lobbying on the theory that the

lobbying fund had been exhausted, and from the record he had learned that such fund had not been exhausted.

Two of his recently appointed directors, Rev. Dr. Clinton Wunder and Jack Kiefer, men who are at present acting in that organization, were under subpoena to appear. Correspondence between these two men, one a minister of the Gospel, in the hands of the committee, contained statements which were too vile and indecent to be read before a mixed audience or to be printed in the record. If these men were called, they would be confronted with this correspondence and from them would be stripped that mantle of piety which they had used to cloak their hypocrisy, to cover their vileness, when appearing in churches, before audiences, where they opened their meetings with prayer and religious songs. Small wonder he did not desire to remain with the committee and see these, his lieutenants, confronted with their letters.

Dr. Townsend had learned from the testimony read into the record, if he did not know it before, that money had been collected by fraud. He knew that the religious atmosphere which had been built up around and about him was about to be dispelled. He was aware, if he had read the record, that one of his most eloquent orators, Edward Trefz, was guilty of a breach of faith, when he wrote Herbert Hoover, seeking an interview for R. E. Clements and told the former President that, if the interview was not granted, no one would be the wiser, as no one knew of the letter, and, at the same time, on the same day, enclosed a copy of that letter written to the former President with a communication to Mr. Clements; that another brilliant orator, Rev. Dr. Clinton Wunder, who had used the cloak of the ministry to bring converts to this plan, would, by his own correspondence, be disclosed as a man of a vile and filthy mind. The reason for Dr. Townsend's refusal to give further testimony or to attend the hearings and submit to further examination must be apparent to all.

The charge of unfairness, of persecution, falls when we remember that R. E. Clements when upon the stand (S. C. 11), McWade, and Wright, all officers high in the organization, before the committee testified, in substance, that they found no fault with the methods of the committee nor with the manner in which they were examined, nor with the questions asked.

A typical illustration of how those who actually knew the methods of the committee regarded the investigation is that gathered from the statement of the organization's Detroit attorney, made at the investigation in Michigan, where the following occurred (S. C. 396):

Mr. HOFFMAN. As a matter of fact, I gave you an opportunity, because we want to be more than fair in this thing.

Mr. GULLEN. I believe that is true.

Two strong supporters of Dr. Townsend, Congressman TOLAN and Congressman COLLINS, were upon the committee. They were at liberty to ask any of the witnesses any questions they desired, or to file any protest against the committee's action. None of significance were made or filed.

THE RESTORATION OF PROSPERITY AND OLD-AGE SECURITY—METHOD OR ACCOMPLISHMENT—LEVYING OF A TAX AND ITS DISTRIBUTION

Assuming that the avowed purposes of this organization; that is, the restoration of prosperity and security for old age, are its real purposes, it is asserted that these will be accomplished by the imposition of a 2-percent transaction tax—referred to by Dr. Townsend as a pyramided sales tax—upon practically all financial transactions and the imposition of certain inheritance, gift, and income taxes, and that, out of the funds so collected, there will be made, quoting from the Townsend Weekly of April 27, 1936, the "payment each month to all men and women of 60 years and older of \$200 a month to be spent inside the United States."

While it is broadly stated that all the men and women over 60 years of age are to receive \$200 per month, there are, nevertheless, certain limitations. Only American citizens residing in the United States and its Territories whose net income is \$2,400 per year or less, who are not occupants of prisons or hospitals for the mentally incompetent, are

eligible, although both husband and wife, if otherwise qualified, may receive the pension.

Engaging in a gainful occupation, the violation of any provision of law enacted for the establishment of the pension, the unreasonable and unnecessary maintenance of any able-bodied person in idleness, the unreasonable or unnecessary employment of any person, or payment to any person, as services or salary, in amounts disproportionate to the services rendered, the willful refusal to pay a just obligation or to obey any regulation established for the enforcement of the law, works a forfeiture of the right to receive the pension. (Current Townsend Weekly.)

The first bill introduced in Congress to place upon the statute books the Townsend plan has been abandoned, and the only bill now (June 17, 1936) pending before Congress, looking toward the enactment of certain provisions of the so-called Townsend plan is the McGroarty bill, known as H. R. 7154, which does not provide for a pension of \$200 per month, but does provide for the distribution of the amount collected by a 2-percent transaction and certain inheritance, gift, and income taxes, after the payment of administrative expenses, among those eligible, and one of the qualifications of the McGroarty bill is that no person receiving a net income of more than \$2,400 annually shall be eligible.

The amount which might possibly be raised under the provisions of the McGroarty bill, according to Dr. Doane, was approximately \$33.33 per month per pensioner. (S. C. 283-9.)

Dr. Doane gave certain figures as to the amount which might, upon a theoretical basis, be raised by a 2-percent transaction tax, but he also stated (H. C. 1112) that at present levels the maximum which could be expected under a 2-percent tax would be \$4,000,000,000, and that if all possible producer and consumer expenditures were included then we might expect approximately \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. HILL. That is per year?
Dr. DOANE. Per year.

This is in line with his subsequent testimony that the tax would raise approximately one-third enough to pay the pension without taking into consideration administrative expenses.

Glen Hudson expressly stated that he would not vote for the bill as then before the committee (H. C. 738).

In his foreword, dated January 1936, to a somewhat recent publication by Sheridan Downey, Dr. Townsend's right-hand man, Dr. Townsend declares himself "not entirely committed to the transaction tax" and he mentions a \$10,000,000,000 bond issue to finance "social dividends", which he apparently, at the suggestion of Downey, terms "annuities" or "pensions." And he also suggests that it may be necessary to start the pensions at the age of 75, instead of at 60 years of age.

His more recent association with Rev. Gerald Smith, of "share the wealth" notoriety, would seem to indicate that he has abandoned the Townsend plan, as originally proposed, and intends to become a candidate for the Presidency on a share-the-wealth platform, although he refused to support Congressman McGROARTY's slate for delegates to the Democratic National Convention, notwithstanding the fact that it was the only one pledged to the Townsend plan and practically the only means by which that plan could be brought to the attention of the Democratic National Convention.

WHY \$200 A MONTH?

There has been more or less speculation as to why Dr. Townsend should insist that the pension given to the aged should be \$200 a month—no more, no less, and as to why he has stated that this could not be changed (H. 754) and that "I know we should never agree to any reduction" (H. 757).

Some have experienced difficulty in understanding why, in view of the country's financial condition, in view of the fact that, according to the United States Department of Labor, the average income of the mining, manufacturing,

construction, and transportation employees for 1929 was \$1,986, and for 1932 but \$1,567, and that, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation's figures, the average income of a factory worker for 1934 was but \$988, while the per capita income for those on farms for 1934 was but \$222, the pensioners, under the Townsend plan, should receive, for not working, \$2,400 per year.

Referring to his plan, Dr. Townsend testified (S. 1036):

Under this, \$200 a month, or \$2,400 a year, is required. It has been actuarially proven that it requires about \$2,500 permanently invested in business to create and maintain a job at good pay for one individual. That is the reason for \$200 per month, that is one of the main reasons.

Asked if he did not think the \$400 a month payable to a married couple living together might be cut \$100 per month, the doctor replied (S. 1033):

I do not. I think it would be suicidal for us to do so.

On another occasion Dr. Townsend testified (H. C. 754):

Mr. COOPER. You insist that the \$200 a month to everybody over 60 years of age could not be changed?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

The Townsend Weekly of December 30, 1935, on the front page, carried this statement:

TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS PER MONTH STANDS

There has never been, nor will be, any compromise on the \$200-per-month provision in the Townsend demands. All statements to the contrary are false.

In subsequent issues of the Townsend Weekly it has been consistently stated that the basic foundation of the plan is the payment to all men and women of 60 years and older of \$200 each month.

In May 1936, when upon the stand before the House investigating committee, the doctor testified without any equivocation and in no uncertain terms that his plan called for a pension of \$200 per month.

It necessarily follows that, if Dr. Townsend was correct in February 1935, and if he be correct in May of 1936, in his assumption that the essential feature of the plan is the payment of a \$200-per-month pension and that the plan is not feasible without the payment of that amount, to be spent each month, then the McGroarty bill, which does not provide for a pension of \$200 per month, is not his plan, and does not include an essential element of his plan and is not feasible and should not receive the support of his followers.

It is equally true that his organization has not, up to the present time, June 17, 1936, presented any bill to Congress, and there is not now a bill before this Congress, embodying this, one of the essential features of the Townsend plan.

According to the doctor's testimony, and certainly he should know more than anyone else about the workability of his plan, its success depends upon the imposition of a tax which will net to all eligible persons \$200 a month, and which pension must be spent within the current month within the confines of the United States, this to create the "revolving pension fund."

THE COST OF THE PLAN

Due to the fact that Dr. Townsend walked out of the committee room and refused to give further testimony, although in Bulletin No. 74, he had announced that, "fair or foul", they courted the investigation and that he and his supporters demanded an opportunity to be heard, we are without information as to what the doctor now, in this month of June 1936, thinks his plan would cost.

When he was before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in February of 1935, testifying on this subject, he gave the information that, based upon the census figures of 1930, showing a total population of 122,775,046, there would be about 10,000,000 persons eligible for the pension and that 8,000,000 of those eligible would apply, and that the cost of paying the pensions, disregarding the expense of collection and administration, would be approximately \$19,200,000,000.

Apparently, no one knows, nor has anyone computed, the cost of the administrative feature of the plan, but experi-

ence along similar lines indicates that the expense of collecting the tax, enrolling the pensioners, investigating the eligibility of each and ascertaining that each received his pension, in accordance with the terms of the law, would be enormous and could not possibly be less than one-quarter of the amount of the pensions, probably \$5,000,000,000.

Assuming that the population was 122,775,046, as stated by the 1930 census, and that but 8,000,000 pensioners of the age of 60 and over would apply, as estimated by Dr. Townsend, and that each person in the United States, including children, and those in hospitals and penitentiaries, paid his per-capita share of the tax, it would cost each individual \$156.38 per year to raise the sum necessary to pay the pension alone, or, if the average family consisted of five persons, a family charge of \$781.90 per year if the cost was paid equally by each.

Using the above figures given by Dr. Townsend, it is apparent that 1 out of every 15.3 persons would be required to contribute to the sixteenth person a pension of \$200 per month.

By taking the population of township, village, city, county, or State and dividing that figure by 15.3 (an approximate figure), the number of pensioners in any one district can be ascertained, and, if the number so obtained is multiplied by \$200, the monthly cost will be found; multiplied again by 12, the annual cost will be arrived at.

A township with a population of 1,000 would have 65.3 pensioners, who would receive a total of \$13,060 per month, or \$156,720 per year.

The burden of paying this pension falls, as Dr. Townsend said, most heavily upon the wage earner and the farmer, and it is collected through the pyramided sales tax, paid by the purchaser in proportion to the amount he buys.

The cost to the taxpayers of the township will, at a glance, be seen to be prohibitive, for the thousand people, in the instance just cited, will be required to add to their tax roll the \$156,720 necessary to pay the pension, plus the administrative expenses involved in its collection and disbursement. These figures at once disclose the burdensomeness and the impossibility of the plan's successful operation.

To avoid this inevitable conclusion, Dr. Townsend and his organizers and lecturers glibly state that they propose to make the millionaires and the stock gamblers pay the tax, but, in the history of the world, no one yet has devised a scheme which will make taxes fall elsewhere than upon the shoulders of the worker, the man of moderate means and the poor.

The 1930 census gives the total number of workers as 40,000,000 and, with 8,000,000 pensioners, this means that every five workers will be required, if this plan is enacted into law, to, out of their earnings, keep in idleness one pensioner and give him an unearned income of \$2,400 per year, or to a man and his wife, both pensioners, \$4,800 per year, while, as just pointed out, the average wage of a factory worker in 1934 was but \$988.

UPON WHOM DOES THE COST FALL?

Although it is apparent that Dr. Townsend greatly underestimates the cost of his plan, if we assume that his figures are correct, it follows that at least \$19,200,000,000 must, by taxation imposed upon the people of the country, be raised for the purpose of giving to a specified class an income of \$2,400 per year and this does not take into consideration administrative expenses.

Organizers and lecturers for the Townsend plan state that this vast sum will be obtained from various sources, favorite terms being the "idle rich", the "Wall Street gamblers", the "international bankers."

A moment's reflection will convince the average thinking person that, if a 2-percent tax is imposed upon each financial transaction, the stock market will either cease to exist or its place of business be transferred to a Canadian or Cuban city. We all recall how, when the city of New York threatened to impose a special tax upon the New York Stock Exchange, that group promptly informed the authorities that it would remove to New Jersey, and the whole matter was forgotten.

Inasmuch as gambling transactions are, in most States, illegal the difficulty of collecting a tax from that source is apparent. There is, however, no need to speculate as to those upon whom the cost of this plan would fall. While it is absolutely true that the tax will be imposed in accordance with the purchases made by a person and that the millionaires and the wealthy will be taxed in accordance with their purchases, it is equally true and apparent that the total transactions made by this class is but a comparatively small percentage of the total and that, there being so many more in the middle and poorer classes, their purchases are in the aggregate, of far greater volume than those made by the wealthy.

Let us accept the testimony of Dr. Townsend himself. In February of 1935, when he was testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, the following occurred (S. C. 1035):

Senator BLACK. If it is your idea, Doctor, to help the poor people, why do you propose to put the tax on the poor people in the main? Everybody that knows anything about the sales tax knows it is paid by the poor people who have the least.

Dr. TOWNSEND. Let me ask you, why do you permit the tax to be placed on the poor people, anyway? The poor people pay the tax today, anyway.

Senator BLACK. The tax should be placed on those who have the ability to pay it. I am opposed to any sales tax to pension Rockefeller, Morgan, or anybody else in that class.

Dr. TOWNSEND. You cannot conceive of a tax that does not fall on the poor today.

Senator BLACK. Yes; you can.

Dr. TOWNSEND. No; you cannot. The poor always carry the burden.

Later in the same hearing the following occurred (S. C. 1065):

Senator CONNALLY. Doctor, you say the plan will cost from \$18,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000 a year?

Dr. TOWNSEND. There will be that amount put in circulation.

Senator CONNALLY. I suppose that money has got to be taken from somebody else in the way of taxes and turned over to the aged?

Dr. TOWNSEND. It has got to be produced.

Senator CONNALLY. In other words, that money has got to come out of those that are working, those that have jobs?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Then, on May 20, 1936, Dr. Townsend testified (S. C. 673):

Mr. HOFFMAN. You testified that the burden of this sales tax, peculiar to your pension, would fall on the poor, did you not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Certainly, because the poor are so numerous.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And you also testified that it would fall on the wage earner and the farmer, did you not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Dr. Robert R. Doane, an economist originally called by Dr. Townsend, testified before the special committee (S. C. 256) that the cost of the pension would fall most heavily upon the consumers and those in the lower income brackets, upon the farmers, the unskilled laborers, upon school teachers, and those with fixed incomes.

Another class upon whom the transaction tax would fall heavily, so heavily that it would probably crowd the most of them out of business, is the independent merchants who come in competition with the chain stores, which are enabled, because of their vast organization, to reduce the number of transactions from the original producer to the ultimate consumer.

The manner in which the tax would affect the cost of the necessities of life was told by Mr. Hudson, Dr. Townsend's expert, sitting by the doctor's side at the House hearing in February of 1935 (H. C. 731), when he said that the tax would add 10.22 cents against every 48-pound sack of flour.

Dr. Doane, a reputable economist originally called by Dr. Townsend, testified before the special committee (S. C. 251) that the increase of the cost of a pound loaf of bread would be something above 10 cents per loaf, and that the cost of other necessities used by the average man would rise in proportion.

The increase in the cost of such common necessities as bread, meat, flour, and the clothing one wears can be easily figured by adding 2 cents every time a dollar's worth of commodities is transferred or sold from the time it comes from the ground, field, or mine in its original form, through all the transactions of transportation and manufacture, until it reaches the hands of the ultimate consumer.

Experts naturally differ as to the number of times a 2-cent tax will be added in the production or manufacture of any particular article and it all depends upon the number of times there is a transaction with, for instance, a bushel of wheat.

First, naturally, would be the purchase of the seed, although some go back to the taxes paid upon the land. Then would follow the harvesting, the transportation, and manufacture into flour, and so on down the list, until the loaf of bread reaches the housewife's hands. In any event, the total added cost would average somewhere around 10 percent, and this is conceded by practically everyone.

THE BENEFITS OF THE PLAN

It is the contention of its proponents that this plan, by taxing practically every financial transaction 2 percent, and by the addition of certain inheritance, gift, and income taxes to those now in existence, and the payment of that sum to persons 60 years of age and over meeting certain qualification, business would be so stimulated that prosperity would result and the aged would be secure from the hardships of life.

When first before the House Ways and Means Committee Dr. Townsend testified as to the pension (H. C. 685):

Mr. HILL. In other words, it would apply to John D. Rockefeller, Sr., to Henry Ford, to J. P. Morgan, as well as to a man who has no means or income at all?

Dr. TOWNSEND. If they wish to acquire the pension under the provisions of the act.

Mr. HILL. That is, they would be eligible?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Again, his expert, Mr. Hudson, testified (H. C. 733):

Mr. VINSON. Would you not include Mr. Andrew Mellon as a beneficiary under this bill, he being past the 60 years of age?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely.

Later, organizers and lecturers for the Townsend plan throughout the country repeatedly made the statement that the claim of the opponents of this plan that these wealthy men could receive the pension was absurd; that they were misquoting the doctor; and that such was not the purpose of the plan.

However, the matter is no longer open to argument, for on May 20, 1936, testifying before the House special committee, Dr. Townsend was interrogated about that provision of the McGroarty bill which provides that no one having a net income of more than \$2,400 per year shall be eligible to receive the pensions, and he said (S. C. 689-690) that he was not friendly with that bill because the \$2,400 per year provision did not seem just to him and he would like to see it revised (S. C. 690).

Mr. GAVAGAN. In what respect?

Dr. TOWNSEND. So as to make everybody who reaches the age of 60 eligible, if they agree to the requirements.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Even J. P. Morgan you would make eligible?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Surely.

Mr. GAVAGAN. John D. Rockefeller?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. (S. C. 692.) Doctor, you are in favor, in addition to the men you mention, of Mellon, Ford, Du Pont, and Hearst coming under the provisions of this bill?

Dr. TOWNSEND. I am. I am in favor of anybody coming under the provisions.

Dr. Townsend also testified on this same occasion (S. C. 690):

Mr. GAVAGAN. So your present theory is to pay the \$200 a month—

Dr. TOWNSEND. To everybody.

The following concrete illustration was put to Dr. Townsend (S. C. 693-694):

Mr. HOFFMAN. Doctor, you said something to me about justice. Let us assume this case: I am 61. Perhaps I have mortgages that bring me in \$1,500.

Dr. TOWNSEND. Perhaps what?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have mortgages or bonds that bring me in \$1,500 without work. Just assume, if you can, without too violent a strain on your imagination, that these young gentlemen here are working and that they earn \$1,500 a year. Do you think it would be just that they should contribute out of their \$1,500 a year to make \$900 more to make my income \$2,400 a year?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Hoffman, you—

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, no; answer that, if you will, please. Would that be just?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I think that ought to be done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You think that ought to be done?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They should also contribute out of their earnings of \$1,500 each enough more that my wife, if she chances to be 60, should have \$2,400 a year?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Not necessarily out of their \$1,500.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Suppose that is all they are earning?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Well—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then they should give to me my \$900 and to my wife \$2,400; is that right? Is that just?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Do you realize why we are—

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know anything about the why or the wherefore; I am asking you for the result. Do you think that would be just?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do?

Dr. TOWNSEND. In its ultimate outcome.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So my wife and I might sit down and live in idleness, and these other folks work and contribute the \$900 and the \$2,400 to us, too?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Dr. Townsend, as we have seen, testified that men with the wealth of a Morgan, Rockefeller, or Ford, if otherwise eligible, may receive the pension. Nor are the indolent to be excluded.

Mr. Floyd R. Moody, area manager for the Townsend organization for 37 counties in Michigan, testified (S. C. 532):

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, this plan does not exclude those, if there be such, who have loafed all their lives, does it?

Mr. MOODY. Not exclusion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So the loafer gets it just the same?

Mr. MOODY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And when the loafer gets it, he has not earned it, has he?

Mr. MOODY. He probably has not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the loafing gentleman gets it just as much as the man who worked all his life?

Mr. MOODY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, you consider that plan an equitable one?

Mr. MOODY. I do.

THE PRACTICABILITY OF THE PLAN

No economist of national standing has given his opinion that the Townsend plan is at all practicable or that it is even possible to make it work.

Dr. Townsend, when he appeared before congressional committees in 1935, produced as expert witnesses Glen Hudson and Dr. Robert R. Doane. Mr. Hudson then testified that he would not, were he a Congressman, vote for the bill as drafted. Dr. Doane testified in substance that the bill would not produce the needed revenue, and he later testified that it was unworkable, would increase unemployment, would produce but a third of the amount required to pay the pension, and would prove disastrous to the country.

Dr. Albert G. Hart, who with a group of 21 other economists had made a study of the plan, declared in substance that it was not feasible, merely fantastic, and that its effect upon the country would be disastrous.

All this testimony stands uncontradicted, except by the statement of Dr. Townsend, who produces no figures, shows no experience in dealing with questions of this character, and who in effect merely expresses a hope that it will work.

THE DOCTOR'S UNRELIABILITY OR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE ESSENTIALS OF HIS PLAN

There are many contradictions in the statements, published and oral, made by Dr. Townsend. But a few illustrations will be cited. They are typical of others. They tend to illustrate his lack of accurate information and fixity of purpose as to basic elements of his plan, and thus are pertinent in forming a judgment as to the extent to which his testimony should be relied upon.

AGE LIMIT

Listening to organizers and lecturers and to Dr. Townsend when upon the platform, reading the Weekly and the bulletins, one gets the idea that only those over 60 would receive the pension.

As a matter of fact, under oath, the doctor was asked (S. C. 670):

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you know about the Townsend plan?

Dr. TOWNSEND. I think I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. Does it apply to people under 60? Is the pension going to be paid to them?

Dr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you ever contemplate that?

Dr. TOWNSEND. No.

However, the year before he testified (S. C. 1036) (S. C. 670):

Dr. TOWNSEND. Because 60 years old is merely a starting point. We do not know definitely how soon we shall have to reduce that to 40 or 50.

On another occasion he testified (S. C. 676-677):

Mr. HOFFMAN. The whole idea is to hold out to the public at large that if they vote for your plan, this 50 and 55 plan, that they will get on the pension roll, is it not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. That may be their assumption.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is your idea, is it not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. No, not necessarily.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is your theory, is it not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. That is my theory.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And you conveyed that theory to them, did you not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So that, in line with that idea, is it not a fact that if the Townsend plan becomes the law people of 50 and 55 will be getting that \$200 a month? Is that right?

Dr. TOWNSEND. And that is the reason for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. Is that right?

Dr. TOWNSEND. That is right, and that is the reason for it.

In his foreword, dated January 1936, to the book on the Townsend plan written by his counsel, Sheridan Downey, Dr. Townsend suggests that the age limit for pensions might start at 75 instead of 60.

It seems to be impossible to learn from the doctor's testimony whether he contemplates the eligibility age to be 45, 55, 60, or 75.

And does Dr. Townsend expect the pension money to be used to provide necessities, security, to protect the aged?

Let him answer. When before the House Ways and Means Committee, he was asked and he answered (H. 687):

Mr. HILL. I take it, of course, he would have to spend it in good faith, even though he spent it for luxuries. He could not go out and squander it in order to get rid of it, so that he may be eligible to receive \$200 the next month?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Why not? We do not care what he does with it. That is immaterial. Let him have carte blanche. Let him buy whisky with it if he wants to kill himself off as quickly as he chooses. That is immaterial. It is commerce—business—that we want in this country. We are not going to regulate people's morals in the least when we give them this money to expend.

A LICENSE FOR EVERY FARMER

On the present hearing (S. C. 672, 673) he testified that he had not told the people generally when advocating his plan that every farmer would have to have a license in order to sell his produce, although he said (S. C. 673) that the plan did contemplate that; and he testified (H. C. 688) that before he could sell a cow or pig, or before his wife could sell a pound of butter, every farmer in the Nation would be required to take out a license to sell what he produced; and, when he was asked (S. C. 672)—

Why not give the people all the information about the Townsend plan?

He replied—

God bless you, that is not the Townsend plan!

The truthfulness of Dr. Townsend's testimony may be arrived at by considering the following excerpts from his testimony:

(S. C. 673-674)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have you at any time ever figured out the cost of issuing the license and supervision to check?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes; certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have you figured it?

Dr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why did you say a minute ago, "Certainly I have"?

Dr. TOWNSEND. It depends upon the price for the license.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A minute ago you said that you had figured the license. Did you or did you not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Why all this nonsense?

* * * * *

Mr. HOFFMAN. You never figured it at all, did you?

Dr. TOWNSEND. No; I think not.

* * * * *

Mr. HOFFMAN. Doctor, you never figured it at all, did you?

Dr. TOWNSEND. What if I did not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Only this: That a moment ago you said that you had, and I want to know whether under oath you are telling the truth; that is all.

Dr. TOWNSEND. I meant this: That I have calculated on what method this tax should be collected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But you never figured the cost of putting your plan into effect by the issuing of licenses, did you?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Not in dollars and cents; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So that when you said a moment ago that you had figured it, that was not true, was it?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Perhaps not.

SOME OF THE RESULTS OF THE ORGANIZATION'S OPERATION—ITS EFFECT UPON MEMBERS OF LOCAL CLUBS

The results of Dr. Townsend's and Mr. Clements' efforts have been profound and far-reaching. It is not too much to assert that millions of aged, unfortunate persons in want and distress, lacking the necessities of life, have been induced to believe that Dr. Townsend, through the operation of his plan, upon the payment by them of a 25-cent membership fee and a monthly quota, could secure for them a pension of \$200 per month, and that the operation of this scheme would restore prosperity to the country.

Believing this, it has followed quite naturally that they have been extremely critical and bitter toward all those who saw fit to question the workability of the plan.

The O. A. R. P. organization, through its bulletins, forbade debates upon the merits of the plan. The club members accepted without question statements of the Townsend Weekly and the organization's bulletins and other publications.

They denounced as false and untrue all arguments and statements which questioned any assertion made by their organizers, Dr. Townsend or Mr. Clements. They branded as unkind, lacking in charity and humanity, those who did not in every particular agree with them.

So far, club members have received nothing in return for their efforts or their contributions, and in the wake of the movement has followed a wave of intolerance for, and a desire to wreak vengeance upon, all those who did not agree with Dr. Townsend.

THE REAL BENEFICIARIES

Dr. Townsend testified (S. C. 615) in May of 1936 that since the inception of the Townsend plan he had accumulated in money and property but \$300 and his wife \$200, and that that was the entire result of his 2½ year's work. He further said that the statement in certain letters that there were "millions in it" referred to the organization, and not to himself personally (S. C. 615).

This testimony, unfortunately, does not square with the other testimony of the doctor, for he said (S. C. 616) that he still, as an individual, owned more than 50 percent of the Prosperity Publishing Co., and that that publication was worth millions, although he insisted that nine-tenths of its profits "are to go to the O. A. R. P.", and then admitted that he and his brother were the owners of the O. A. R. P., Ltd., corporation, which he controlled. The record also shows that that organization had in April of 1936 upward of \$110,000 in cash and of at least half of this the doctor was the sole owner, as he was of a like share of the Prosperity Publishing Co., and that his brother, a figure-head, a porter in a hotel, owned the balance.

This brother, so far as is known, has never taken an active part in either of the organizations, and apparently is merely an employee, while Dr. Townsend is the actual, beneficial, sole owner of both of these corporations and their assets.

In addition to this, the doctor received certain cash payments. Dr. Townsend testified (S. C. 606):

Mr. HOFFMAN. He (Mr. Clements) said that you got about \$68,000 or \$69,000. Is that true?

Dr. TOWNSEND. That would have been true, if I had retained the money that I paid him (the \$25,000 for Clements' interest in the Townsend Weekly).

Mr. HOFFMAN. You spent it, but you got it, did you not?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I got it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And you have had your living expenses in addition?

Dr. TOWNSEND. But I can tell you what I have done with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. I say and you have had your living expenses in addition?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

From the testimony of Mr. Clements it appeared that, while he testified in the hearings in 1935 and while it was reported

at the Chicago convention that he and Dr. Townsend received but \$50 per week and their expenses, he received:

In 1934, for salary and expenses (S. C. 333) \$1,915.26

In 1935:

Salary from the O. A. R. P. amounting to (S. C. 84, 85, 334)	5,200.00
From the Townsend Weekly (S. C. 84, 335, 339)	350.00
And as dividends from the Townsend Weekly (S. C. 84)	6,650.00
And other income from the Townsend Weekly (S. C. 84, 336)	385.00

Or from the O. A. R. P. and the Prosperity Publishing Co. a total of at least (S. C. 85)	12,585.00
--	-----------

He also received for expenses for himself and for living expenses for himself and Dr. Townsend \$7,940.95.

Up to the time of his testimony in April of 1936 Mr. Clements had received, in 1936, in addition to certain expenses—As salary from the O. A. R. P., at the rate of \$100 per week to Jan. 18, and from Jan. 18, \$250 per week (S. C. 335)

\$2,750.00

From the Prosperity Publishing Co., a salary of \$100 per week, 13 weeks (S. C. 336, 339)	1,300.00
---	----------

Dividends from the Prosperity Publishing Co. (S. C. 336, 343)	25,000.00
---	-----------

Sale of his interest in the Prosperity Publishing Co. to Dr. Townsend on Apr. 1 (S. C. 336, 343)	25,000.00
--	-----------

Or a total for 1936 of	54,050.00
------------------------	-----------

Balance forward for 1935	12,585.00
--------------------------	-----------

Balance forward for 1934	1,915.26
--------------------------	----------

Total	68,550.26
-------	-----------

And, in addition to this, \$7,940.95 for living expenses for himself and Dr. Townsend.

A critical examination of Mr. Clements' testimony shows some discrepancy in his figures, the figures here given showing the smallest amount indicated.

It is apparent that, so far at least, the benefits derived from this organization have gone to its promoters, not to those who expected to receive old-age pensions, or to bring about a return of prosperity.

We have seen how, by repeated requests through the weekly, the bulletins, and by personal appeals, club members and others were pressed to contribute; how even those on relief were urged to, and did, give of their meager funds to support what they believed a humanitarian movement.

Contrast their attitude with that of Dr. Townsend, who, so far as the record shows, has yet to contribute of his cash; who, on the contrary, for the first time in his life, has received thousands of dollars, as well as his expenses, for the time he has devoted to the cause.

What has Robert E. Clements given to the movement, which he says is in aid of the unfortunate, the needy, the suffering aged?

Mr. Clements testified (S. C. 355) that he had received, from the Prosperity Publishing Co. and the O. A. R. P., \$68,535, which he regarded as his individual funds (S. C. 326), and that, in addition to that sum, for expenses of himself and Dr. Townsend, he had received \$3,043.62 (S. C. 355). He was asked (S. C. 356):

Mr. LUCAS. All right. Regardless of what the slight disagreement may be upon the question of figures—the record speaks for itself—let me ask you one more question. Do you feel any moral responsibility to make any contribution out of the amount that you have received during the last 2 years to the Old Age Revolving Pensions, Ltd., or to the followers of the Townsend plan, to help advance the movement that you founded in the name of humanity, and which you claim to be one of the greatest humanitarian movements in all history?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The question is, Do I feel morally bound to make any contribution out of what I have received as salaries from the Old Age Revolving Pensions or dividends and salary from the Prosperity Publishing Co. to the advancement of this movement?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Any money contribution?

Mr. LUCAS. Any money contribution.

Mr. CLEMENTS. No, sir.

CONCLUSION

The record discloses beyond argument:

That the so-called Townsend plan did not originate with Dr. Townsend but followed a copyrighted article of C. Stewart McCord, merely changing the amount of the pension, the age of the pensioners, and the name of the sales tax.

That the plan had been used by Dr. Townsend's organizations, the Prosperity Publishing Co. and the O. A. R. P., Ltd., to collect more than a million dollars from members of local clubs, and that this sum has been used in large part for the enrichment of Dr. Townsend, Mr. Clements, and their associates, who in turn have inspired false hopes in the hearts of millions of elderly, needy people.

That by his recent actions in combining forces with some who advocate a share-the-wealth program, a social-credit theory, and his statement that neither the Republican nor the Democratic nominee is deserving of his political support, coupled with his previous statement in his letter of September 4, 1935, when of the old parties he said, "To hell with them", Dr. Townsend has delusions of grandeur and on this 17th day of June 1936 sees himself as a Presidential candidate.

The record further discloses that the so-called Townsend plan is an economic impossibility, but the history of the movement indicates that some sound, adequate provision should be made for those who, because of age and inability, are unable to care for themselves.

To this end Congress should, under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution, give the necessary assistance to the States in solving the problem. Legislation should be enacted requiring the Federal Government to give to each State, if the States cannot make completely adequate provision from their own funds, an amount equal to that appropriated by the States for the relief of the citizens of the State. All relief funds should be administered through local agencies to those who are in need and in accordance with their need.

Such legislation should at all times have in mind the fact that workers are to be protected in their earnings; that home owners and laborers are not to have their property or their earnings taken from them except as the general welfare may require that they contribute a portion of their income to relieve actual distress and want; that no one should be permitted to go hungry or cold or without suitable clothing; but that, on the other hand, no one physically able to work should be permitted to loaf, to live in idleness at the expense of the thrifty and the industrious.

To this end we may all bend our energies, for it is an objective which may be attained and the issue is not, and it should not be made, a political one. Under no circumstances should want, suffering, or hardship, dependent old age, be exploited to obtain political support.

The holding out of the hope of relief in the form of a pension or otherwise to the aged needy who are fearful of what a day may bring forth and uncertain as to where they are to obtain food, clothing, or shelter, in return for political support, when it is known that the proposed relief or pension is impossible of attainment, is so reprehensible that no self-respecting, honest candidate will even consider it.

The acceptance of compensation from the aged unfortunate for rendering a service which it is the duty of every conscientious, humane person to render, is but the unjustifiable acceptance of a fee for the rendition of a service long overdue.

ENROLLMENT OF FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a House concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 58

Concurrent resolution affecting the enrollment of H. R. 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, fiscal year 1936

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, fiscal year 1936, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to include in said bill, on page 2, after line 13, a new paragraph, as follows:

"For payment to the widow of Joseph W. Byrns, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, \$10,000, to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House."

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

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUCHANAN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, providing supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and 1937, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12624) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 25, 38, 51, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 78, 80, 81, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 98, 99, 105, 107, 111, 121, 123, 124, 126, and 153.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 21, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35, 36, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 92, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 102, 103, 106, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, and 150, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the word "contestant," and insert in lieu thereof "contested"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1938"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Senate Office Building: For repairing and painting four hundred thirty-five corridor doors, for painting all outside window frames, and painting one hundred and four rooms, \$44,180, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum of "\$51,180" and insert in lieu thereof the sum of "\$7,000"; and in line 1 strike out the following: "Senate Office Building"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Study of Executive Agencies: The President of the United States is hereby authorized to allocate, out of funds appropriated by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat., 115), not to exceed \$100,000 for the expenses of a committee designated by him to make a study of the emergency and regular agencies of the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of making recommendations to secure the most efficient organization and management of that branch of the public service. Such committee shall ascertain whether the activities of any such agency conflict with or overlap the activities of any other such agency and whether, in the interest of simplification, efficiency, and economy, any of such agencies should be coordinated with other agencies or abolished, or the personnel thereof reduced, and make recommendations with respect thereto. Copies of the report or reports of such studies and recommendations, together with the essential facts in connection therewith, shall be transmitted to the President and to Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "approved", insert the following: "June 5"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"ARKANSAS CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"To provide for the contribution of the United States to the commemoration of the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Federal Union, to be paid to the Arkansas Centennial Commission

of the State of Arkansas, to be expended by said Commission for such purposes as it may deem appropriate in connection with such commemoration, \$75,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "or" insert "other positions" and in line 5 strike out the words "or hereafter"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 11 and 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "special counsel fees, consulting engineering fees, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "not to exceed \$250,000 for the employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise in the District of Columbia and elsewhere for special accounting, statistical, and mechanical services determined necessary by the Board, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) and the provisions of laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, but such sum of \$250,000 shall not be available for any contract for a period of service exceeding six months"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"This title may be cited as the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936.

"To continue to provide relief, and work relief on useful projects, in the United States and its Territories and possessions (including projects heretofore approved for the Works Progress Administration which projects shall not be subject to the limitations hereinafter specified in this paragraph), \$1,425,000,000, to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President, together with such unexpended balances of funds appropriated and made available by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 as the President may determine, which are hereby reappropriated and made available for the purposes of this paragraph, to remain available until June 30, 1937 (except as herein otherwise authorized.)"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "Title" from said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "paragraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"The departments, agencies, or establishments having supervision of projects for which funds from the foregoing appropriation are made available shall not knowingly employ aliens illegally within the limits of the Continental United States on such projects and they shall make every reasonable effort consistent with prompt employment of the destitute unemployed to see that such aliens are not employed, and if employed and their status as such alien is disclosed they shall thereupon be discharged."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"No Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the foregoing appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the foregoing appropriation in any State shall be made from among the bona-fide residents of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Works Progress Administration with the approval of the President"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"No part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person who is a candidate for any State, District, County or Municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary attaches), in any primary, general or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54½: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54½, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"The Federal Emergency Relief Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to liquidate and wind up the affairs of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration under the act of May 12, 1933, as amended, and funds available to it shall be available for expenditure for such purpose until June 30, 1937."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "by the President"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$402,000" named in said amendment, insert: "\$227,000"; and in lieu of the figures "1938", insert: "1937"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "to be immediately available and" and in line 7 strike out the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1937"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"War Minerals Relief Commission: For payment of awards made by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of Congress approved May 18, 1936 (Public, Numbered 602, Seventy-fourth Congress), amending section 5 of the War Minerals Relief Act of March 2, 1919, as amended, February 13, 1929, fiscal year 1936, to remain available during the fiscal year 1937, \$500,000: Provided, That all awards made by the Secretary of the Interior for payment under this appropriation shall be certified to the General Accounting Office for settlement through that office."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Central Valley Project, California: for continuation, \$6,900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1937, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available for construction of Friant Reservoir and irrigation facilities therefrom in the San Joaquin Basin and \$250,000 for administrative expenses (including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere), to be available for the same purposes as those specified for projects included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937 under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation' and to be reimbursable under the Reclamation Law: Provided, That not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Marine Band: To carry into effect the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Arkansas Centennial Celebration, at Little Rock, Arkansas, the Texas Centennial, at Dallas, Texas, and the National Confederate Reunion, at Shreveport, Louisiana, between the dates from June 6 to June 16, 1936, inclusive', approved June 3, 1936, \$11,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, United States Section—Rio Grande Diversion Dam: For beginning

the construction of a diversion dam in the Rio Grande wholly in the United States, with appurtenant connections to existing irrigation systems, as authorized by law, fiscal year 1937, \$1,000,000, under a total estimated cost not to exceed \$1,400,000, to be immediately available and to be available also for the same objects of expenditure and under the same authority specified for other projects of the Commission in the second paragraph under the caption 'International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico' contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1937."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "1939" and insert in lieu thereof "1937"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "and he is hereby authorized, when deemed by him desirable and advantageous, to employ, by contract or otherwise, the personal services of temporary professional, technical, or non-technical employees to such extent as may be required to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, without reference to civil service laws, rules, regulations, or to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "its creation shall have been specifically authorized by Congress", and insert in lieu thereof "established by or pursuant to law"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 152: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "(c) The appropriation made by section 2 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1937, for carrying out sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is hereby made available to the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of carrying out such Act with respect to land devoted to growing trees for the production of gum turpentine and gum rosin"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 29, 30, 41, and 49.

J. P. BUCHANAN,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
W. B. OLIVER,
C. A. WOODRUM,
JNO. J. BOYLAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
ROBERT L. BACON,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
FREDERICK HALE,
HENRY W. KEYES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12624) 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended as to each of such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

LEGISLATIVE

On amendments nos. 1 to 6, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates \$10,000 for payment to widow of the late Senator Trammell; increases the compensation of the assistant clerk, Committee on Appropriations, from \$4,200 to \$4,800, effective July 1, 1936; appropriates \$50,000 for miscellaneous items, fiscal year 1936; appropriates \$75,000 for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1936, and makes the unobligated balance of the appropriation for such purpose for the fiscal year 1936 available for the fiscal year 1937; all as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 7 to 12, inclusive, relating to the House of Representatives: Appropriates \$20,000 for payments to widows of deceased Members; appropriates \$2,000 for payment to the contestant and \$2,000 for payment to the contester in a contested-election case; makes a textual change, and appropriates \$20,000 for expenses of the select committee to act in pursuance of House Resolution 460, adopted April 29, 1936; all as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 13: Appropriates \$35,000 for expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1937, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 14: Appropriates \$200,000 on account of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, as

proposed by the Senate, amended to limit the availability thereof to June 30, 1938, instead of "until expended", as the Senate proposed.

On amendments no. 15 and 16, relating to the Architect of the Capitol: Appropriates \$51,180 for repairs and painting and for electrical work and supplies in the Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate, amended as to form and period of availability.

On amendment no. 17: Appropriates \$1,200, under the Library of Congress, for printing and binding a compilation of Federal laws held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, as proposed by the Senate.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

On amendment no. 18: Authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, the allocation by the President of not to exceed \$100,000 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation, 1935, for expenses of a study of emergency and regular agencies of the executive branch of the Government looking to better organization and management, amended by separating such study from the National Emergency Council, by prescribing a certain line of inquiry, and by requiring report and recommendation to be made to the President and to Congress.

On amendment no. 19: Appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry.

On amendment no. 20: Appropriates \$75,000, instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, as a contribution by the United States toward the commemoration of the admission of the State of Arkansas to the Federal Union.

On amendment no. 21: Continues available during the fiscal year 1937 to the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority the unexpended balance of the "Conversion of inhabited alley's fund", together with receipts from certain sources during such fiscal year, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 22 and 23, relating to emergency-conservation work: Restores the House proposal, stricken out by the Senate, to except personal services under the paragraph from the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, providing that the authority in the paragraph to permit employment of personal services without regard to civil-service laws and regulations shall not affect the status, under the civil-service laws, of positions created under the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, or brought under such laws by Executive order heretofore issued. The intent of the Senate in this respect is clarified and the provision in the language relating to Executive orders "hereafter issued" is eliminated.

On amendment no. 24: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration, fiscal year 1937, as proposed by the Senate, amended to eliminate provision for special counsel fees and consulting engineering fees.

On amendment no. 25: Strikes out the appropriation of \$200,000, inserted by the Senate, for establishment and maintenance of solar observation stations under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution.

On amendment no. 26: Restores to the appropriation, "Wage records, Social Security Board", the authority, proposed by the House and stricken out by the Senate, for the engagement by contract or otherwise, without advertisement, of persons or organizations for special accounting, statistical, and mechanical services modified so as to fix a limit thereon of \$250,000 and to limit contract services to a period not exceeding 6 months.

On amendment no. 27: Appropriates \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the Tariff Commission.

On amendment no. 28, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language of the House bill changing the name of the Chickamauga Dam.

On amendment no. 31: Appropriates \$1,500, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of the Commission to represent the Government of the United States in the observance of the three-hundredth anniversary of the founding of Harvard College.

RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

On amendments nos. 32 to 40, 42 to 48, and 50 to 55, relating to relief and work relief: Inserts a new title; transfers control from the Works Progress Administration to the President, as proposed by the Senate, and in addition to the appropriation proposed by the House, reappropriates unexpended balances of funds appropriated and made available by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, as proposed by the Senate, and inserts a clause making the appropriation applicable to projects heretofore approved by the Works Progress Administration, such projects to be exempt from the limitations in the paragraph upon expenditures upon various classes of projects; changes the designation of the allocation proposed by the House for "white collar" projects to "assistance for educational, professional, and clerical persons", as proposed by the Senate; makes the allocation proposed by the House for rural rehabilitation and relief to farmers available also for loans to farmers and for loans and relief to livestock growers, as proposed by the Senate; provides for augmentation of the amounts proposed by the House for application to certain classes of projects proportionately by the unexpended balances of funds appropriated and made available by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, which the Senate proposes shall be reappropriated, but strikes out the proposal of the Senate that such amounts thus augmented might be increased by transfer from one class to another, by not to exceed 15 percent in any case; inserts a substitute in lieu of the House and Senate provisions with respect

to the employment of aliens illegally within the United States, placing the responsibility for their employment upon the employing executive agencies, requiring the exercise by such agencies of every reasonable effort, consistent with prompt employment of the destitute unemployed, to guard against such employment, and requiring the discharge of such aliens found to be employed; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, providing that no Federal project shall be undertaken under the relief appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion, but eliminates from the paragraph that part thereof which authorizes the restoration by the President to the Public Works Administration of sums not exceeding \$50,000,000 of funds of such Administration which were impounded or transferred after December 28, 1934; the Senate inserted a paragraph providing that not more than one-half of 1 percent of the total number of persons appointed or employed in an administrative or supervisory capacity within a State could be nonresidents of the State and providing that not more than 1 percent of the total amount allocated out of the relief appropriation for expenditure within any State could be paid as compensation to persons in an administrative or supervisory capacity who were not bona-fide residents of such State; the House agrees to the Senate provision with a substitute which provides that appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or supervisory capacity under the relief appropriation in any State shall be made from among the bona-fide residents of that State, so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration; the House bill provided that rates of pay should not be less than the prevailing rates as determined by the Works Progress Administrator, and the Senate bill changed the determination to the President; the bill as agreed upon leaves the determination to the Works Progress Administration with the approval of the President; provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the entitlement or receipt of adjusted-service bonds or a Treasury check in payment of an adjusted-service certificate shall not be considered in determining the actual need of any person of employment; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the President to utilize agencies of the Federal Government to effectuate the purposes of the relief appropriation and authorizing the delegation by him to such agencies of authority to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the functions so delegated; broadens the penal provision with respect to improper acts associated with administration and participation in relief funds; strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, with respect to political contributions from persons for whom relief or work relief is intended; inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting any candidate for State, county, municipal, or district offices (offices requiring full time of such person and to which a salary attaches) or any campaign manager or assistant campaign manager of any such candidate from being paid salary or expenses from the relief appropriation modified to eliminate from operation of the prohibition members of campaign committees; authorizes and requires the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator to liquidate and wind up the affairs of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and extends for such purpose the availability of present funds until June 30, 1937, as proposed by the Senate, and requires, as proposed by the House, a report of operations under the appropriation to be submitted by the President to Congress before the 10th day of January in each of the next two regular sessions of Congress.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

On amendments nos. 56 to 62, inclusive, relating to the District of Columbia: Inserts a title; appropriates \$2,240, fiscal year 1936, for pay of bailiffs, etc.; continues available until June 30, 1937, the appropriation of \$123,000, fiscal year 1936, for pumping units at the Bryant Street pumping station; appropriates an additional amount of \$1,708.77 for the payment of claims, an additional amount of \$1,150 for the payment of final judgments, and an additional amount of \$747.99 for the payment of audited claims; all as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

On amendments nos. 63 to 65, inclusive, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Appropriates \$12,000 additional, fiscal year 1937, on account of Weather Bureau station, Lynchburg, Va., as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate on account of sugarcane investigations, Bureau of Plant Industry; and continues available during the fiscal year 1937 not to exceed \$15,000 of funds appropriated by the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, for completion of the soil survey of the Hawaiian Islands, as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

On amendments nos. 66 to 74, inclusive, relating to the Department of Commerce: Appropriates \$35,000, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the General Committee of the Accident Prevention Conference, fiscal year 1937; strikes out the additional appropriation of \$247,000, fiscal year 1937, proposed by the Senate, for air navigation facilities; strikes out the appropriation of \$10,000 proposed by the Senate for the acquisition of a site for a fish hatchery at Jessup's Mill, near Glacier National Park, Mont.; strikes out the additional appropriations proposed by the Senate for the fiscal year 1937 under the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as follows: District and cooperative office service, \$15,000; domestic commerce and raw materials investigations, \$15,000; list of foreign buyers, \$2,860; appropriates an additional amount of \$227,000, instead of \$402,000, as proposed by the

Senate, for special projects under the Bureau of Lighthouses, including a new lighthouse tender, at a cost of \$125,000, the life of the appropriation being limited to June 30, 1937, instead of June 30, 1938, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates under such Bureau \$91,500 to remedy flood damage to aids to navigation along and contiguous to the Atlantic seaboard and in the Mississippi River Basin, as proposed by the Senate, amended by making the appropriation available until June 30, 1937, instead of immediately and until expended, as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

On amendments nos. 75 to 95, inclusive, relating to the Interior Department: Provides \$500,000 instead of \$900,000, as proposed by the Senate, for payment of awards made by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with Public, No. 602, Seventy-fourth Congress, amending the War Minerals Relief Act, as amended; appropriates \$1,291.39 under the General Land Office, fiscal year 1936, for payment as provided by law to the several States of the percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands lying within their limits, for the purpose of education, or of making public roads and improvements; appropriates an additional amount of \$85,000 on account of Indian agency buildings, fiscal year 1937, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$161,400, proposed by the Senate, for payment of the claim of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians for land in western Colorado set aside as a naval oil reserve; reappropriates unexpended balances of appropriations for construction, operation, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems, repealed by the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, to meet obligations incurred prior to the fiscal year 1936, and to augment, with any surplus remaining, receipts accruing from each project during the fiscal year 1936, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$125,000 proposed by the Senate for co-operation in construction and equipment and improvement of public-school buildings for Indian pupils in the States of Washington and Montana; strikes out the proposal of the Senate making \$40,000 of the appropriation of \$100,000 for cooperation with public-school districts in Glacier County, Mont., available for improvement and extension of elementary school buildings in the public-school districts in said county; appropriates an additional amount of \$11,500, fiscal year 1937, for general support of Indians and administration of Indian property, as proposed by the Senate; makes appropriations for the fiscal years 1935, 1936, and 1937 from tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin for general support and administration of the Keshena Agency available for hospitalization of Indians under contract for such service for such fiscal years, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$10,000, fiscal year 1937, for dairy barn, hay shed, and milk house, Jones Academy, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the expenditure of not exceeding \$3,000 from the tribal funds of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Agency, Utah, for payment for services rendered by general counsel under a contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$504.41 for payment to Mrs. Earl H. Smith, as proposed by the Senate; reappropriates the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Annette Islands, Reserve, Alaska, fund from leases", repealed by the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, to meet obligations incurred against such appropriation prior to July 1, 1935, any amount remaining to be added to and become a part of receipts accruing during the fiscal year 1936, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$57,610,000 proposed by the Senate, to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, for continuing the prosecution of certain reclamation projects, including incidental administrative expenses, and inserts in lieu thereof an appropriation of \$6,900,000 for continuing the Central Valley project, California, \$6,000,000 to be available for construction of Friant reservoir and irrigation facilities therefrom in the San Joaquin Basin and \$250,000 for administrative expenses, including personal services, to be available for the same purposes as those specified for projects included in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation", and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law; strikes out the appropriation of \$40,000 proposed by the Senate for studies, investigations, and experiments with respect to sub-bituminous and lignite coal; strikes out the appropriations, inserted by the Senate, as follows: \$25,000 for the Homestead National Monument, Nebr.; \$1,000 for a marker at Columbus, Ga.; \$187,500 for the Colonial National Monument, Va., and \$50,000 for the Andrew Johnson Homestead National Monument, Tenn.; and inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate carrying forward the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made for the Ackia National Memorial Commission and Battleground National Monument, Miss.; and appropriates an additional amount of \$1,250, fiscal year 1936, on account of insane of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND JUDICIAL

On amendments nos. 96 to 99, inclusive, relating to the Department of Justice: Appropriates \$34.27 for payment of damage claims, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$30.25, as proposed by the House, and strikes out the additional appropriation for 1937 of \$87,500 proposed by the Senate for miscellaneous expenses, United States courts.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

On amendment no. 100: Repeals appropriations for the Bituminous Coal Labor Board, Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1937, as proposed by the Senate.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

On amendments nos. 101 to 104, inclusive, relating to the Navy Department: Appropriates \$5,000 for expenses consequent upon acceptance of the bequest of Henry H. Rogers of a collection of ship models to the Naval Academy, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$150,000 to replace assembly and repair-shop facilities destroyed by fire at Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$11,500 on account of expenses of the Marine Band, as proposed by the Senate, amended to make the appropriation accord with the provisions of the authorization act of June 3, 1936, providing for the attendance of the band at the Texas and Arkansas Centennial Celebrations, and the Confederate Veterans' Reunion, at Shreveport, La.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

On amendment no. 105: Strikes out the additional appropriation, inserted by the Senate, of \$200,000 for foreign-mail transportation, fiscal year 1937.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

On amendments nos. 106 to 115, inclusive, relating to the State Department: Appropriates \$4,100 for payment to widow of McCeney Werlich, late a Foreign Service officer of the United States, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$20,647.25 proposed by the Senate for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who suffered personal property losses; appropriates \$1,000,000 for beginning the construction of the Rio Grande diversion dam, proposed by the Senate, amended to limit availability to the close of the fiscal year 1937, fixing a cost limit of \$1,400,000, and making the appropriation available for the same objects of expenditure and under the same authority specified for other projects of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, United States section in the second paragraph under the caption "International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico", contained in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1937; appropriates \$6,500, fiscal years 1936 and 1937, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the conference to revise the convention for the protection of literary and artistic works, Brussels, Belgium, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$11,500, fiscal years 1937 and 1938, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Ninth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held in Rumania in 1937, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$4,039.68 proposed by the Senate for the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and associated unions; appropriates \$308.80, fiscal year 1936, for the contribution of the United States to the International Hydrographic Bureau; appropriates \$2,500, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of participation by the United States in the meeting of the International Telegraph Consulting Committee in Warsaw, Poland, in 1936; provides \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for aid in defraying expenses of the Sixteenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in the United States in 1937; and inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, continuing the availability of the appropriation heretofore made for the Commission to study the subject of Hernando De Soto's expedition, modified to extend such fund until June 30, 1937, instead of June 30, 1939, as proposed by the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

On amendments nos. 116 to 124, inclusive, relating to the Treasury Department: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, making appropriations available for the fiscal year 1937 for payments to Federal land banks on account of reduction in interest rates on farm mortgages available to make such payments during the fiscal year 1937 in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 12 of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; inserts the appropriation of \$51.25, proposed by the Senate, for a refund to Edgar M. Barber as authorized by law; appropriates \$2,782.45, as proposed by the Senate, for payment of judgments against internal-revenue collectors; strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, to provide for a post-office and courthouse building at Shawnee, Okla., out of the fund for construction of public buildings, such fund in the House bill being available to select such place for a post-office building; restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, authorizing the employment, by contract or otherwise, by the Procurement Division of temporary employees, modified so as to eliminate the employment of "firms or corporations" and to eliminate authority for such employment "without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes"; strikes out the appropriation of \$1,363,000, inserted by the Senate, for buildings for the National Institute of Health, such project being eligible for selection under the general appropriation for public-building construction in the bill; and strikes out the appropriation of \$2,500, inserted by the Senate, for a memorial to persons killed in the wreck of the Navy dirigible *Shenandoah*.

WAR DEPARTMENT

On amendments nos. 125, 126, and 127, relating to the War Department: Inserts the appropriation of \$100,000, proposed by the Senate, for the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice; strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, to provide active duty pay and allowances for certain retired officers on active duty at the United States Soldiers' Home; and appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for acquisition and improvement of additional land in New York City for national cemetery purposes.

JUDGMENTS AND AUTHORIZED CLAIMS

On amendments nos. 128 to 150, inclusive: Appropriates for the payment of property damage claims, judgments, and audited claims certified to Congress in accordance with law after the bill had passed the House.

MISCELLANEOUS

On amendment no. 151: The Senate modified section 7 of the House bill by adding thereto provision that no agency specified in such section should continue to function after June 30, 1937, unless "its creation shall have been specifically authorized by Congress." The House agrees to the Senate amendment with a substitution providing that none of such agencies should continue to function after June 30, 1937, unless "established by or pursuant to law."

On amendment no. 152: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, making the appropriation for carrying into effect the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act available for the purposes of such act with respect to land devoted to growing trees for the production of gum turpentine and gum rosin modified so as to eliminate therefrom any reference to a specific sum of such appropriation for such purpose.

On amendment no. 153: Strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, providing that transfer of appropriations under the provisions of title VI, part II, of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933 "shall be accomplished by transfer appropriation warrant."

DISAGREEMENTS

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

Nos. 29 and 30, relating to the Gilbertsville and Watts Bar Dams on the Tennessee River under the Tennessee Valley Authority.

No. 41, relating to the continuation of the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal in Florida.

No. 49, authorizing the use by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works of \$300,000,000 from the sale of securities for the purpose of making grants for Public Works projects.

J. P. BUCHANAN,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
W. B. OLIVER,
CLIFTON A. WOODEUM,
JOHN J. BOYLAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
ROBERT L. BACON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12624) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, providing supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and 1937, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill as it left the House carried, according to the figures that I have, \$2,364,000,000 plus. The amendments that have been agreed upon in conference add \$11,281,000, according to my figures, making a total of the bill as it is now in the conference report \$2,375,000,000 plus.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Does amendment no. 5 make available to the Senate money to pay to the counsel of the Black committee, money which the House refused to make available for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. Amendment no. 5 makes available for any committees of the Senate \$75,000. It is, however, subject to the limitation adopted several years ago, which is still in effect, prohibiting payment of more than \$3,600 per year to any person who is employed there.

Mr. PETTENGILL. So that limitation will not be discontinued by the adoption of Senate amendment no. 5?

Mr. TABER. It will not. That is correct, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, there are in disagreement three amendments. The adoption of the Tennessee Valley amendment would add \$1,200,000 to the bill. The adoption of the fund for Secretary Ickes would add \$300,000,000 to the bill, payable, however, really out of R. F. C. funds, but it is just the same thing as appropriating this much more money out of the Treasury. Then there is the Florida canal proposition that we are to be called upon to vote on separately which would add \$10,000,000 to the bill.

Frankly, I was opposed to the bill when it passed the House. I am more opposed to the conference report. I am opposed to all the amendments that are in disagreement, and I hope the House will vote them down.

The changes in the bill as the result of the conference report with reference to relief or so-called relief simply throws the control of the situation more fully into the hands of the President than they were before. It makes the bill a little bit more under the thumb of absolute political control than it was when it left the House. It will restore, if the \$300,000,000 is added for Ickes under amendment 49, the trio of Hopkins, Tugwell, and Ickes—the three most incompetent spenders we have had in the Government of the United States. It will continue the policy of spending funds which are appropriated for relief for purposes which are entirely foreign to relief and for which Congress would not appropriate money if the items themselves were brought to it for consideration. Under the guise of relief we have had allocated to the Coast Guard \$247,520 to build a Coast Guard boat which has been transferred to the Navy. Relief money! And this boat has been converted by the Navy, at an additional cost of \$118,000, into a private yacht for the President of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. No; I decline to yield at this time. Frankly, I believe the Congress of the United States ought to get to the point where if it is going to appropriate money for relief the money should be appropriated for relief and not for the promotion of projects that in times like these we would not countenance. [Applause.] For this reason I myself shall vote against the conference report.

This so-called relief bill was bad when it left the House. And just like every other so-called relief bill it was worse when it passed the Senate; and just like all the rest of them, when it came back from conference it was worse than when it left the House—a continuous, steady record of getting worse all the time. Is it not time that the Members of this House made whatever appropriations are necessary for relief but stopped this turning over of funds to the Executive that can be used for almost any purpose he wants to use them for? Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion go by without saying at least this about this bill.

With reference to a very large multitude of items which are involved here I have no quarrel, they are necessary for the maintenance of the regular operations of the Government; but to that kind of relief which is wasteful, extravagant, and largely extraneous, I object. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH and Mr. FISH rose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. Then I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back from conference carrying \$2,375,281,000. I call the attention of the Members to the United States Treasury statement of June 15 last. If the Members will look at this statement, they should be almost paralyzed when they realize the true significance of the statement. Receipts this year are \$3,807,533,801.43, whereas expenditures to June 15 have been \$8,492,474,029.40. We are in the red \$4,684,940,227.97, and our national debt on the 15th day of June was \$34,331,355,867.48, the largest debt statement this Nation has ever published; yet you are now bringing in here a bill adding to that debt \$2,375,000,000 more. Is it not appalling to you?

This Democratic Congress is responsible for putting the Federal Government in this position. If this is not the time for sober thought and judgment on the part of Members of

Congress, there never was such a time in the history of this Nation. The Nation's future is at stake. What will happen to the Nation nobody knows. What may happen to this country in the future, and the position it is being put in, will be and is due entirely to the action of the Members of this Congress. I have never known or heard of a Congress that was so ruthless in its expenditure of funds as this Congress. To me it does not seem as if we had any real common financial sense.

The President of the United States made the statement on the 3d day of January last that we were approaching a balanced Budget. I should think he would faint when he reads this Treasury statement of June 15; yet he comes in here at this time and asks you rubber-stamp Congressmen to pass a bill putting in his hands \$1,500,000,000 more. What are the American people going to say to a request of this kind and to your action in turning over to him full authority for the expenditure of this \$1,500,000,000? Does he know what he is doing? And do you know what you are doing? I do not believe you do.

During this session we heard Members of this Congress condemning the method of the expenditure of the \$4,880,000,000 given the President last year, yet today by your action on this conference report you are approving the very things you condemned ever since January of this year.

Now, you again approve the very things that you have been condemning in the past. What respect are your people at home going to have for you when you go back?

Mr. Speaker, if the people of my district wanted me to vote for a thing like this I could not approve it, because it is wrong. The people have delegated the power to Congress to use your prerogative, and to use your brain and your initiative in the handling and expenditure of these funds, but you have turned over all of the authority to the President of the United States. Have you no responsibility of your own? For 3 long years you have spent money ruthlessly. For 3 long years you have been putting this country in the worst financial condition it has ever been. For 3 long years you have been fooling the people of this country. You will not do it much longer. In 3 long months we will elect Landon President, and then, and only then, can America be saved. We will land Landon in the White House in January. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there are 10 pages in this bill calling for the appropriation of money for international congresses, commissions, bureaus, and so forth, including an International Joint Commission between the United States and Great Britain, the Mixed Claims Commission between the United States and Germany, and nine amendments put in by the Senate having to do with appropriations for international conferences of one kind or the other.

I do not see a single penny appropriated in this bill to make any attempt, nor the slightest endeavor, to collect the war debt. As Al Smith stated, "Let us look at the record."

On November 12, 1932, President Hoover sent a special letter to Governor Roosevelt at Albany, N. Y., asking for Mr. Roosevelt's cooperation in settling the war-debt situation. The President-elect, at that time the then Governor of the great State of New York, flatly refused to cooperate in any way with the then President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, intimating he would settle it himself just as soon as he got into power. He stated that would be one of the first objectives of the new incoming Democratic administration. Up to that time under Republican administration, until the moratorium was declared by President Hoover with the consent of the Congress, the various foreign nations were paying to us every year approximately \$200,000,000. In the 3 years of the present administration we have not received a single dollar from any of these nations except the little Republic of Finland. Yet here we are, the Congress of the United States, about to adjourn, with the last deficiency bill now before us, and not a single attempt is made by anybody in this administration, from the President down, to live up to his promise or to attempt to collect the money that these foreign nations

have failed to pay. These foreign nations have repudiated their debts. They have welsched on their obligations, and the President says nothing and does nothing. Why this inaction on his part? I would remind the Democrats that this will be an issue in the coming campaign. Thank God, the Republicans put in their platform a specific declaration and propose to discuss this pledge and carry it out when in power.

They stated:

We shall use every effort to collect the war debts due us from foreign governments, amounting to \$12,000,000,000, one-third of our national debt. No effort has been made by the present administration even to reopen the negotiations.

A leading British statesman only a few days ago made the statement that Great Britain did not propose to pay any of these war debts. If they do not propose to pay the war debt to us, let me suggest to my Republican friends when they come into power—and, of course, they will, by an overwhelming majority—if these foreign nations continue to repudiate and welsch on their debts, let us ask them to relinquish their possessions in the Caribbean Sea, which should be ours geographically anyway, and are within our sphere of influence commercially and politically.

What we need in the White House is another Andrew Jackson, who would soon secure a proper adjustment and payment of the war debts. There are too many internationalists in the New Deal administration to expect or hope for any proper and adequate adjustment of the war debts. However, President Roosevelt, because of his refusal to cooperate with President Hoover in November 1932, owes it to the country to explain his failure to secure any war-debt payments in the last 3 years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 29: Page 26, line 3, strike out the words "and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of a dam on the lower Tennessee River" and insert "a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar, Tenn."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments having to do with the T. V. A., amendments nos. 29 and 30. I ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be considered together, both of them providing for dams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report amendment no. 30.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 30: Page 26, line 17, strike out "\$39,900,000" and insert "\$41,100,000."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments nos. 29 and 30.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of that question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have been a consistent supporter of the development of the Tennessee River ever since the subject was first presented to the Congress. In addition to the program of flood control there is the additional item of navigation included in this program covering the development of this river, and in this proposition of navigation there is involved a 9-foot channel in the Tennessee River up to Knoxville, Tenn., affording slack-water navigation to Knoxville.

We have already spent a considerable sum of money in exploring the dam at Watts Bar, mentioned in the Senate

amendment; in fact, work is now in progress in the way of exploration and survey of this project.

The Senate amendment only provides for \$1,200,000, which is to be divided between Watts Bar and the dam in Kentucky. It is only a question of time when this development is sure to come. It is an inevitable development, and it seems to me that now of all times is the proper time to start this work, due to the fact that our people in this section have suffered tremendously from the depression—and right in the vicinity of Watts Bar is the town of Rockwood, which has been terribly stricken by the depression, with hundreds of people out of employment who need work. I hope the House conferees will reconsider their attitude with respect to this item and that the motion which I made a moment ago will be adopted by the House.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. REECE. Under the policy which has been adopted by the Congress and under the program which has been set up by the T. V. A., these dams are going to be constructed in any event.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. There is no question about that.

Mr. REECE. The commencement of the construction of the dams will occur in a reasonable time and this amendment simply provides for the beginning of construction at this time when, in addition to obtaining the dams in accordance with the policy adopted by the Congress, we will derive the incidental benefit of giving work to the unemployed at the present time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. That is exactly right. I have understood from some source that the officials of the T. V. A. have said that this is a premature development and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this is true.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They have not only intimated it, they have absolutely and unconditionally said so. Look at the chart before you where it is shown that construction is not proposed before the fiscal year 1940, and that is a T. V. A. chart.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Did not Dr. Morgan, the chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, appear before the committee?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; and stated he was not ready for Gilbertsville, if that is what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. But the last Congress provided for the preliminary development work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; the last Congress provided some money to investigate where he should put a dam, whether at Gilbertsville or Aurora.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Watts Bar is several hundred miles upstream from Gilbertsville, and is an indispensable unit of the T. V. A. program, both as to navigation and flood control.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not referring to Watts Bar, but to Aurora.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. As I said a moment ago, having started the work in a preliminary way, I hope the House will support my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. May I ask my colleague if this is not a part of the contemplated program?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. As I stated at the outset of my remarks, this is a vital part of the Tennessee River development.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If we start the construction of additional dams that are not recommended by the T. V. A. authorities, where are you going to get the money to complete them? Did the gentleman see the statement of the United States Treasury to which I referred today? Something is going to break here very soon if we do not stop these expenditures.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. But this is a part of the system to which the Government is already committed.

Mr. RICH. Why ask for something that has not been recommended by the engineers until you can get the money?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. This is an essential part of the system, and now is the proper time to begin the development.

Mr. RICH. The trouble is our system is too big.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield.

TAX WEALTH

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just spoken, that we have salaries in this country that run over the million-dollar mark, and there are many thousands who get hundreds of thousands of dollars salary per year. We might tax the superrich a little to build some of these dams. Under the title "A Mirror of Wealth and Poverty" during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress I listed some of these huge incomes. I compiled much of the vast wealth of America that now escapes taxation. Lift the burden from the shoulders of the poor and place it upon the broad and strong shoulders of the rich. That is where it belongs. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is right about that, too. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], in opposition to this Senate amendment.

The provision of the House bill provides for the money requested by the T. V. A. for the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of dam on the lower Tennessee River. In place of this language the Senate put in the bill a mandatory provision requiring a dam to be built at Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at Watts Bar, Tenn.

The testimony before your committee by the Tennessee Valley Authority was that they had not yet completed their preliminary investigations and that they had not yet completed the necessary borings to determine exactly where these dams should be built. All that the Tennessee Valley Authority has asked is something over \$600,000 to continue these preliminary investigations, and your committee and the House gave them what they asked for and they were satisfied with the House provision.

A certain Senator now wishes to anticipate this orderly procedure by forcing the building of two dams before the investigations are completed, and before the engineers of the T. V. A. themselves are certain that they wish to build the dams at these two places. It seems to me that the Congress of the United States should not set itself up as an engineering body to override the engineers employed by the T. V. A.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. I have only 5 minutes. One of the new matters that has come up, and one of the matters that the engineers of the T. V. A. want to study further, is the question of flood control. If we are going to build these dams, it seems entirely reasonable to expect that the question of flood control should be taken into consideration throughout the entire Mississippi River Basin, so that the work that is to be done may fit into an orderly program of flood control. The disastrous floods on the Ohio and in the upper Mississippi last spring warrant and urge the policy that the projected preliminary investigations for a dam site on the lower Tennessee should consider the question of orderly flood control. It seems to me that the proponents of the Tennessee Valley Authority, those who are so eager for this work to go on, would do very well to allow the Tennessee Valley Authority to consider flood control which will benefit the entire Nation, and not narrow the funds simply to a local improvement. From a practical point of view, we allow them to go along and make those investigations, having in mind the benefits to the whole country from the point of view of flood control, and it would seem that there would be more

people in favor of this broader objective than merely the localized proposition. My plea is in support of the chairman of the committee, that the Senate amendment be defeated and that the House language, which meets with the approval of the Tennessee Valley Authority, be adopted as the recommendation of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY].

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] has brought to the attention of the House the possibility of flood control on the Ohio River. That is the bugaboo which they are using now to defeat this proposition on the Tennessee River. He knows and every member of the committee knows and every Member of this House knows that the Tennessee Valley Authority has no authority now to expend one single dime on the Ohio River, the Cumberland River, or any other river in the United States, except the Tennessee River and its tributaries. So this talk about the Ohio River is beside the question and does not meet it at all.

I am rising more particularly at this time to call attention to the fact that if this amendment of the Senate be adopted, it will fit in with the general plan provided by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that it meets with the approval of the President of the United States. We are now building a dam at Pickwick Landing. That is probably 150 miles from the Ohio River. If you stop with that dam, you have all the territory in the upper reaches of the Tennessee with no way to get into it. It is like the neck of a bottle, with no provision for navigation up to Pickwick Dam, and you have a lot of inland lakes, so to speak, built in there. It is a part of the program to build a 9-foot channel all the way through. We have been making improvements all over the country, and while one of these proposed dams is in my own congressional district, I voted for Boulder Dam when you folks out west were crying for it, I voted for them all over the United States, for reclamation projects and things of that sort, and since this matter is one which is absolutely essential to the carrying out of the original purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority, since it has been recommended by the Board of Army Engineers in the report of 1930 and was recommended in the Rivers and Harbors Act of that date, we are not anticipating or going ahead of the program at all by the adoption of the amendment which was passed by the Senate.

While on the floor I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. In the allocation made by the House bill was any provision made for a continuation of the work at Gilbertsville Dam and how much money?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is \$650,000 in the House bill for continuation of engineering and other investigations of the Gilbertsville Dam and Reservoir.

Mr. GREGORY. The bill itself does not disclose that fact.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The hearings abundantly disclose it.

Mr. GREGORY. I understand that I am taking the chairman's word for it. It was not disclosed in the bill. I wanted to be sure.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And the House report on the bill also shows it.

Mr. GREGORY. Of course, we have had no opportunity to see that. I wanted to get the chairman's confirmation of the report which I had heard that \$650,000 is now available for continuation of studies.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is available in the House bill. The one we are now considering.

Mr. GREGORY. That is what I wanted to know. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] will prevail, because it is meritorious, and it is simply carrying out the original plan.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON].

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that when this bill was passed by the House a few weeks ago, I offered on the floor the identical amendment to the bill which has been placed in it by the Senate,

with the exception of the fact that there was no increase carried in the appropriation in the amendment which I offered.

At the time the amendment was offered I stated to the House that in my humble judgment if the amendment were adopted at that time it would mean a saving to the Government in the construction work which was to be carried on in the Tennessee River Valley. The House at that time did not see fit to adopt the amendment. Now we are confronted with the same amendment which has come to us by virtue of the amendment placed on in the Senate.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] says that it is an effort on the part of one Senator to anticipate the orderly procedure of the development on the Tennessee River. I take the liberty of disagreeing with the gentleman in that statement.

This amendment was placed here, not at the instance of any one Senator but at the instance of several Senators and after mature deliberation on the part of the entire Senate.

I stated to the House in good faith when this amendment was offered several weeks ago that, in my humble judgment, unless it was adopted, it was the intention of the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority to eventually ask for authority to take into their program the Ohio River, and to construct a dam across both the Tennessee and the Ohio, at an expenditure of over \$200,000,000, and advanced the thought that if construction could be started on a dam at Gilbertsville or Aurora that visionary scheme would be foisted. I am still of that opinion, and I am firmly convinced that it is good judgment on the part of this House to adopt the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] in the interest of economy, and in the orderly completion of the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. If we fail to take this step now, the chances are overwhelmingly in favor of our being confronted at a later date with an expenditure five times as great as the expenditure which would be required on the dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., or Aurora.

May I ask the chairman of the committee a question? The gentleman stated, in answer to my colleague from Kentucky, that \$650,000 had been allocated by the committee in this program for the purpose of carrying on investigating work at Gilbertsville. May I ask whether or not it is in the contemplation of the committee or the managers of the Authority, if the chairman knows, that any part of that money is to be expended in actual construction work at Gilbertsville?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No part of that money was to be used to commence construction.

Mr. PEARSON. Is it not true that the Tennessee Valley Authority has already expended thousands of dollars in exploratory work at the dam site known as Aurora?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They have spent thousands of dollars at about 8 or 10 different dam sites on that river and are continuing to spend it. We are now specifying in the bill where they can make these investigations.

Mr. PEARSON. Have they not stated in their last annual report that in their judgment or in the judgment of the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a dam should be constructed at Gilbertsville, Ky.? In other words, has not the location of it already been determined, and is not the expenditure of \$650,000 for that purpose rendered unnecessary?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which they recommend to Congress, Gilbertsville is listed for the construction of a dam to be commenced in the fiscal year 1940. It is so shown in a plan presented to our committee at this session.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON] has expired.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this Tennessee Valley proposition that is before us today is not a question whether dams

should be constructed in the neighborhood of Gilbertsville or somewhere around there. It is entirely a question of going ahead with orderly procedure. I want to read to you from the hearings on the subcommittee on the deficiency appropriation bill at page 115, where we took up this question, and where, as a result of those hearings, the committee reported out \$650,000 to continue the investigation of this Gilbertsville site.

EXPLORING WORK FOR GILBERTSVILLE DAM

We have an item of about a half million dollars to continue exploration at Gilbertsville.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you find a foundation there?

Dr. A. E. MORGAN. Yes; we found a good foundation finally.

Mr. TABER. Did you get away from the cave situation at Aurora?

Dr. A. E. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. You found it was not a good site.

Dr. A. E. MORGAN. It was not a good site, and we have gone down the river where we can provide much better flood control.

Mr. TABER. Have you made drillings, or are you not far enough along to tell us about that?

Dr. A. E. MORGAN. Yes; we have made drillings, but not as close together as we would like to for final plans. Every hole we have is a good hole.

The CHAIRMAN. How many holes did you have across the river?

Mr. PROKOP. Ten holes, all of which showed full cores, with good rock in all the cores. Some of them had a few small breaks, which is characteristic of the whole area, but the amount of that is comparatively small.

I want to tell you what the situation is, so that those of you who do not live in that territory may understand it. That territory is of a cave formation. Large portions of it do not provide a substantial foundation upon which a good dam can be built.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. When I have finished, if I have time, I will. The investigation of the Aurora site, after spending several hundred thousand dollars in borings, showed that the cave situation was so bad that it was not feasible to build a dam there.

The committee provided funds that the investigation might go on. At Gilbertsville, with 10 holes across the river, they have found only some breaks. It is not safe to go ahead and definitely establish that we shall build a dam at Gilbertsville until there have been further borings and further investigations. There are always situations in that territory where they have to pour tremendous quantities of concrete into these cavities down under the river bottom. It is not possible to do a good job on these things unless we are careful and proceed as good engineers would. Those engineers themselves, as you gathered from the testimony I have read, have told us that they have not made enough borings or enough studies to justify the definite determination on this dam. This is the reason we should only go ahead with exploration work and not appropriate the money for actual construction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I occupy a very embarrassing position, a position wherein my duty as trustee of an expressed duty in this House compels me to deny and oppose my colleagues, when my own personal disposition would be to accommodate them if I could do so out of my own money; but I cannot bring myself to accommodate them out of taxpayers' money because I regard myself as a trustee for that. [Applause.]

First, let me say that this is one of the most premature, unheard-of propositions ever presented to a sensible body of men. You have organized the Tennessee Valley Authority; you have put men in charge of it, supposedly eminent engineers who know their jobs, supposedly businessmen who know their business. What do they recommend? Let me read you just one sentence before I explain the schedule on this blackboard. Dr. Morgan said, indicating the rate at which these dams should be built, just on the basis of good engineering progress, that he is not including in the coming fiscal year any construction on Watts Bar Dam, Coulter Shoals Dam, or Gilbertsville Dam. We already have approved one new dam to begin construction this next fiscal year.

What is the plan presented on this chart? Let me read it to you:

Dam construction program now under way and recommended by T. V. A. The execution of this program would require the appropriation for dam construction purposes of about \$35,000,000 a year for about 7 years in addition to investments which may prove to be necessary for generating electric power at other than the Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Dams.

What are elements of the program? In the fiscal year 1934 there were commenced the Wheeler Dam and the Norris Dam, with their completion contemplated by the fiscal year 1937 at a cost of \$32,000,000 and \$35,000,000, respectively.

In the fiscal year 1935 they investigated and commenced the building of the Pickwick Dam, to be completed in the fiscal year 1939 at a cost of \$32,500,000.

Investigation of Guntersville Dam: Began in the fiscal year 1936, with commencement of construction in the fiscal year 1937, to be completed in the fiscal year 1940, and to cost \$29,500,000.

Chickamauga Dam: Investigations to start in the fiscal year 1936, construction to commence at the beginning of the fiscal year 1937, and to cost \$31,650,000.

Hiwassee Dam: Investigations to be started in the latter part of the fiscal year 1936, construction to commence in the fiscal year 1937, and completion scheduled in the fiscal year 1940 at a total cost of \$15,000,000.

All these dams are not only authorized but appropriations have been made toward their construction. The aggregate of the appropriations required for them is \$176,000,000. Is not this enough for 3 years for one activity in one section of the United States? And Dr. A. E. Morgan says, and the Authority says, they should proceed in an orderly manner with about \$35,000,000 of construction a year.

There is sense in a level program over a period of years. It provides an even employment program; it permits organization and plant equipment, when one dam is completed, to be shifted and utilized at another dam. It is economical. There is no sense in rushing a lot of dams at one time. You acquire a lot of plant equipment and a big organization, and it must be disbanded in a short time. The House bill proceeded along this sensible line of construction program—an even construction program for each year. The bill went to the Senate. Some people apparently are afraid that public sentiment, the psychology of the people of the United States, will change and make it hard to get appropriations hereafter. That is all; they fear a coming Congress may say, "We are going to put a stop to building these dams in this valley and everywhere else." Whether the Congress will say this or not I do not know. That is in the hands of the people. It is for them to say if they want a more rigid economy. What is the next project on this chart?

The Fontana Dam: No appropriation has been made. It is estimated to cost \$32,000,000. It is supposed to be investigated in the fiscal year 1937, with construction to commence in the fiscal year 1938. That is a wonderful reservoir site. We provide no money for that.

Watts Bar Dam: The Tennessee Valley Authority wants to investigate this in the fiscal year 1938 and commence construction at the beginning of the fiscal year 1939. The estimated cost of this dam is \$31,000,000.

Gilbertsville Dam, about which you have heard so much: They have been investigating it. They want to continue the investigation in the fiscal years 1938 and 1939 and commence construction in the fiscal year 1940. The cost of this is set at a total of \$74,000,000. They are not ready. Why are they not ready? This brings me to my second reference to the hearing. Let me show you from page 227 of the hearings, the testimony of Dr. Morgan again, under questioning by me as to the \$650,000 he said he wanted to investigate Gilbertsville Dam next fiscal year, 1937:

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you going to use it? Have you used all this \$550,000 that you had this year, or are you going to have any of that left over?

Dr. MORGAN. No; I think there will be none of that left over. Of the \$720,000, about \$650,000 is for the lower river at the Gilbertsville site.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean just for investigations? Dr. MORGAN. For borings, survey, and plans, primarily.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you had already found your foundation.

Dr. MORGAN. We have. We have made borings about 300 feet apart across the river channel. We must make additional borings in between. Then we have to do these things: For instance, we must know the amount of land to be cleared and the amount of land to be purchased, and we must make our survey of the reservoir boundary line. That reservoir is 184 miles long, plus the extension up the branch streams. We must work out the land to be taken and determine what cities would be damaged and how to treat such damages.

You are called upon to vote for a project involving a reservoir 184 miles long, involving land which will be submerged, families to be relocated, towns moved, roads moved, bridges moved, perhaps railroads relocated, and so forth. A project estimated now to cost \$74,000,000, and not all of the investigation of the elements of the cost yet ascertained.

Let us make these surveys and find out just what land will be submerged and what railroads will have to be moved in this 184 miles up that river. This involves the richest part of the valley. The land will be costly. Let us see what we are doing. We are the trustees for the taxpayers, and let us prove ourselves true to that trust. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] offered the preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments and concur therein.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has asked for a division of the question.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments nos. 29 and 30.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee) there were—ayes 10, noes 116.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] that the House insist on its disagreement to amendments 29 and 30.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 41: Page 32, after line 5, insert:

"That the President of the United States is authorized to appoint a board of three members, to be known as the Florida Canal Board (hereinafter called the 'Board'), the members of which shall be qualified members of the engineering profession who are not employees of the United States, or of the State of Florida, and who have in no manner been connected with or have any financial interest, present or prospective, in what is known as the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal project, Florida.

"The Board shall review the reports heretofore rendered in connection with the project for a sea-level ship canal across the State of Florida, with particular reference to the questions of (a) whether the construction of such a canal across the State of Florida between the St. Johns River and the Withlacoochee River would create any consequential or irremediable disturbance of the ground water levels of the State of Florida; (b) the estimated costs of constructing, maintaining, and operating such a canal; and (c) the justification for the expenditure of the Federal funds estimated to be required. The Board shall make such further study of these and other pertinent questions relating to this project as it may deem necessary.

"The Board shall report its findings and recommendations to the President on or before July 20, 1936. Should its conclusions be favorable to the continuance by the Federal Government of the project hereinbefore mentioned, the President is hereby authorized to make allotments for carrying forward such project during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, from any funds now or hereafter available for relief and work relief on useful projects, as follows:

"For a ship canal across the State of Florida, not to exceed \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the total estimated capital cost of such canal shall not exceed \$150,000,000, including all funds previously allotted thereto.

"The members of the Board herein authorized to be appointed shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 per day for each day of service, including Sundays and holidays, together with their necessary traveling expenses, and the Board is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it may find necessary to assist in the performance of its functions, without regard to civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to pay their necessary traveling expenses. The expenditures authorized by this section shall be paid from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors.

"The Secretary of War and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall make available to the Board herein authorized all reports, records, plans, estimates, or other data and information in their possession which in any manner relate to the project hereinbefore mentioned and shall render such aid and assistance as said Board may request in connection with the duties imposed upon it hereunder."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 41.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion that the House recede in its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 41 and concur therein.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a quorum present to hear this important discussion, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I think it will be helpful if I describe briefly the present status of the Florida canal project and just how this Senate amendment relates to it. The Florida canal is a regular river and harbor project originating in the river and harbor bill of 1927, which included a provision for a survey for this project. In the ordinary course of procedure the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers would report the project to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, and I understand that this will be done in the near future. Because of the magnitude of the project and the large amount of ground to be covered, the board of survey of the Corps of Engineers was approximately 6 years in making a most exhaustive survey and study. Before they had made their report but after they had completed the actual work and had collected all necessary data, Congress had enacted certain relief legislation which empowered the President, and indeed laid upon him the responsibility to select and designate public works of all kinds which could be used for the relief of unemployment. With the advice and recommendation of the appropriate agencies of the Government, the President designated a large number of such projects, and among these, the Florida canal. In the case of this particular project he not only took the advice and recommendation of the Chief of Engineers but caused it to be further examined by the engineers of the Public Works Administration and by a special board consisting of Army Engineers, engineers of the Public Works Administration, and an engineer selected by these from civil life. I do not propose to attempt to go into the mass of detail with regard to these examinations and reports.

It is sufficient to say that they appeared to the President and the appropriate agencies of the Government to amply justify the project and therefore make it available for the work-relief program. And so it was authorized by the President under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and \$5,400,000 was allotted to initiate the work. I understand that something like 17,000,000 cubic yards of earth have been removed, and that 6,000 men are at the present moment employed on this job, and that it is admirably serving to relieve unemployment and stimulate trade and industry.

Critics of the administration and opponents of the project itself have claimed that it should not have been started because either it is unsound or because its construction might

do certain damage to the water supply of a portion of the State of Florida. It is not my purpose to argue here the merits of these questions which have been raised. I desire to point out, however, that years of careful and most exhaustive study by the Army engineers and other agencies of the Government were given to these very questions; and unless the Army engineers and these other authorities are entirely mistaken, the objections to the project cannot be well founded. In any event, it is self-evident that the President insisted upon careful examination and was entirely satisfied before he authorized this project.

However, all of these questions will be duly considered by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors when they have received the final report of the Army engineers. The House will have ample opportunity to discuss and decide these questions at the next or succeeding sessions, for, of course, this project will continue to follow the routine prescribed for river and harbor projects. Any regular appropriations for this project, when and if they are made, will come before Congress for decision in the future.

The present amendment does not relate to these questions. It is an entirely different question which we have to decide at the present moment—that is, whether these 6,000 men shall be arbitrarily thrown out of work, the Government forced to find other work relief for them, millions of dollars wasted, and work on this particular project for the time being abandoned. This amendment provides for a special board of review to be constituted by the President. This board shall consist of competent engineers, no one of which shall be in the employment of the Federal Government or the State of Florida, no one of which shall have had any connection whatever with the project heretofore. This board is directed to reexamine this entire project, and specifically it is directed to examine the questions of whether it will have a harmful effect on the water supply of Florida and whether the project itself justifies the expenditure of Federal funds for its construction. If the report of the board is favorable, the President would be authorized to utilize the project for work relief by expending on it not more than \$10,000,000 of the work-relief funds appropriated in this bill—funds which must be expended for work relief in Florida in any event. That is the sum and substance of this amendment. It is the President's view that it will be informative and helpful to have the study and advice of a board whose judgment may be relied upon as unbiased and unprejudiced in determining these fundamental questions. The President was undoubtedly fully satisfied on these points before he authorized the project, but his critics have continued to insist that he has erred in this matter. This amendment provides for just that further examination and study of the project which they demand before additional funds are expended. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is therefore not only eminently fair but is the most reasonable way of meeting this very serious situation. It is one which I believe any sincere opponent of the project should welcome, because it insures that no further funds would be expended until additional investigations of the questions raised have been made. The great number who favor the project should be willing to have this further study made. A vote in favor of this amendment is simply a vote to require more study of this project before it can be utilized for work relief, reserving to Congress the decision at some future time as to whether this project shall be prosecuted to completion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how this request of the President can be reasonably refused by his opponents, and I feel certain that it will not be refused by his supporters. It is so sensible and so fair that I am confident that the House will vote to adopt it.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. The gentleman stated that the Army engineers had approved the project. My understanding is that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors have not made any report either for or against it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct. They have not reported officially. I meant the Army engineers who had studied the project heretofore.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. TABER. On page 42 of the hearings on nonmilitary projects of the War Department this question was asked General Pillsbury:

Was that approved by the same type of board that the Passamaquoddy project was approved by?

General Pillsbury replied:

No; to the best of my recollection that was not recommended by any board.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can only say I am informed it was recommended by a special board of Army engineers, including P. W. A. and other engineers. I have not any more time at the moment to yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] as he may desire to use.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a short statement of facts of about one page.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have on several former occasions discussed this project in detail and at length. It is not now my purpose to anything more than very briefly review the history and the present position of the Florida canal. This is a river and harbor project. In the ordinary course of events it would before now have reached the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and been subject to such action and recommendation as that body might have seen fit to make. It had its inception in the river and harbor bill of 1927, which provided for a survey for a waterway connecting the intracoastal system of the Atlantic seaboard with that of the Gulf of Mexico. I drew and introduced the survey bill. The River and Harbor Act of 1930 provided for further surveys. It was my lot to also introduce this survey bill. Pursuant to these provisions, the Corps of Engineers, over a period of more than 6 years, conducted what Maj. Gen. Lytle Brown, then Chief of Engineers, has described as the most exhaustive survey of any project ever made by the War Department. In the usual course of events the report of the board of survey of the Corps of Engineers would be made to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and that board would report to the Chief of Engineers, and the Chief of Engineers in turn would lay the matter before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in accordance with the provisions of law governing river and harbor projects; and this course will undoubtedly be duly completed at the next regular session of Congress. In the meantime, however, between the time the surveys were ordered by Congress and the time of the completion of the report on the same by the board of survey of the Corps of Engineers, Congress enacted the laws creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and establishing the Administration of Public Works and other work-relief agencies. Under the provisions of these acts Congress made possible the financing of this project in whole or in part without direct specific appropriation. By enacting the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 Congress went a step further and delegated to the President the power to authorize as well as to finance projects of this nature. Therefore, to understand the history of the Florida canal it is necessary to bear in mind that it is a river and harbor project, and it began as such in a regular river and harbor bill, and will undoubtedly continue as such as soon as it can be placed before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the course of orderly procedure. In the meantime, it has been selected by the President, after due examination and approval by the appropriate departments of the Government, and, pursuant to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, has been authorized and designated by him for the expenditure of certain work-relief funds.

The canal is now under construction on a large scale. Six thousand men are employed directly on the job. Seventeen million cubic yards of earth have been excavated. The people of that portion of the State of Florida traversed by the canal have bonded their property for nearly \$2,000,000 and have purchased and contributed to the Federal Government the right-of-way, comprising many thousands of acres of land. An excavation has been opened across the central portion of the State nearly 16 miles long, 400 feet wide, and 30 feet deep. A great bridge, with its piers rising 40 feet into the air, is in course of construction. It is unanimously agreed that the project has given, and is continuing to give, dollar for dollar expended, a more diversified, widespread, effective, and satisfactory work relief than almost any other project in the President's program, thus proving the wisdom of his decision to begin this enterprise.

The construction of this canal is directly in line with the general policy of Congress as expressed in its river and harbor legislation over the past half century. I think no one will deny that that policy has been to steadily push forward the construction of the great intracoastal waterway system running along the Atlantic seaboard from the New England States on the north to the southern tip of Florida on the south; from the mouth of the Rio Grande River in Texas on the west, along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico to the southern Gulf coast of Florida; and finally to complete the system and thereby realize its full value to the Nation, a connecting waterway across the peninsula of Florida. The details of this policy—just how rapidly the development of this great system of intracoastal waterways should be developed, the dimensions and types of the several links which comprise it—have been, of course, questions which have been debated from time to time for a great many years, but I feel that all will agree that the history of the legislation enacted by Congress indicates clearly the general policy I have outlined. Therefore I say again that the construction of this waterway across Florida, so far from being something new and a departure from our long-established policy, is, on the contrary, an integral part of that policy. The appropriate time for beginning this enterprise and the speed with which its construction should be prosecuted are questions which, in the normal course of events, would be decided entirely by direct action of Congress. By the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 the Congress not only empowered the President to answer the first of these questions—that is, whether the appropriate time to begin this project had arrived—but it laid upon him the responsibility of making this decision. He has accepted that responsibility and, after the most elaborate and painstaking examination of the subject, decided that the appropriate time for initiating the work had arrived, and, pursuant to his powers and duties under the law, he acted. Since that time he has clearly and unmistakably referred to Congress for its decision the second question as to the rate at which this work should proceed—that is, whether it should proceed slowly by moderate appropriations or rapidly by larger appropriations. These questions will undoubtedly be answered by Congress at the next regular session.

In the meantime a situation has arisen which requires action at the present time unless waste and want and much distress are to be created. There are those who believe that the project should not have been begun at the time it was initiated. There are those who honestly believe that it should never have been begun. I think these are a decided minority, but I recognize and respect the sincerity of their opinions. There are interests which seek, for selfish reasons, to prevent the construction of the canal regardless of its benefits to the public. There are those, and I believe them to be the great majority of the people of the United States, who are convinced that the President was right when he began the enterprise and who believe that not only as a work-relief project but as a great benefit to the Nation's commerce, agriculture, and industry, the canal should be pushed to completion. Because of the insistence of those who oppose the project on the grounds that it is unsound or that it will result in harmful effects incommensurate with its national benefits, the President now requests the Congress to authorize him to make

further and special investigation of the project, with special attention to the controversial points, and in the event that this additional investigation shall indicate the justification for the expenditure of certain of the relief funds appropriated in this bill, to make such expenditure for that purpose. That is the whole meaning of this amendment which we are now discussing. We are not now deciding whether or not the Florida canal shall be completed now or 20 years from now, or ever. These questions will come before Congress for its decision in due course. The only question which we have to answer today is whether we shall grant the request of the President for authority to further examine this project and, depending upon the result of that examination, to use the project as a vehicle for unemployment relief by using a limited portion of the funds which must in any event be expended for such relief in that region.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this is the most fair and the most rational method which could have been suggested for handling this most important problem. I know that some of our Members feel that Congress should not be committed to this project in its entirety without further opportunity to discuss and act upon it. Their acceptance of this amendment in no way precludes that. As I have pointed out, the question of appropriations for this project, if any, must come before us in due course at the next and succeeding regular sessions. On the other hand, a great number of us who believe that the project should be pushed to completion as rapidly as possible must be content to have it reexamined and to have any continuation of the work for the immediate present depend upon the results of that examination and upon such allotments of relief funds as the President may feel are justified by that examination. Rather than see the waste and the distress which will inevitably follow cessation of the work even for a short time, rather than see the President rebuked, rather than see the confidence of the people in the efforts of our Federal Government to grapple with the great problem of unemployment seriously shaken, we accept this amendment and very earnestly urge that it be concurred in by the House.

FLORIDA CANAL—OUTLINE OF BASIC INFORMATION AND DATA

(Furnished by the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida)

1. Basic data: All examining authorities of the Government including the Public Works Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and the Board of Review are in substantial agreement on the following:

A. The route of the canal: Entering the St. Johns River, thence up the St. Johns River to a point near Palatka; thence westerly across the central portion of the peninsula to the Withlacoochee River near Dunnellon; thence down the Withlacoochee River to the Gulf of Mexico, entering the Gulf of Mexico at a point due east of the mouth of the Mississippi.

B. That the canal should be constructed at sea level.

C. That its construction will have no deleterious effect upon the underground water supply of Florida.

D. That its cost will be approximately \$142,700,000.

E. That its benefits to commerce are Nation-wide and will exceed \$8,000,000 per year.

F. That the canal as planned and under construction is of proper alignment and dimensions to permit the safe navigation of ships night and day.

G. That upward of 10,000 ships per year will transit the canal.

H. That a relation of cost of the project to its benefits is more favorable than is the case with the average River and Harbor project.

2. Statistics: A. Length of the canal: Approximately 180 miles from sea buoy on the Atlantic to sea buoy on the Gulf.

B. Bottom width: Sea approaches, 1,000 feet. River sections, 400 feet. Central cut section (29 miles), 250 feet.

C. Depth: In earth, 30 feet plus 2 feet over depth. In rock, 30 feet plus 3 feet over depth.

D. Speed of vessels in canal: In all but central cut section, 10½ knots per hour. (This is average ocean speed.) In cut section (29 miles), 6½ knots per hour.

E. Time to transit: Sea buoy to sea buoy, 23 hours.

F. Time saved per round trip: New York to New Orleans, 2½ days.

3. Contribution by the State of Florida: Formation of a special navigation district, including six counties which have bonded themselves for \$1,800,000, the proceeds of which are being used to purchase and deed the right-of-way to the Federal Government.

4. Work done to date: A. Clearing of right-of-way: Substantially complete.

B. Bridges: Piers of first large bridge substantially complete.

C. Workmen's camps, etc.: Complete.

D. Excavation: Approximately 17,000,000 cubic yards to date. The excavation has made a ditch approximately 16 miles long.

400 feet wide, and 30 feet deep across the central portion of the State.

E. Men at present employed: Approximately 5,000.

F. History: A. Survey as a barge canal ordered by War Department under Rivers and Harbors Act of 1927. Further survey ordered as ship canal under Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930. Surveys in charge of Corps of Engineers.

B. Before completion of surveys by War Department, the National Gulf-Atlantic Ship Canal Association (a corporation not for profit), on behalf of a public corporation of the State of Florida to be constituted by the State, made a pro-forma application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (July 1932) for a loan to construct the canal as a self-liquidating project. Revenues to be obtained from tolls on shipping.

C. Early in 1933, by Executive order, this and all other applications to the R. F. C. were turned over to the Public Works Administration. No action whatever was taken by the R. F. C.

D. Early in 1933 the Legislature of the State of Florida constituted the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, which took over the matter and became the applicant before the P. W. A.

E. In June 1933, by instructions of the President, the board of survey of the Corps of Engineers, although it had not entirely completed its work, made a preliminary report which included practically all the basic data necessary for estimating the cost of the canal and practically all economic data necessary for estimating the benefits. This report was made in order that the State authority might present the data to the P. W. A. The report was not made public. It finally and definitely determined the route and indicated a preference for a lock canal of ship-canal dimensions.

F. During the summer or fall of 1933 the engineering division of the P. W. A. and the legal and financial divisions of that establishment thoroughly investigated the project, using the basic physical data furnished by the Corps of Engineers but making their own economic and financial survey.

G. In October 1933 the engineering, legal, and financial divisions of the P. W. A. made a report to the Administrator to the effect that the project should be a ship canal along the route laid down by the Army Engineers (present route); that it should be a lock canal; that its cost would be \$115,000,000; and that revenues could be expected from tolls on shipping sufficient to pay all maintenance and operating expense, together with interest charges (4 percent), and repay the loan in accordance with the regulations of the P. W. A. for such projects. Page 26, paragraph 8, of that report gives the following conclusions and recommendations:

"It is concluded that the project covered herein constitutes a public necessity and is of real social value. The project will afford much employment to many classes of skilled and unskilled labor; that the design is in accord with sound engineering practice; and that the project is economically sound.

"It is recommended that the loan, with or without the grant, be made."

The Administrator rejected these findings and did not approve the loan. He stated later to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce that he had not rejected the project as a river and harbor project but merely because he did not agree that cash tolls could be collected enough to represent sufficient security for the loan under the regulation of the P. W. A. for self-liquidating projects, and that his action was without reference to the merits of the project as a regular river and harbor item.

H. In December 1933 the board of survey of the Corps of Engineers completed its work and made its report. In accordance with usual procedure, this report was not made public but was filed with the Board for Rivers and Harbors, which ordinarily would examine the same and make a report to the Chief of Engineers, who would in turn report to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House. The project, however, had been, by order of the President, already placed in process in the P. W. A., which gave it a special status, and, until finally disposed of there, it was deemed inappropriate to continue processing the project through the Board for Rivers and Harbors. Pursuant to usual practice, the Chief of Engineers did not make public this report but permitted its examination by Members of the Congress.

I. The above-mentioned report of the board of survey of the Army Engineers indicated a preference for a lock canal along the same route called for in the preliminary survey, and estimated the cost of this lock canal at \$190,000,000, with benefits to commerce of upward of \$8,000,000 per year.

J. It should be noted the economic survey of the Army Engineers was based upon an independent survey made by themselves and supplemented by a statistical survey made at their request by the Department of Agriculture. The economic survey made by the P. W. A. was an independent survey. All of these surveys agreed substantially that the direct benefits to commerce would be something over \$8,000,000 per year. The P. W. A. and the Army estimates as to the cost of the project were, however, \$115,000,000 and \$190,000,000, respectively. It developed that this was largely due to the fact that the Army was considering three locks and the P. W. A. two locks, and to certain other differences in unit construction-cost estimates.

K. Early in 1934 the President constituted a special board of review comprised of two Army Engineers, two engineers from the P. W. A., and a fifth engineer from civil life selected by the other four. This board was instructed to review the reports of the P. W. A. and the board of survey of the Army, and to make a report with recommendations to the President.

L. The board of review undertook to pass upon the project as a regular rivers and harbors project and not as a self-liquidating project for a loan. In June 1934 this board reported to the President that, in its opinion, a sea-level canal was feasible and preferable; that such a canal would have no serious effect upon the underground water supply of Florida; that it would cost \$142,700,000, exclusive of interest during construction and land for right-of-way. The board recommended the construction of the canal to the President and stated that based upon the economic data gathered by the Army Engineers the project was justified on a 4-percent basis even up to a cost of \$160,000,000.

M. Shortly after receipt of this report, the President instructed the board to examine the project with a view to determining whether, instead of being a regular river and harbor project, free from tolls, it could be made a self-liquidating project and used as a basis for a bond issue. On this particular point the board reported adversely in September 1934, basing its conclusion upon the assumption that a ship would not pay as cash toll more than 45 percent of the amount it would save. The board recognized, however, that the full amount saved by shipping would be ample justification for the construction of the canal as a river and harbor project.

N. In January 1935 the Administrator of Public Works, having up to that time withheld final action on the question of a loan for the construction of the canal as a self-liquidating project, overruled the recommendation of his engineering, financial, and legal divisions and disapproved the loan.

O. At this point the project stood approved by the board of review as a river and harbor project, justified by the benefits it would yield to commerce, but disapproved as a toll, self-liquidating project by the Administrator of Public Works.

P. On August 30, 1935, under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the President authorized the project and allocated to it \$5,000,000.

Q. Two subsequent allocations of \$200,000 each were made.

R. Work was begun on the project on September 3, 1935, and has been continuing ever since, with an average employment of about 6,000 men on the job.

S. Opposition of railroads and certain shipping lines: The Atlantic Coast Line, the Seaboard Airline, and the Southern Railway have opposed the project at public hearings held by the Army Engineers. Certain steamship lines have indicated opposition to the project. The question at issue is not whether the Government will build this canal for the benefit of certain ship-operating concerns but whether, when built, it will benefit the general public to an extent commensurable with its cost. That is the real question; and all attempts to divert the argument by citing opposition of ship operators are beside the point.

Ship operators realize that in the long run substantially all of the savings in the operation of ships made possible by the canal will have to be passed on to the general public in the form of lowered freight rates. They also realize that the canal will greatly stimulate shipping into and out of the Gulf of Mexico, and they fear that this will mean new competition.

The Corps of Engineers, the Department of Commerce, and the Public Works Administration have all found that the construction and operation of the canal will result in general public benefits to the greater part of the United States. These benefits are much more than sufficient to justify the cost.

The Corps of Engineers, which is the highest authority on the safety and practicability for navigation of improved waterways, has stated that the canal is safe and feasible for ships to use.

The Bureau of Navigation, which is the highest authority on questions of time and distance on given courses for ships, has stated that ships using the canal will definitely make certain savings in time and distance.

In view of these facts, it is impossible to conclude that ships will not use the canal when it is opened. Whether some ship-operating concerns wish to see the canal built is not the question we are discussing here; and all evidence of this kind only serves to prove that the canal will undoubtedly bring about vast economies to the general public.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to take issue with my friend the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Rules Committee, but I think the record will show that the engineers of the Public Works Administration have more than once reported against this canal, and I am assured that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, who have given it preliminary study, have not yet made any report whatever.

I would have no objection to the Florida canal if it came up in an orderly way in a river and harbor bill. It is part of the inland waterways and it seems to me it should go through the same process as every other improvement of our inland waterways or our harbors. It seems to me that the Board of Engineers ought to thoroughly investigate it. It

seems to me that the Board of Engineers ought to have a hearing and make a report, and then if it comes up in an orderly way so that the House can consider it as a definite proposition on its merits, we can then act intelligently in the matter. As it is, however, civilian engineers have made certain reports and most of them have been in conflict and it now comes up in the form of an item in the relief bill. Congress has never authorized it.

This canal will cost \$142,000,000 or \$160,000,000 with interest at 4 percent. The amount requested in this bill is only a beginning, and only a small beginning. This means that future Congresses, in the ordinary course of the regular appropriation bills, will be found to continue the building of this canal, and this will impose upon future Congresses a burden of well over \$100,000,000 in the completion of the project.

I do not believe that it is a wise policy to start a project as a relief project unless you have allocated sufficient money at the time you start it to finish it. I do not believe that it is wise to start a project as a relief project to be continued eventually in the regular appropriation bills when the problem of relief is over. It seems to me a thoroughly bad policy and a thoroughly bad precedent to establish.

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

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I have made an investigation of the Florida ship canal and I find that in 109 years there never has been a favorable report filed on this canal—not on this route primarily, because other routes have been proposed, but I cannot find a single favorable report upon it and I do not think there is any.

Mr. BACON. Who is going to benefit by this canal? Apparently commercial shipping, according to the proponents of the canal; but the testimony before our committee was to the effect that two-thirds of that commercial shipping which will benefit by it are the oil tankers of the large oil companies. Are we going to expend \$142,000,000 for the ostensible purpose of benefiting the tankers of the large oil companies? They form two-thirds of all the traffic that goes around Florida today. Yet, if it is for the benefit of the freighters, tankers, and commercial liners, they do not want or request it. Let me read to you what the Department of Commerce has stated:

The consensus of opinion of that part of the shipping industry with which contact has been established in the preparation of this study appears to be that the probable cost of building the projected waterway is not justified through any benefits which might thereby accrue to the cargo or the vessel. The significance of this is that it rests primarily upon the considered opinion of the principal and naturally most interested group, namely, the tanker trade.

It would thus appear that this canal will be little used and is not needed. There is no economic justification for the expenditure of \$142,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. BACON. A report from the Department of Commerce, which appears in the Record of May 30, 1936, at page 8394.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I appreciate more than words can express the gracious and cordial welcome just extended me on my return to the House, and before the session closes, when the business before the House is not so exacting, I hope to ask your further indulgence that I may try to convey my deep and never-to-be-forgotten gratitude for the solicitude, affection, and interest which individually you have in so many ways expressed for me during my long illness. [Applause.]

Only a few moments ago did the request come that I make a talk on the subject now up for consideration. It is the first talk I have made in the House for more than a year. May I read two lines of a verse quoted by one who, in the Senate, opposed this appropriation some weeks ago:

The waves that plunge along the shore
Said only, "Dreamer, dream no more!"

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who quoted these words, has since felt how pertinent, how prophetic, they were. I would say to the Senator from Michigan that these words are clothed now with a broader, deeper, and more significant meaning.

That great soul which passed from among us this morning may have been a dreamer, but his dreams were worth while, and such dreams always come true, sooner or later. They were like the dreams of Theodore Roosevelt, of Wilson, of Lincoln, of Jefferson, and of Washington—in that, after the dreamer was called away, there always came, as there will now, others to carry to realization those visions of these our departed great.

My friend from New York [Mr. BACON], for whom I entertain the highest personal regard, is in error in concluding that the Corps of Engineers has made no study of this project. He is in error in concluding that the Department of Commerce has recommended that it is economically unsound. He is in error in concluding that the facts gathered in reference to this project by the Corps of Engineers and on which their final report will be predicated do not justify the building of the canal.

I invite the gentleman from New York to read, on page 3832 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the letter there set out from the Chief of Engineers—and then, fair as he is, I venture to predict he will rise of his own volition to say that he was in error. I invite the Members of the House to read that very remarkable and informing statement recently spoken, with deep feeling, on the floor of the Senate by that great man, now no longer with us, and which appears in the RECORD under date of May 30 of this year. It effectually answers much erroneous propaganda.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. OLIVER. The two recent speeches by Senator FLETCHER, full and complete, are the only statements in reference to this project I have read in the last 12 months. To me, they seem convincing, coming as they did from one of unimpeachable integrity, when nearing his fourscore years, after a distinguished service of 27 years in the United States Senate. No words of bitterness or unkind acrimony, no resentment against those who differed from him, will be found in these statements, but only a dignified, forceful, logical statement of the reasons for his faith and belief as to the practicability and public value of the canal. Senate amendment no. 41, which the House is now considering, simply undertakes to provide funds for furnishing to the President further advice with reference to the Florida canal, and while, in my opinion, the expert opinion now available is sufficient, yet cumulative evidence may well be considered.

May I here say that the Senator's speeches of March 17 and May 30, to which reference has been previously made, serve to set a high and proper standard for the discussion of public questions, if you please, that might well be followed on both sides of the aisle, while the House is in session and not in session, and especially during an election year, when too often we give utterance to unkind and bitter emotions.

When I read those beautiful memorial addresses which recently appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I could but feel how truly they represent the heart sentiments of the Members of this House, differences forgotten and only the beautiful things, characteristic of our departed colleagues and friends, remembered.

Thus does this great and beloved Senator from Florida, whose soul took its flight today, leave with us his last words, which will remain always as a memory to be cherished—yea, like the memory our beloved Speaker left with us—which will never die.

I will here diverge to ask, What are some of the memories that, of all the great things our Speaker did, will live on? Some may answer, "His great love for his fellows, forgetting classes and sections", because it can be truly said of him that it mattered not from where they came, whether from the East, North, West, or South, friends to him were the same.

This is, indeed, a just tribute, for Joe Byrns never inquired from what section you came, and his handshake was cordial and warm, and his heartbeats true for men and women of worth and character, irrespective of domicile or class, whether high or low, rich or poor. What, though, again I ask, are the most enduring things our Speaker left with us? His successor, elected by the unanimous vote of the membership of the House, said this of him, that "For 35 years preceding his death he never failed at night, on his knees, to implore the help and guidance of Almighty God"; and to his family physician, Dr. Powell, of Nashville, just before he passed over the river, he said that our country was "drifting away from the principles of Christianity", and that what we most needed in America today was for America to "get back to God." This, my friends, was indeed a message of great import, coming as it did from the late Speaker of this House, a man of prayer. It was a message to us and every American, and may there be many to heed it and carry it on is my wish.

Now, my friends, while not regretting this divergence, let me in conclusion, before the vote is taken on the pending question, ask that those who have not done so, read over the statement put into the RECORD by the beloved Senator from Florida on May 30.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. The statement is not long, and I call your attention to it because I feel you will be impressed with it. From an economic and engineering standpoint it is impressive and convincing. It took a creative mind to frame some of its word mapping. It is my firm conviction that, from an economic and engineering viewpoint, the building of this canal is sound and that it will serve a great public need.

The vision, the industry, and the work of the Senator from Florida, no longer with us, have not been in vain, but they will shine like jewels on the finger of time, until, what the Senator from Michigan called a dream, comes true—yes.

"Sometimes, I think, the things we see
Are the shadows of the things to be;
That what we plan—we build,
That every hope that hath been crossed,
And every dream we thought was lost,
In future shall be fulfilled."

[Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to my colleague from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a few letters and the last memorandum written by Senator FLETCHER on the Florida ship canal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The memorandum referred to follows.

(Memorandum written with a pencil by Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER)

OPPOSITION TO ATLANTIC-GULF SHIP CANAL ACROSS FLORIDA

The Emergency Appropriation Act of 1935 gave the President full authority to select, initiate, and approve projects to be undertaken by the Government and to allot funds for prosecuting work thereon. The President was vested with complete discretion in the matter and \$4,800,000,000 was placed in his hands for the purpose of discharging that trust.

On August 30, 1935, the President issued an Executive order to the Secretary of the Treasury to set aside \$5,000,000 for the Atlantic-Gulf Ship Canal, describing it, generally, as the project which the Board of Review, composed of two Army engineers from the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, two Public Works Administration engineers (the chief and his assistant), and a chairman selected by the four, a distinguished engineer from New York, recommended to him.

Upon recommendation by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, the Director of the Budget approved and placed in the Budget an item of \$12,000,000 for prosecution of work on this canal during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937. This was approved by the President when he transmitted the War Department budget to Congress.

The appropriation bill, of course, had to originate in the House and these matters were reported there and were taken up by the subcommittee handling the War Department appropriation bill. There were five projects in like situation—all inaugurated by the President—work begun on them, funds allotted for them, and under construction—the five projects calling for a total appropriation of \$29,000,000. Opposition arose before the subcommittee by a Republican member who insisted that as these projects had never proceeded along the course of ordinary river and harbor projects and been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, reported to the House, referred to the committee, and received legislative action by Congress, it was not in order and would be irregular for Congress to make any appropriation for them.

It was a technical point which had back of it those who were criticizing the administration at every opportunity and who lost no chance to fasten on the President and the administration any charge that authority had been exceeded or abused and public funds wasted.

It was, I believe, a Republican move, a covert attack on the administration, which subsequent references herein will bear out. The effort was to have Congress emphasize and support the charges they were making by refusing this appropriation.

Disclaimers of any political purpose, of course, were made and the objection was shrewdly handled by appealing to Congress to pursue undiminished its prerogative and by asserting that the President had the funds and ought to go on with the projects with the money in hand and not ask Congress for specific appropriations in addition to what had been given him.

Their objection really reached back to the act of 1935—the vesting in the President of extensive authority and the power to dispose of a large sum. But, of course, the act of 1935 is the law. It is idle to combat its wisdom now. It passed the Senate by a vote of 66 to 13. It gave the President the authority to do precisely what he did. The opponents finally conceded that. Under the act the projects were authorized legally and were eligible to receive appropriations by Congress. They had not been adopted by legislative acts of Congress, specifically and directly, but Congress had authorized the President to adopt the projects.

The House subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, and the House itself adopted the view advanced by the Republican members and did not include any of these five projects in the appropriation bill.

When the bill came to the Senate I offered an amendment adding \$29,000,000 to take care of these projects as included in the Budget and recommended to Congress. The same objection was urged as had been raised in the House. With clearness and force and at considerable length a leading Republican argued repeatedly the protest and points against the amendment. The attack finally centered largely on the ship canal, opponents of the canal furnishing material and arguments in support of the attack.

I offered the amendment before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. It was defeated by one vote. In the meantime the Senators from Maine preferred that the Passamaquoddy project in their State be left out, and I modified the amendment so as to add \$20,000,000 to the bill, thus taking care of the four other projects—including \$12,000,000 for the canal. That was defeated by one vote. I then offered the amendment before the full committee, and there it was defeated by one vote.

The singular thing I call attention to is that every Republican member of the subcommittee and every Republican member of the full committee voted against this amendment. Some of such members had never attended a meeting of the subcommittee or of the full committee and heard nothing of the discussions and were in absolute ignorance of the merits of the proposal. However, they left their proxies with opponents of the amendment and were so voted. These Republican members were unanimous in their opposition to the amendment that would have carried out the Budget estimates and the recommendations of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers. Thus the amendment was defeated in the full committee.

I gave notice I would offer it in the Senate when the bill was considered there. I did so. It was impossible to interest Members of the Senate who apparently had made up their minds, without a clear understanding of what was involved and, not to my surprise, but in strict accordance with what I felt was going on and in line with the political purpose to make the fight on this appropriation as a policy that might serve to strengthen the attack on the administration, every Republican in the Senate except those noble, independent souls, JOHNSON and NORRIS, voted against the amendment.

Is it not remarkable that the Republican Party should be so united against this proposal to carry out the administration's recommendation? One must be decidedly naive and childlike not to recognize the political significance of their votes. Many of them did not follow the discussions—they voted as a party, speaking generally. A few individuals, no doubt, felt there was merit in the opposition—particularly influenced by propaganda, telegrams, and letters from the State voicing opposition to the canal. In some instances this local opposition had its influence, but, generally speaking, there was a set, determined, political line-up, for political purposes, against the canal.

Then the Senate itself did an amazing thing. After defeating my amendment, 39 to 34, on the claims set up in the House, that the projects did not have back of them regular, direct, legislative action, it proceeded to make appropriations for three of the projects—totaling \$8,000,000—which had been authorized in precisely

the same way as the canal had been. I, of course, voted for these. Senators realized that this action was not fair and that, while the canal was a much larger project, the principle involved was the same. Some who favored my amendment had not been present when it was voted on. One of the absentees made a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was lost and the vote on that motion was 35 for to 36 against. Again some of our friends could not, on account of illness, be present. If they had been, the motion would have carried. Again, every Republican Member, except Senators JOHNSON and NORRIS, voted against the motion to reconsider. They have carried their point and can now set up the action of Congress as enforcing this attack on the administration. Perhaps it was good politics, if that is what we are here for. It has advanced certain Republican ambitions and enhanced their prestige. The matter is not settled and will not be until it is settled right.

As to how the Senate treated the arguments that projects not adopted by legislative action should not receive appropriations by Congress, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1936, particularly pages 3034 to 3042. The Senate was then considering the bill making appropriations for the Interior Department. The same point was raised, the same contention advanced respecting a number of reclamation projects as argued respecting the canal project, but the Senate voted the appropriations and ratified and adopted the projects theretofore authorized by Public Works Administration and the President, and not by act of Congress. The precedent in the Senate is therefore to hold such contention unsound and not well taken.

These reclamation projects stood on the same footing as the canal. Appropriations were made for them in this bill on March 2, 1936. They first appeared before Congress in this appropriation bill. They involved millions of dollars. There is no merit in the technical point raised. Congress has the right and the power to make the appropriations.

There is a pretense of opposition to the canal on the ground that it is not economically justified. Broad assertions to that effect are made by laymen, who assume to know more than the most capable, scientific, experienced experts, engineers of the highest standing in this country. The Board of Review, composed of most capable and distinguished engineers, recommended this sea-level canal to the President, and, after studying the exhaustive economic survey of the Army Engineers, stated it to be commercially justified at a cost of \$160,000,000. The cost is placed at \$143,000,000, and this figure has been approved by the Chief of Engineers. Who has any right to say it will cost more? Its minimum direct benefits to commerce are placed at \$7,500,000 annually. As to its usefulness, is it not perfectly silly for any shipping concern to say that when a vessel would save 2 days' time on a round trip from New York to New Orleans by using the canal it will not do so?

Mr. SEARS. I have refrained from filling the RECORD with arguments for the canal, hoping I might convince my colleagues without putting the taxpayers to the expense that the printing of such arguments in the RECORD would entail.

I have mailed to my colleagues in the House, as those of you who are present perhaps know, all of the information up to date that has been available, including my brief remarks, the remarks of Senator FLETCHER, and the proceedings in the Senate. We want you to have before you all of the facts in reference to this canal.

EXTENT OF OPPPOSITION TO THE CANAL

I must confess that I am unable to understand the opposition to the canal, except that all major projects and advance movements, so far as I can recall, have always been strongly opposed.

I referred briefly to the Panama Canal during the course of my remarks on the floor of the House.

At another time, if I deem it necessary, I will refer further to that old fight against that canal, because to my mind it was a parallel fight to this one.

The President at that time, Theodore Roosevelt, constructed the Panama Canal without direct authority from Congress.

Throughout the country, in the daily press—I have no fight to make on the press of the country, because I learned early in life that you cannot fight the press—editorials have been and are being published against the canal, and articles have been written against it in the magazines. All of them that I have seen have been misleading and based evidently on misinformation.

I call attention to an article in Collier's Weekly of December 14, 1935, in which the writer undertook to make it appear that if we undertook to build the canal shotguns would be used, and that it would divide the State politically and make two States—north Florida and south Florida. I am satisfied

you will believe me when I say that there is nothing to that article when I tell you for the past 30 years there has been an effort to divide Florida. I have always been opposed to that effort, and I would not refer to it now except for that article, which evidently was sent to my colleagues for the sole purpose of creating an antagonistic feeling toward the canal.

Then I also call your attention to an article that appeared in the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of February 11, 1936. I will not read the article to you because it will simply clutter up the record. It is a rehash of the old argument and I will just read you this one paragraph:

Large groups within the State, possibly as much as three-quarters of the population, have expressed opposition to the project as useless or actually inimical to the interests of the State.

The Time and other magazines have carried semiadverse articles until it has led my colleagues on the floor to believe that we in Florida do not want the canal.

I have been asked why I supported something that so many people were opposed to. I will undertake to show you all the people of Florida are not opposed to the canal. Let me read you an editorial which was published in the Cocoa News of March 24, 1936. This paper is published in Brevard County, south of the canal. It says:

Every candidate for Congress for this, the Fifth District of Florida, favors the cross-State canal. So we can't hold that against any of them. But we can elect a man who is honest and will work for the fifth, and not himself, when he goes to Washington.

There are nine Democratic candidates in that Fifth District of Florida. That is a newly created district, and, while they are all men of the highest integrity, intellect, and character, yet, if 80 percent, or 60 percent, or even 51 percent of the people of that district are opposed to the canal, those men would be fools to run on a platform favoring the canal. I also understand in the election next November a Republican will run against the Democrat who receives the nomination and the main plank in his platform will be, "Build the canal."

RESULTS OF BONDING ELECTION IN THE CROSS-STATE CANAL DISTRICT

The last Legislature of Florida provided for a bonding election in what we call in Florida the "cross-State canal district", composed of the counties of Clay, Duval, Putnam, Marion, Citrus, and Levy, six counties, the amount of the bond issue being \$1,500,000. They did that because the administration told the delegation from Florida, at which meeting my colleague, Congressman CALDWELL, was present, with myself and the other members of the delegation, that before the administration would go on with the canal the people had to show their good faith by giving the right-of-way.

At that election only freeholders could vote. In other words, those qualified electors who had registered and paid their poll tax and who owned property could vote. It was out of the taxes that they paid that this million and a half dollars would be refunded. The vote was as follows:

In Clay County the vote was 473 for and 47 against.

In Duval County, which is my home county, the vote was 10,039 for and 329 against.

In Putnam County the vote was 1,720 for and 100 against.

In Marion County the vote was 2,115 for and 46 against.

In Citrus County the vote was 485 for and 37 against.

In Levy County the vote was 603 for and 31 against.

I am informed that 90 percent or more of the qualified freeholders participated in this election. Under our law in Florida a majority of the qualified freeholders must participate.

Freeholders are landowners, and not less than 50 percent of the freeholders must vote. So, even if you have a unanimous vote for the canal, if only 49 percent of the freeholders participated in the election, the election would be void. But to show our interest in and enthusiasm for this project, fully 90 percent of the freeholders voted, and the result was practically a unanimous vote for the bond issue.

May I call your attention to this salient fact: Duval County had just prior to that, or within a year or so, voted down two or more bond issues for local public improvements.

Practically all of the southern counties of Florida during the boom bonded themselves to where they had said they would never bond themselves again.

The afternoon before the election I happened to be in Jacksonville. I had taken no part in the campaign, except to express my interest in the canal. But they called me and insisted that I speak before them. I shall never forget that night, and I hope I shall never regret that night.

There must have been 15,000 people on Forsyth Street that night listening to the speakers.

I told them that the Florida delegation had assured the President the people of the district would give the right-of-way as demanded by him, and if they did not do so work on the canal would cease when the first allotment was exhausted. That if they placed a mortgage on their homes they need have no fear work on the canal would stop. Mr. Speaker, I did that then because I had faith both in the administration and my colleagues.

Perhaps I overspoke myself, but I do not think so, for I still have that faith and still believe the canal will be built.

I said also to those people, "there are thousands of you listening to me who have been hungry and who are hungry tonight, but who have refrained from going on the relief rolls because you did not want to add to the expense of the Government in taking care of the needy. If the bond issue carries, and I know it will, the battle will be won and you can then secure work on the canal."

I want to show you the map of that district. One of my colleagues the other day stated that a \$1,500,000 bond issue for Florida was just a drop in the bucket, and for me to forget it.

This is a map of Florida, which has 67 counties. I have drawn a line around here to show you the canal district, which includes, as I said before, Duvall, Clay, Putnam, Marion, Citrus, and Levy Counties. The canal starts at Mayport on the St. Johns River. One of the reasons why that was done was because there are 30 feet of water for about 20 miles from Mayport to Jacksonville. Then there is between 12 and 14 feet of water, I should say, in the river down to Palatka. Perhaps that is why they can build the canal for \$143,000,000. Then they use the Oklawaha River across to near Ocala, and come here [indicating on map]. Then there is no river, and they have about 55 miles where they will have to construct the entire canal. Then they go into the Willacoochee River, and into the Gulf at or near Yankeetown [indicating on map].

This little district marked in red [indicating on map] is the canal district of Florida on the property of which was placed this bond issue of a million five hundred thousand dollars. The district, as you see, is only an average of about 50 miles wide.

The congressional district I spoke about a while ago, the new Fifth District, takes in Marion, Sumter, Brevard, Osceola, Orange, Seminole, Flagler, Volusia, and St. Johns Counties. In other words, it is all this section of Florida [indicating on map]. Here is Miami, and the section running to Sarasota, where the main fight against the canal is coming from. There is no doubt, in my mind at least, about a large majority of the people of Florida being in favor of the canal, and that more than 45 counties of Florida are overwhelmingly for the canal. I am satisfied a majority are not opposed to the canal.

Let me remind you that in 1915 and following years I was up against the same fight and opposition when I advocated the deepening of the harbor of Miami to 15 feet, then to 20 feet, then to 25 feet, and then to 30 feet. On that project we had some opposition, not only in Florida but also in the press, but this is no news to you, for you know improvement of water transportation always has to overcome that opposition. At the very beginning they raised the question that it would ruin the fresh water of Florida by making the water salty. The people of the canal district had that before them when they voted for the bonds.

My home is within a quarter of a mile of the canal. The groves in Marion County are adjacent to the canal. The people of this district have the orange groves, and they are not alarmed about our waters being ruined or the salt-water proposition.

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO CANAL

While I will not question the motives of my friends who have been so loyal to me during my political life, yet it seems to me it is passing strange that from 365 miles south should come the cry that if you give us the canal, Florida will be made a desert, and our fresh water will all be made salty.

In December 1933, I received from the board of directors of the Florida Citrus Growers' Clearing House Association of Fort Myers a petition protesting against the canal. The first point of that petition was that such a canal would immediately open the door for a short-haul water movement from Texas of Texas grapefruit, under refrigeration, to the eastern markets, and intimating that we are endeavoring to build up Texas and hurt Florida. They also cite the fact that it will also hurt the waters of Florida.

At that time I was Congressman from the State at large, a position which I still hold. On January 8, 1934, I wrote those good people—and I will read you the letter—showing clearly that I did not fear any injury to the water of the State; that I thought the canal was economically sound, and that it would be for the benefit of all Florida.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1934.

MISS JANET ARMSTRONG,

Assistant Secretary, Florida Citrus Growers'

Clearing House Association, Winter Haven, Fla.

MY DEAR MISS ARMSTRONG: Further reference is made to your letter of December 30.

It is almost impossible to keep up with my mail. On January 8 I wrote you, and in our haste in getting out yours and about 100 other letters written during the day, my secretary overlooked a page of my dictation to you.

I am writing you again because my letter of January 8 as mailed to you might cause you to reach the conclusion I was evasive. We have just located the notes which were overlooked, and I have asked that they be incorporated in this letter.

Paragraph 5 of the minutes of the director's meeting of December reads as follows:

No. 5: "The construction of such a canal would for a period of years probably make much more difficult the problem of retaining reliable agricultural labor for work on the groves and farms."

I have always contended—and this is without criticism of any work going on in Florida or in any of the other States—that work done on worth-while permanent projects will be money well spent and not wasted; and the laborers on the canal, if properly supervised, will only take away all surplus labor and will not interfere with groves.

No. 7: "The cost of bridges across said canal to the State of Florida and to the various counties which would be affected would be enormous."

Of course, you know the bridges will be paid for by the Government and will not cost the State or counties anything.

No. 8: "The effect upon the subterranean water sources and springs of the State would probably be most injurious and destructive."

I have conferred with many of the best engineering minds of the country, who have made soundings and a complete survey, and they assure me that the water sources would not be injured in the least.

For about 10 years we worked hard to secure the East Coast Canal, and probably the same objections were raised, and due to a division of sentiment and opposition the fight was prolonged and the securing of the East Coast Canal was delayed; but we finally got everybody together, and I am satisfied now that everyone familiar with the East Coast Canal is perfectly satisfied.

For the above reasons and reasons stated in my former letter I have urged the cross-State canal at whatever point determined upon by the engineers in the strongest terms possible, because I felt it would in the long run materially benefit the entire State of Florida.

Many evade questions, and, while this is an election year and there is a tendency to evade, during all of my public life, which has run over a period of the past 20 or more years, many have differed with me, but I have retained their friendship because of my frankness.

I sincerely trust that my letter will not be misunderstood, and I feel satisfied after a careful research you will agree with me.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. SEARS.

That letter clearly shows my attitude; that I am not a recent convert; I am not a demagogue; and that I am not shaping my course for political effect.

It might also be interesting at this point to remind you that just prior thereto I received from Fort Myers a resolution asking me to work for a cross-State canal from Fort Myers to Lake Okeechobee, coming out to the ocean at Fort Pierce.

I have before me request for the cross-State ship canal, dated July 27, 1933, Fort Myers, Fla., in part as follows:

As the result of my personal investigation I am convinced that a cross-State ship canal is feasible, possible, and probable.

As to a definite route, the northern route (Mayport-Jacksonville-Yankeetown) was finally decided upon for a complete report after consideration of seven other possible northern routes.

We are definitely in favor of such a ship canal to join the Atlantic with the Gulf, and we are willing to heartily support such a project for the benefit of the whole State of Florida; but we are not willing to support this particular route unless it is clearly demonstrated that this is the best and most economical route that can be established. We do not believe this to be the case. In every report on this subject since the Civil War the definite route recommended has been the Okeechobee-Caloosahatchee, or southern route.

I have here a map which shows that most of the opposition to the cross-State canal outside of Florida has come from the Atlantic coast and from that section of the country where there are no rivers and harbors.

THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE CANAL PROJECT

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I say—and I hope my remarks will not be misunderstood—during the years I have been in Congress I have supported all measures from a national viewpoint. I will not question the motives of those who are now opposing me, but I have gone through many of these fights. I went through the Cape Cod Canal fight, and I am sometimes wondering why it is that some of my colleagues who are now bitterly fighting me were so anxious and willing to accept support in the Cape Cod fight.

I have never in my life indulged in any criticism of my colleagues. I have never reflected upon any of my colleagues since I have been in Congress, but I am giving you the facts. There was then no hue and cry raised about the waste of money. The same fight was put up against the Cape Cod Canal, but in that case Congress appropriated \$27,000,000 for the completion of 13½ miles of canal and \$11,730,000 for the old canal and outstanding bonds.

Whether that was done wisely or unwisely, it was done, and at the same rate of expenditure per mile you could spend six or seven hundred million dollars on the Florida cross-State canal, and it would not cost any more in proportion to the mileage than the Cape Cod Canal cost. I have voted for the Great Lakes improvements. As a matter of fact, we have not asked very much for Florida improvements. Florida has contributed dollar for dollar to meet the appropriations that the Government has made for our harbors, beginning with Miami Harbor. I recall that shortly after I came to Congress Miami spent more than the Government spent on improvements; I know that West Palm Beach built their own harbor without cost to the Government, and I know that Fort Pierce provided its harbor, and Port Everglades did not cost the Government a penny. Now, I voted for the Hell Gate improvements, and for the Albany improvements; yet, like a voice out of the wilderness, there comes a cry from a statesman, who is able, capable, and forceful, at one end of the legislative branch of the Government, and at the other end of the legislative branch of the Government we hear the echo of his colleague from Michigan trying to save 80 percent of my friends in Florida from their madness by stopping the construction of the Florida cross-State canal.

Of course, that is their privilege, but I differ with them, and I do have a right to make against any propaganda which is misleading and which is not correct, or information which was given to them by someone with a motive to deceive them. I hope that I shall never be led into the same sort of attack on projects in the districts of my colleagues. Of course, my colleagues from New York, my colleague from Michigan, and my colleagues from the other States, have the right to save the people of Florida from their madness if they please to do so, but I appeal to them to base the fight on facts and not error. I do not want to make the canal political at all. I have never seen a political issue on improvements raised until during the last 2 years. This should not be a political issue, but, unfortunately, it has become a political issue. I have only to remind you of the vote in the Senate committee to show that. The vote against reporting

it favorably was 12, 8 Republicans and 4 Democrats, while the vote for reporting it favorably, or for voting it out, was 11, and they were all Democrats. What I am unable to understand is the Florida papers coming out quoting leading Republicans of my State to the effect that the Florida cross-State canal will be plank no. 1 in the State platform this fall, and that if the Democrats will not put it through Congress during this session of Congress, the Republicans will complete it.

Now, may I ask my good Republican friends and my Democratic friends to read the new work-relief comments of the American Liberty League, in which they are commanding my colleagues in Congress for slapping the President in the face. I am just wondering if it was because Florida, against my appeals, and possibly, I might say, against the appeal of the candidate from New York, walked out in 1928? Do they think it is a good time to take a walk now? I am wondering why they suddenly became so interested in Florida? Surely you would not suspect the Liberty League of only wanting to embarrass our President. Dense indeed must be the man who does not know the answer.

Now, on yesterday, another Pennsylvania man, a Republican, a man "rich" in thought and service, took a slap at the canal, and said that the President was to be congratulated on his statement saying that if the work was continued, it would have to come from Congress. Knowing my colleague, I am satisfied after he gets all the facts he will not oppose the canal.

Now, there is no use in arguing with you the technical points, because it has been held that this project is in order. The Senate did that by vote. The President authorized it, and Congress can continue it.

Mr. Speaker, we come to this point: I have listened to criticisms of the administration because he was spending money on boondoggling propositions. They call our cross-State canal a boondoggling proposition, and one paper recently said this, in spite of the facts that were put before him, the President went ahead on this canal and foolishly wasted \$5,000,000, and then got tired of it and threw it back to Congress. Franklin D. Roosevelt can speak for himself better than any Member of Congress can speak for him, but I tell you no man ever gave more serious thought and study to a project than he gave to the canal. For more than 2 years he considered and studied it and he only gave his endorsement and made the first allotment after every angle had been carefully looked into by our able, capable, and forceful Chief of Army Engineers, General Markham, but also by boards of outstanding engineers and geologists nationally known, and their endorsement and approval had been given. I regret to make the statement but with some facts are immaterial, and so far as the President is concerned, he is damned if he does and he is damned if he does not. Fortunately for the country he is a man of courage and vision and the harpings and biting criticisms do not worry him.

REPORT OF THE ENGINEERING BOARD RE FLORIDA CANAL

Now, who was on that Board that made the favorable report? The first is Edward B. Burwell, mining engineer and geologist, and this is his record:

Born Lancaster, Va., December 17, 1894; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1913-17, B. S.; assistant in geology, Virginia Polytechnic, 1916-17; first lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army, 1917-19; mining engineer and chief engineer, Low Moore Iron Co., Virginia, 1919-25; associated with Weld & Liddell, construction engineers, 1925-26; chief geologist, Missouri-Kansas Zinc Corporation, 1926-27; in charge of explorations, Central American Mines, Inc., 1927-29; assistant manager, Missouri-Kansas Zinc Corporation, 1929-31; geologist, United States Engineer Department, 1931 to date.

The next is Sidney Paige, geologist, and here is his record:

Born Washington, D. C., November 2, 1880; educated University of Michigan; Yale Graduate School; engineer with Nicaragua Canal Commission, 1898-1900; United States Geological Survey, 1903-26; geologist, Panama Canal Commission, 1907; construction geologist, 1926 to date; author of numerous articles on geology.

The next is Malcolm Pirney, construction civil engineer, and here is his record:

Born New York City; educated Harvard College; Harvard University Graduate School of Applied Science; assistant engineer with

Hazen & Whipple, 1911-16; member of firm Hazen, Whipple & Fuller, later Hazen, Everett & Pirney, 1916-29; private practice, 1929 to date; sanitary engineer, American Red Cross Commission, Russia, 1917; captain, Transportation Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, 1918-19; designed water-purification works, Providence, R. I., West Palm Beach, Stewart, St. Petersburg, Fla., and many other cities.

The next is Brehon Somervell, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, and I will give you his record, as follows:

Born Little Rock, Ark., May 9, 1892; graduated United States Military Academy, June 12, 1914, and promoted second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers; graduate Army Engineer School; Command and General Staff School; honor graduate Army War College; served in grades from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel; returned to major, Engineers; after war with troops on surveys, New England, Texas; road building with punitive expedition in Mexico; charge of construction at Mehun, Is-sur-Tille and elsewhere in France; assistant chief of staff, G-1, G-3, Eighty-ninth Division, and Army of Occupation, Germany; assistant and district engineer, New York City, Washington, Norfolk, New Orleans; assistant to president, Mississippi River Commission; assistant to Walker D. Hines on survey navigation conditions Rhine and Danube Rivers for League of Nations; special adviser, General Economic Survey, Government of Turkey; temporary duty National Emergency Council; district engineer, Ocala, Fla., September 6, 1935; awarded Distinguished Service Medal and Distinguished Service Cross.

I might say, with reference to Colonel Somervell, he was directly connected with the construction of the Panama Canal, and I doubt if there is an engineer in the country who is more capable, better qualified, or more competent than the geologists and engineers who reported on this matter.

The Army engineers made their survey, and the amount submitted by them was too large. Then the Public Works engineers made an independent survey, and their estimate was too low. They were all competent engineers.

The general width of the canal is 200 to 400 feet. It will be 30 feet below sea level. It would have a depth, in cut, roughly speaking, on an average of 40 feet. There is a section of about 56 miles that will be, perhaps, 90 feet deep in some places, because that is where it crosses the ridge of Florida.

As to effect on water of Florida General Markham states in a letter to me as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 10, 1935.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: The National Emergency Council has furnished this Department copies of your letter of June 29 to the President and its enclosure, letter of Hon. S. H. Christian, of Ocala, Fla., of June 28, relative to the proposed cross-Florida canal.

A special board of review appointed by the President, consisting of two officers of the Corps of Engineers, two engineers of the Administration of Public Works, and a consulting engineer of New York City, concluded that a sea-level canal was more advantageous than a lock canal; and after securing the advice of ground-water experts having a knowledge of the geological and artesian-water supply of Florida, found that the possible damage to agriculture from such a canal would be negligible and limited to a narrow strip adjacent to the canal and that the damage to water supply would be small, consisting only of lowering the levels of nearby wells.

These reports are now being reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors precedent to the submission of the reports to Congress with the recommendations of the Department.

Very truly yours,

E. M. MARKHAM,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

USE OF RELIEF WORKERS ON THE CANAL

There are now 6,000 people employed on the canal, 90 percent of whom were taken from the relief rolls. They allowed contractors 10 percent not on relief rolls, because the contractors had to take with them certain men who had been with them for years. The men are doing real work, and you are getting dollar for dollar for the work. If \$12,000,000 is appropriated, the result will be that 10,000 more people in Florida will come off the relief rolls and begin digging the canal.

Now, when the President made his estimate to this committee, Mr. Speaker, he asked for \$1,500,000,000, and he asked for \$12,000,000 in addition thereto for the Florida cross-State canal. Therefore these 6,000 men already put to work and the 10,000 to whom work will be given were not taken into consideration, and the bill should be increased by an amount sufficient to take care of those people if the appropriation for the canal is not secured. I do not know of any way of

absorbing those people in any other employment. Frankly, I have urged the canal not only from an economic standpoint and as something worth while—a great national project—but from the relief standpoint. It will be a project that will stand as a monument to the President and to Congress when this canal shall have been completed.

Now, I cannot speak for the members of the committee or for my colleagues, but I can say that some of my colleagues have told me on the floor of the House and over in the Office Building that it was just a matter of difference of opinion. They felt that the President should go on with the canal without asking Congress anything about it. The President thought he should ask Congress' endorsement before going too far with it. Personally, it is immaterial to me which way you proceed so long as we get the canal.

ADVANTAGES TO SHIPPING AND BUSINESS THROUGH USE OF CANAL

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let us consider some of the opposition to the canal. First, I will call your attention to this phase of it: It has been stated, and I think it can be proven, that the mail-contract rates will be materially reduced if the canal is completed. For the boats carrying the mail, the canal will take off about 400 miles of the distance. That much will be cut off the distance by going through the canal; and as you know, they are paid by the mile. Of course, that may be a selfish way to look at it; and if I were a mail contractor, receiving several hundred thousand dollars a year for carrying the mail, and there was a chance of cutting off \$75,000, or more, because of the construction of the canal, no doubt I would oppose it.

The contract that the Government has with them, I think, provides that they shall carry the mail by the shortest route that can be traveled.

Second, I should like to call your attention to this map. Perhaps you have heard about this before. This [indicating] is called the Yucatan Channel, the graveyard of ships. This is leading into the Gulf and down into the Caribbean Sea. The canal, you will see, comes through here [indicating] from Yankeetown across to Jacksonville. Now, the canal is 373 miles nearer to the Gulf on the western side through the canal on to Galveston and other Texas points. From points on the east coast of Florida to Galveston, Savannah, Charles, and northern ports, New Orleans, Mobile, Pensacola, and other points, the distance is 300 to 400 miles shorter by going through the canal instead of around the coast of Florida.

Now, they tell you that the boats will not use it; but the same argument was used against the Suez Canal, and it was used against the Panama Canal. I want to be perfectly fair with you. It may be argued that the Merchants & Miners Line, the Clyde Line, the Occidental, and all the lines of ships from New York City around to Gulf ports, will come around through the Yucatan Channel, by way of Key West, and may refuse to use the canal.

Let me give you the statement of Colonel Youngbird [reading]:

SAVINGS IN DISTANCE, TIME, AND MONEY

Having determined the cargo tonnage to benefit by the proposed waterway, and knowing the characteristics of the various vessels and the number of voyages, the data must be translated into terms of distance, time, and money, and to contrast these factors via the existing shipping lanes and those that would result from the construction of the waterway. Distances east-bound are not the same as distances west-bound for the reason that ships follow different lanes. There are corresponding variations in time or duration of voyages, determined not merely by the mileage but by the effect of helpful or contrary currents and winds. The operating costs of vessels vary according to their characteristics and their management. The studies have taken all these variations into account, and for purposes of illustration they are indicated as follows:

On an outbound voyage from New Orleans to New York the canal would save 398 nautical miles, but on the inbound voyage it would save but 385 miles. For a vessel of 8 knots in the open ocean and 6½ knots in transiting the canal a saving of 4 days would be effected, but for a 10-knot vessel the saving would be cut to 3 days for the round trip. Correspondingly, between New Orleans and northern Europe, the savings outbound would be 371 nautical miles and inbound would be 335 miles, and the round-trip savings in point of time would be 3 days for a vessel of a normal speed of 8 knots and 2½ days for a vessel of a speed of 10 knots.

WILL THE BOATS USE IT?

If I had a boat line from New York to Jacksonville and on to Gulf points, and if I should refuse to use the canal, then

if somebody else with a boat line from New York to Gulf points made use of the canal and saved 2½ days per trip I would have to use the canal to meet that competition or go out of business. There is no line that will not use the shortest route between two points. There is no doubt whatever in my mind about shipping lines using the canal.

From Jacksonville to where it turns off I will say that, except for a few places, I doubt if the banks of the river are over 3 or 4 feet above the water. It will be a sea-level canal.

The canal will be 200 miles. Twenty-five miles of that distance is the route going out into the Gulf. It will be wider there, so vessels will have no trouble in getting into the canal. As a matter of fact, the canal proper will be only 175 miles long.

I will repeat what one of my colleagues told me the other day: He said he was surprised that I was supporting the canal. He said, "Do you not realize you are putting Florida out of business and making Texas?" I laughed and said, "I found some opposition in the Texas delegation, and it might be well to whisper that to them." I said to him, "Let me be frank with you; Texas is four or five hundred miles from Florida; they use American machinery, American labor, and they use American fertilizer. If they can haul their products and produce 400 or 500 miles farther on the same boat, as it has to pass by my farm or grove—if they can do that and put me out of business, I should be put out of business." That is the way I feel about it. I do not think there is anything to it. I do not think there are too many oranges and vegetables produced in the country or enough to glut the market. It is simply a question of distribution.

I have a letter from a leading citizen of Miami in which he said—and now you are getting the facts as to much of the opposition—"If the canal was built, it would divert the tourists from Miami." Another constituent wrote me that it would change Jacksonville to a flag station and that Palatka, 50 miles in the interior, would become the metropolis of Florida.

My colleagues, you should visit our State and learn of the possibilities. It will help to bring about a reduction in freight rates, which will give our people a chance to get our fruit and produce to market. We must have a reduction in freight rates in order that we may be able to get our fruit and vegetables to market after the price goes down. This is now a total loss. At the same time, we believe it will not hurt the railroads, because they will get the same amount of transportation, and perhaps more.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that the Florida Legislature in 1933 adopted a resolution asking Congress to build this canal. You will find that resolution in the General Laws of Florida, 1933, volume 1, page 877. You will find that the Senate and House of the Legislature of Florida unanimously passed that resolution, which was approved by the Governor on May 27, 1933. I want to put that resolution in the record, in addition to what I have already said about the opposition being a made opposition.

Said resolution is as follows:

Senate committee substitute for House Concurrent Resolution No. 11

JOINT MEMORIAL OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

A memorial to the President of the United States requesting the assistance and cooperation of every available Federal agency in order to make possible, at an early date, commencement of construction work on a ship canal across the peninsula of the State of Florida.

Whereas the construction of a ship canal across the State of Florida will give employment to a vast amount of human labor, thus greatly relieving the distress due to the unemployment crisis; at the same time creating a valuable commercial and military asset which will, in the course of time, repay its own cost through the collection of reasonable tolls from ships using the canal; and

Whereas the Constitution of the State of Florida contemplates with favor the construction of such a canal across the State and makes provision for and authorizes special legislation in order to facilitate such construction; and the legislature of the State has now created a public corporation known as the Florida Ship Canal Authority and has granted to said corporation a franchise with full power and authority to construct said canal; and

Whereas such a canal will cut off approximately 500 miles of distance by the water route between New Orleans and the Gulf ports,

on the one hand, and New York and Liverpool, on the other, will eliminate the danger to shipping incident to passage through the Florida Straits, will bring about tremendous savings by reason of the resultant reduction in time, insurance, and other transportation costs, and will constitute a valuable asset to our national defense; and

Whereas such a canal will largely solve the distribution problems of the Mississippi Valley and of the southeast section of the United States; will greatly aid the agricultural and industrial activities in said section by furnishing them perpetual and cheap transportation to the Atlantic seaboard, where the best markets are located; will enhance the value of the farm lands through the producing of means for delivering their produce to market, and will offer material advantages and benefits to fully one-half of the producing area of the United States; and

Whereas said ship canal, while rendering this valuable service to labor, industry, agriculture, and ocean shipping, will at the same time, and without additional cost, provide a connection between the Atlantic coastal waterway and the Gulf coastal waterway for barges and small craft plying between Boston, Mass., and Gulf of Mexico ports; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the Army of the United States, pursuant to authorization of Congress, is now completing an exhaustive physical survey of various possible routes for such a canal, and of the costs of the construction thereof; and

Whereas an application is now pending with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the United States for a loan of sufficient funds with which to construct said canal, such loan to be self-liquidating in character: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the house of representatives concurring). That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully urged to approve of said construction project as an effective measure in relieving unemployment and stimulating industry, and that he be, and he is hereby, further requested to procure the assistance and cooperation of every appropriate and available Federal agency in order that construction work upon said project may be commenced at the earliest possible date; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to furnish a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the United States, and to the Associated Press.

Approved May 27, 1933.

Mr. Marvin H. Walker, of Tampa, has been very active down there in connection with the canal. He complained that they were covering up the reports and were keeping them secret. I at once called upon the United States engineers and asked them about it, and they told me that Mr. Walker came up here; that they furnished a stenographer and engineer to go through the report with him. They said that he made all the notes he wanted and went over it carefully. In reply to his letter, I wrote Mr. Walker in part as follows:

Your letter was called to my attention today upon my return to the city from an inspection tour with the Naval Affairs Committee of the naval bases on the west coast.

In reply thereto, will state I understand either you or another Mr. Walker looked over the report at the Army engineers' office and had access to all available information. Of course, as I see it, after one man reads a report, the charge of secrecy is not well founded. This is not critical, but in order that we may understand just what the facts are. Personally, I know of no delay in furnishing the facts to the people of the State, and I assure you there has been no effort on my part to conceal any of the facts.

Now, this matter is a vital one to us. In fact, for the next 30 years we will have to pay on those bonds we voted. It means so much to the people of the canal district and of my State that I hope Congress will see its way clear to adopt the project. I do not want to be misunderstood about it, but the Senate adopted three projects that were on all fours with the Florida canal.

It does not make any difference whether it is a thin dime or a \$20 gold piece when it comes to a question of policy. They also passed several items, involving millions of dollars for irrigation. They were exactly on all-fours, with the cross-State canal in Florida, and they involve large sums of money. I just want the members of the committee and my colleagues in the House to understand that I feel as you would feel if you were fighting for something in your own State. I feel that I can speak for my people, having been elected as a Member at Large from the State, and then reelected as Congressman at Large without opposition.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, so we may know just what type of project this is and just what the situation with reference to it is, I shall read from the War Department appropria-

tion subcommittee hearings on nonmilitary projects. I read from page 42 of the hearings a portion of the testimony of General Pillsbury, Assistant Chief of Engineers:

Mr. POWERS. General Pillsbury, just to clear up something in my own mind, will you tell me this about the Florida ship canal: Was that approved by the same type of board that the Passamaquoddy project was approved by?

General PILLSBURY. No; to the best of my recollection, that was not recommended by any board. The report is now before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; and, upon the request of Members of Congress from Florida, the Board has adjourned the hearing on the proposition until interested parties should have a further opportunity to assemble data in support of it.

Mr. POWERS. Do I understand, then, that the Florida ship canal has never been approved by any board of the Army engineers or anyone else?

General PILLSBURY. I do not recollect any.

Captain CLAY. There was a special board, and they did point out that, although it lacked complete economic justification, with a part of its cost charged to relief, it would be suitable as a relief project.

Gentlemen, are you going to authorize the appropriation of \$150,000,000 and appropriate immediately \$10,000,000 for a project which has not, in the words of the engineers of the United States Army, economic justification? Let me say to you that what study I have made of it indicates that it will not be of any economic advantage for any ship having a speed of upward of 12 knots. Let me say to you further that the people in Florida, the orange-grove people, the farmers, the truck farmers, and all that class of people are in desperate fear that if this proposition goes through their soil will be destroyed. Chambers of commerce from all over the southern part of Florida have sent communications here. The farmers have been here opposing it, and I do not believe it has any justification whatever. I do not believe we should vote for any project for any other reason than that it can be justified on economic grounds. There is absolutely no reason why we should go ahead with this proposition. The only support of it is a local political support. An eminent geologist from Columbia University, Dr. Henry S. Sharp, has stated that all of the geologists unite in predicting that the canal will cause damage to the water supply. The United States Geological Survey itself has said, to summarize: There appears to be no reasonable doubt that serious adverse effects will be produced upon the important underground water supplies of the Ocala limestone territory.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will vote down this proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with some diffidence I enter upon the discussion of so contentious a subject, particularly after the reference of my colleague the gentleman from New York, who intimates that all of the opposition to this subject has come from this side of the aisle. So it is a pleasure to stand up as perhaps a lone voice to suggest that at least the issue should be clarified.

From the discussions of my colleague from New York on this side I should understand that the Congress and this House was about to determine whether or not any money should be allowed to be expended upon the Florida canal. If my reading of the legislation we are considering is correct, such is very far from being the case. If I am incorrect, I shall be glad to be corrected.

It is my understanding that if the amendment we are now considering is stricken out there will be nothing in this legislation to prevent in any way the President from going forward with the completion of this canal if he should determine that to be desirable. It seems rather like Alice in Wonderland that so much heat should be generated on a subject about which so much confusion now exists. The Senate amendment simply provides that the President shall carry on none of these projects unless he shall make available funds sufficient to complete them. While it is very uncertain he will do that, still the authority remains.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. TABER. That applies, not to this project but to other projects where the P. W. A. makes the allotments.

Mr. BREWSTER. I disagree with the interpretation of the gentleman, but I do not think time will permit a complete general understanding; each Member will be obliged to determine the matter for himself. The language of the amendment seems to be very clear:

No Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds provided for in this appropriation unless and until an amount sufficient for its completion has been allocated and irrevocably set aside for its completion.

The Passamaquoddy project was also being considered in connection herewith. I think it is well that the situation should be understood in order that there may be no misinterpretation of the effect of our action. The purpose of this amendment requested by the Administration is simply that if a competent and impartial board should determine that the things claimed regarding this project are correct the President may then go forward not with the allocation of the \$14,000,000 which may be needed to complete it, but with the allocation of \$10,000,000. The only thing here proposed is that if the President should determine that the use of \$10,000,000 for Florida "crackers" to dig sand is more useful in affording relief labor than to permit them to learn eurythmic dancing, or to build dog pounds, or to teach bridge, then the President might so proceed.

From my knowledge of Florida, I think it is infinitely more preferable, and I would be glad if any member of this Committee will advise whether not only every one of those proposals but every one of the boondoggling experiments about which we have heard so much, are not authorized within the legislation now being enacted? The only think we forbid is that you shall not dig sand in Florida for the purposes of a canal. You may dig sand anywhere for any other purpose.

As far as Passamaquoddy is concerned, I do not understand there is anything in this legislation to prevent the President from continuing the Passamaquoddy project if he shall simply determine to allocate not the \$9,000,000 contemplated by the amendment, but the \$29,000,000 necessary to complete it. I have every confidence that within a month after this Congress adjourns the President, in his journey up the coast of Maine and surveying the relief needs of our State, will determine such an expenditure is amply authorized and required.

Why this terrific excitement about Passamaquoddy and the Florida canal and why so little fuss about all the boondoggling extravagances which Maine has thus far been so happily spared.

Under this bill as now enacted by the Congress the President has full power and ample funds to allocate \$29,000,000 to complete Passamaquoddy.

This I feel confident he will do.

As a matter of fact, the construction of the project has now reached a stage where orderly and economical procedure requires a complete allocation. Within the next 6 months all major contracts can then be awarded and the completion far advanced.

To continue piecemeal allocation by 6-month periods would greatly handicap the engineers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CALDWELL].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Florida canal does not traverse any portion of the district which I represent; and, while the people of my district are greatly interested in this project, I trust that I can bring to its discussion a point of view sufficiently detached to commend my observations to your attention. When all is said and done, the canal is not a district project; it is not a Florida project; but is a national undertaking of which the State of Florida happens to be the focus. Therefore, I deem it necessary, in order that we obtain a comprehensive view which will enable us to fairly and intelligently act upon this matter, that it be discussed in its relations, not only to the State of Florida but to the country as a whole.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONNERY. I should like to ask the gentleman to clear up two things. I should like to vote for this legislation for the benefit of the people of Florida, but there are two things I should like to have cleared up. First of all, I am told that about two-thirds of the shipping that will go through the canal will be of the big oil companies. I am informed, second, that the water supply of the people of Florida will be affected by this ship canal. Will the gentleman clear up those two things?

Mr. CALDWELL. If the gentleman will be patient with me, I am going to cover that very briefly.

The fundamental purpose of the canal is to bring closer together the Mississippi Valley and Gulf States and the Atlantic seaboard by effecting economies in transportation and greater freedom from the hazards which attend navigation at certain seasons on the long route through the Straits of Florida. It thus affects directly the agriculture, industry, and commerce of at least 37 States of the Union, and indirectly it affects them all, including the States of the Pacific coast. It is probably the greatest river and harbor project ever undertaken by the Federal Government, not excepting the Panama Canal. While the Panama Canal possesses greater strategic importance and was far more expensive to construct, the existing available tonnage which the Army engineers and other authorities state will transit the Florida Canal is nearly one and one-half times as great as the traffic which passes through the Panama Canal.

This project began, as other river and harbor projects, in the orderly course of procedure laid down by Congress and nothing is more certain than that it will continue to be subject to this procedure in the future. However, due to conditions arising out of the emergency and the legislation which Congress has enacted to meet that emergency, this project has temporarily become a vehicle for work relief which has been selected by the President, upon the advice of the appropriate departments, for that purpose. So that we are not now dealing with this river and harbor project out of turn, as it were. It has been and will continue to be in the future subject to process through the Corps of Engineers, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Congress itself. But for the moment we are called upon to answer the question propounded by the President: "Shall the work which has been initiated and the funds which have been expended on this canal, pursuant to the act of Congress empowering the President to initiate it, be wasted and the project, regardless of all other considerations, rejected as a means for furnishing work relief? Or shall Congress authorize the President, first, to cause further examination to be made with a view to answering certain questions raised by those who have doubts as to its appropriateness, and, subject to the results of that further examination, to authorize the use of the project to supply work relief by expending upon it a certain portion of funds appropriated in this bill for work relief—funds which will certainly have to be employed for work relief on some project or projects to be selected by the President?" I desire to make it very clear that this amendment does not require that the Congress accept the proposition that the worth and appropriateness of the project are demonstrated, nor does it mean that the Congress does not reserve to itself a decision as to whether the project shall be completed or at what rate the work shall go on in the future. A vote for concurrence in this amendment is nothing more or less than a vote to empower the President to study the project further and, if he finds it appropriate, to use it to a limited extent and for a limited time as an element of the work-relief program. I feel, therefore, that all of us, whether we be already convinced that the canal has been demonstrated to be a needful and worth-while river and harbor project or whether we doubt that the case for the project has been proven, can go at least this far in assisting the President in

his endeavor to proceed with wisdom and caution in the matter.

I realize, nevertheless, that aside from the fact that the President and the departments which advised him were undoubtedly entirely satisfied with the full justification of the canal as a river and harbor project before it was selected as a part of the work-relief program, it is desirable from the point of view of Congress that there should be sufficient presumptive evidence before us to warrant us in concurring in this amendment. It is for this reason, and not with a view to asking the opponents of this measure to accept the conclusions as proven, that I should like to present a brief résumé of that evidence.

First, pursuant to the provisions of the regular river and harbor acts of Congress, the project has been subjected to more than 6 years of intensive examination, physical survey, and study by the Corps of Engineers. The report of the Chief of Engineers will reach the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in due course. The recommendations of the Chief of Engineers to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have yet to be made, and therefore no one can say what these will be. Because of the emergency, however, and by virtue of authority delegated to him by Congress, the President caused the evidence and data developed by the Corps of Engineers to be made available to himself and to other appropriate departments of the Government before this evidence and data could, in the ordinary course of procedure, reach the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Congress therefore without the benefit of advice and recommendation which it will eventually have from that committee when it has acted upon the project; and not until then is it to be supposed that Congress will determine what, if any, regular appropriations to this project shall be made. In the meantime, because of the necessities arising out of the emergency, it appears entirely reasonable that Congress, like the President and the departments, should avail themselves of that evidence to assist as a guide for temporary procedure. While it is contrary to the policy of the Chief of Engineers to publish the findings of boards of survey before they are submitted to Congress, and for that reason we have not available the details in this case, the action of the President in causing the survey of the Corps of Engineers to be reviewed by a special board of Army engineers and Public Works engineers, and the findings of that board have made known the outstanding data collected by the Army engineers on this project. These are, I think, entirely sufficient to enable us to conclude that a *prima-facie* case has been made for the project. The Board of Review went much further than this and found the case to be complete and proven and the project justified, and so reported to the President.

It is unnecessary to go into details as to the findings of the Army engineers. I think it is sufficient to say that they found as follows:

First. That the canal along the route selected is feasible and practicable.

Second. That a sea-level canal along this route would have no serious adverse effect upon the underground water supply of Florida.

Third. That the existing available traffic which can be reasonably expected to actually use the canal is upward of 11,000 ships per year.

Fourth. That the canal will so shorten time and distance between the ports of the Atlantic seaboard and the ports of the Gulf of Mexico as to effect a direct saving to shipping of more than \$8,000,000 per year.

Fifth. That the cost of the canal will not exceed \$142,700,000, exclusive of land for right-of-way, which has been furnished by the State of Florida.

Now, these are fairly simple facts and figures, and I think we are at liberty to use them as a guide, at least for temporary procedure. I am satisfied we are warranted in accepting them when we consider the source from which they originate.

Even a casual inspection of the relation of the cost of this project to its direct benefits will show that it is apparently not only justified, but justified to an unusual degree. There

are few river and harbor projects which can show so high a ratio of benefit to cost. And it should be borne in mind that the benefits set forth above do not include the benefits accruing to commerce in general by virtue of lowered freight rates, stimulation of trade, freedom from hazards, and so forth. If these general but nevertheless real benefits are added, the project stands as probably the most amply justified of its kind.

I think these figures of the Army engineers are entirely sufficient, but we are not lacking in corroborating evidence. The Public Works Administration, through its engineering department, made an independent examination of this project and found somewhat higher benefits and somewhat lower cost.

I therefore call to your attention the undeniable fact that we have here ample warrant for concluding that the presumptive evidence in favor of this project is entirely sufficient as a basis for the action we are considering at this time. I now invite your attention to the opposition to this project. I feel that no description would be sufficiently frank and complete without careful scrutiny of the claims which have been made by those who oppose the project. I repeat that this is not the appropriate time to reach a final decision in this matter, for the very essence of the pending amendment is further examination before final decision; but I think it will be helpful if we consider the more outstanding phases of the opposition at this time. There are those both within and without the State of Florida who oppose the canal. With the exception of certain interests, whose opposition I am satisfied is inspired by a desire to prevent the economies which the canal would bring into being, I believe this opposition to be honest and sincere. But, no matter how honest and sincere it may be, it must first be shown that it is inspired by motives which can be taken into account by Congress in judging the matter affecting the welfare of the general public. A certain city may be jealous of the advancement of another city and therefore be honestly opposed to the project, but such supposition cannot properly be considered here. A certain section of the State may fear that, no matter how much the country at large may profit, it will not proportionately profit by the project. While such opposition may well be considered, it must be carefully weighed against the general welfare. A number of people may fear that the cutting of the canal would endanger their interests because it may adversely affect their water supply. Such opposition is worthy of most serious consideration; but when all is said and done, neither the proponents nor the opponents in such cases can be permitted to be the final judges. In matters of this kind the law provides for orderly examination and dispassionate and impartial judgment by competent agencies set up for this purpose. Individual opinion, no matter how firmly held, cannot expect to override such judgment. Both opponents and proponents must submit their case to the established tribunal, namely, the technical departments of the Government, and finally to Congress itself, and must abide by the decisions reached in that way.

Now, let us look at the record of this opposition. It is of record that the project is opposed by certain railroads and certain large corporate interests. These opponents have, of course, a perfect right to voice their opposition, but it is for Congress to weigh the value of such in coming to a decision. Certain communities and certain individuals in the State of Florida are of record as opposing the project, and they most certainly are entirely within their rights in raising such opposition. However, although the opposition appears to come from numerous quarters, the grounds set forth for the opposition are few. These are:

First. That when the canal is built ships will not use it.

Second. That it will not effect the savings in time and distance and freedom from hazard which the proponents claim.

Third. That even if the ships do use it, the project will cost more than it is worth.

Fourth. That it will adversely affect agriculture in a part of the State of Florida because it will diminish the underground water supply.

I think these four headings comprise all points which have been raised by opposition from any source. It seems somewhat strange to me, however, that a railroad which does not touch within a hundred miles of the territory whose agriculture it is claimed will be affected should give as its ground for opposition its concern for such agriculture. It seems strange to me that communities which can have only the remotest connection with the hazards of navigation should base their opposition to the canal upon their claim that ships cannot navigate it without hazard. It seems equally strange that individuals far removed by physical distance and business interests from any direct connection with the canal should oppose it on the ground that the upkeep of a certain part of the channel would be greater than estimated by the Army engineers. I do not find anywhere in the record that any community has objected to the canal because it would prefer that relief expenditures remain closer at home. Nor do I find anywhere in the record that one city objects to the canal because it might enhance the development of another city. Nor do I find that any railroad or other transportation agency has objected on the grounds that the canal would result in cheapened water transportation which, no matter how much it might benefit the general public, might adversely affect their individual positions. These do not appear in the record, but I invite your attention to the bare possibility of their existence.

Now let us return to the four grounds for objection I mentioned a few minutes ago.

As to the claim that when the canal is built ships will not use it, I think you will grant that if the ships can save time and money by using the canal they will use it. Whether they want the status quo to be upset and for that reason do not want the canal to be built is quite another question. We are not considering this project solely for the benefit of shipowners but for the people of this country as a whole. If the shipowners say that even though they were to save time and money by using the canal they would not do so, I, for one, do not believe them.

Now as to the next point—that is, that it will not effect the savings in time and distance and freedom from hazards which the proponents claim—I submit that the highest authority in the land on the requisite dimensions and characteristics of improved waterways are the Army engineers; and the highest authority for the courses which ships will sail and the times and distances involved is the Bureau of Navigation. Both of these authorities have pronounced that the canal will result in the time and distance savings indicated, and I think we are warranted in accepting this verdict.

As to the third point—that is, that even if the ships do use it the project will cost more than it is worth—this is a matter which should not have to be argued because it is subject to computation and survey by competent authorities. The Army engineers say that it will not cost more than \$142,700,000, and that its benefits will be upward of \$8,000,000 a year. There are few, if any, river and harbor projects in the United States which can make such a showing, and unless we are to assume that the Army engineers are absolutely wrong in this case, and that the Public Works engineers are wrong, and that the engineers of the board of review are wrong, I think we must accept these figures.

Now as to the last one—namely, that it will adversely affect agriculture in a part of the State of Florida because it will diminish the underground water supply—this is a purely technical question, and competent authorities of the Government to which Congress has referred such questions advise that there will be no such deleterious effect, and I think we are warranted in assuming that they are correct. If we assume that they are wrong, to whom are we to turn for a decision on this highly technical matter? As a matter of fact, this question has been examined by the Corps of Engineers, by the engineers of the special board of review, and by a special commission set up by the Chief of Engineers, and, after exhaustive study, their reports may be summed up in the following extract from a letter to Senator

FLETCHER from the Acting Chief of Engineers under date of December 28, 1935:

The findings of the Board at this time definitely indicate that no serious adverse effects on the underground water supply need be anticipated from the construction of a sea-level canal.

The Chief of Engineers has stated to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce that the fears of certain persons that the construction of the canal will have adverse effect upon the underground water supply of Florida are "wholly without foundation."

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to present the subject matter of this amendment to the House comprehensively and impartially. In closing, I desire again to point out both to those who may oppose the project and those who favor it that a vote to concur in this amendment is nothing more or less than a vote to insure further examination of the project and the possible expenditure of a limited amount of relief funds, which must be expended in any event, pending further disposition of this project by Congress in due course. I therefore feel that both opponents and proponents should vote for this amendment, which represents a fair and reasonable procedure for providing for an emergency situation which it is our duty to meet. [Applause.]

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. My colleague is aware of the fact that in my particular district there is considerable opposition to this canal, based upon apprehension of its effect upon the water supply and upon the question of its economic necessity, as well as the method of using relief funds. Is that correct?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think that is quite true.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PETTENGILL. Are the reports which the gentleman referred to reports of the full Board of Army Engineers or simply of a subcommittee?

Mr. CALDWELL. The sum and substance of the report of the Board of Engineers is incorporated in a report of the board of review, dated June 15, 1934.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Is that a report of the full board?

Mr. CALDWELL. It is my understanding that is true, although I would not be certain. In answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I understand that 60 percent of the available tonnage in 1930 was oil tankers. The board of review has reported that this is gradually decreasing while other freight cargoes are increasing, and that within 15 years from the time the canal is opened the tanker freight will be less than 15 percent of the total traffic.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has offered the preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur therein. The gentleman from Texas has asked for a division of the question.

The question, therefore, is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CALDWELL) there were—ayes 62, noes 108.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment no. 49: Page 36, line 1, insert: "That in order to provide relief, work relief, and to increase employment

by providing for useful projects and public works, projects of the kind and character for which he has heretofore made loans or grants pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act for 1935, the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works (hereinafter called the Administrator) may, upon direction of the President, use not to exceed \$300,000,000 from funds on hand or to be received from the sale of securities, for the making of grants, to aid in the financing of projects capable of being substantially completed, in the determination of the Administrator not later than June 30, 1938: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to any project that has been enjoined in any Federal or State court: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the grant exceed 45 percent. Nothing herein shall be construed to increase the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered under existing law to issue and to have outstanding at any one time, and nothing herein shall be construed to limit or curtail in any way any powers which the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Administrator is now authorized to exercise."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 49, and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 49: Mr. BUCHANAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"In order to increase employment by providing for useful public-works projects of the kind and character for which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works (hereinafter called the Administrator) has heretofore made loans or grants pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Administrator may, upon the direction of the President, use not to exceed \$300,000,000 from funds on hand or to be received from the sale of securities, for the making of grants to aid in the financing of such projects: *Provided*, That no part of the sum made available by this paragraph shall be granted for any project unless, in the determination of the Administrator, the completion thereof can be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1938, and adequate provision has been made or is assured for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied through the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works: *Provided further*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project enjoined in any Federal or State court: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount of the grant exceed 45 percent of the cost of the project. Nothing herein shall be construed to increase the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered under existing law to issue and to have outstanding at any one time, and nothing herein shall be construed to limit or curtail in any way any powers which the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Administrator is now authorized to exercise."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of my remarks I may incorporate the resolution passed unanimously by the Florida State Legislature endorsing the canal and one or two small statements from engineers.

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

There was no objection.

FAKE OR REAL CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM—WHICH?

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in the extension of my remarks to include therein two short bills that have been introduced in the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, the Ramspeck bill, ostensibly extending the classified civil service to postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, cannot command the serious attention of any informed supporter of the merit system.

It is pure political camouflage, adroitly framed for campaign effect.

Under the guise of civil-service reform, it would deal a deathblow to the last pretense of merit administration in the Post Office Department.

President Roosevelt, Postmaster General Farley, and every other key man in our new spoils regime have undertaken to broadcast the impression that the Ramspeck bill would take

postmaster appointments out of politics. But I for one do not intend that this shameless camouflage shall obscure the New Deal's crimes against civil service since 1933. Mr. Roosevelt has added more than 250,000 persons to the full-time Federal pay roll without increasing the civil-service lists.

In a word, the Ramspeck bill is not at all what it is represented to be. It is a spoilsman's bill in civil-service dress. Friends of merit should not confuse the substance of the matter with the form.

The Ramspeck bill is worded very cleverly—framed, it appears, with a primary view to confusing public opinion on an issue which the New Deal no longer can evade. The bill provides in section 1 that all postmasters of the first, second, and third classes shall be appointed under the Civil Service Act. This is what the New Dealers would like the country to believe the bill would accomplish.

But section 2 specifically entrenches the spoils system. It provides that at the expiration of present terms appointments in these classes "shall be made by reappointment and classification, noncompetitively, of the incumbent postmaster * * *."

This language embodies precisely the antithesis of merit principles. It would enable the Postmaster General, in effect, to reappoint any incumbent postmaster for a life term without a competitive test of any sort. It would enable Mr. Farley to "freeze" incumbent postmasters into a Nation-wide political oligarchy. Note that section 1 of the bill provides that these postmasters "shall hereafter be appointed without term." The net effect of the bill, therefore, would be to abolish the present 4-year term and place the appointive power on a noncompetitive basis exclusively in the hands of the Postmaster General.

In the event the Postmaster General elected not to reappoint the incumbent at the expiration of the present term, his alternative would be to fill the place—

By promotion or transfer from within the Postal Service in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act and rules. * * *

But attached to this language is a sweeping proviso empowering the Postmaster General to certify to the Civil Service Commission at will—

That there is no qualified person serving in the vacancy office available for such promotion or transfer.

This would be the most sweeping spoils power ever placed in the hands of any Cabinet officer—and yet this legislation is attempted under the guise of bolstering the merit system.

Furthermore, note that in section 3 the Ramspeck bill specifically authorizes continuance of the present deplorable system of appointing acting postmasters. This is the device which Postmaster General Farley has used with such conspicuous success in evading the provisions of the existing civil-service laws relating to postmasters in the first three classes.

At present the acting postmaster always is appointed on purely political considerations. In the course of a few months the Civil Service Commission holds its nominal examinations to prepare a list of three ranking eligible applicants. But in this rating the factor of experience and training weighs 80 percent in the appraisal of the candidates. Thus the man who has been serving 6 months as acting postmaster has an 80-percent head start on all his competitors. This is how the system has worked under Farley since 1933, and the provisions of the Ramspeck bill, as embodied in section 3, would legalize the acting-postmaster racket for all time.

In a word, the Ramspeck bill is a public fraud. It is designed to place the whole Post Office permanently in the hands of the presently entrenched political spoilsman. It would submerge the mail service so deeply in partisan politics that reform would be hopelessly blocked for perhaps a quarter century.

On the whole, this measure is only another illustration of the New Deal's empty lip service to merit. The spoilsman of this administration do not dare defend their personnel

policies, conduct, or record. They seek only to cover their crimes against our 50-year-old civil service with fake legislation. They recognize well, as the recent national newspaper poll indicated, that 90 percent of the American people favor civil service. Thus they seek to constantly advance the Roosevelt spoils system by putting a merit tag on their successive measures of civil-service corruption.

The purpose of the civil-service law is to place Government employment on a career basis. Any measure sincerely aimed in that direction will command my vigorous support. I insist, however, that any bill offered in the name of civil-service reform shall be genuine. I do not intend to be taken in by any such fraud as the Ramspeck bill, the Logan bill, or the Mead bill. Nor do I intend to be silent on such bills merely because their sponsors call them civil-service measures.

No such campaign device for sugar-coating the shameful record of New Deal spoilsman ship ever can command more than the indignant opposition of all true friends of merit. The New Deal has ravaged civil service as has no other administration during the last half century. This crime against the public service cannot now be covered with the white garments of vacuous civil-service reform.

As I see it, this cringing confession by the administration is even more revolting to the American sense of justice and square dealing than the crime itself.

Every major act of the Roosevelt administration has been a dagger thrust at the heart of civil service. Yet the New Deal spoilsman have not the temerity to state their policy boldly and follow through. Instead, they walk timidly behind the skirts of civil service.

And I now give in full the Ramspeck bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That postmasters of the first, second, and third classes shall hereafter be appointed without term, by the Postmaster General, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States", approved January 16, 1883: *Provided*, That postmasters now serving may continue to serve until their terms of office expire.

Sec. 2. Appointments to positions of postmaster at first, second, and third class post offices shall be made by the reappointment and classification, noncompetitively, of the incumbent postmaster, or by promotion or transfer from within the Postal Service in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act and rules, unless the Postmaster General certifies to the United States Civil Service Commission that there is no qualified person serving in the vacancy office available for such promotion or transfer.

Sec. 3. Appointments of acting postmaster in all classes of post offices shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service rules governing temporary appointments.

Sec. 4. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

As a substitute for the Ramspeck bill, with its fraud on the civil service, I have introduced H. R. 12829, which would honestly and genuinely bring all postmasters of the first, second, and third classes into the civil-service system.

I invite honest comparison of my bill with the provisions of the Ramspeck measure.

My bill entirely eliminates the objectionable spoils features of the Ramspeck bill. Note that it does not propose to "blanket" the Farley political postmasters into the civil service for life terms. It provides that at the expiration of his present term every incumbent postmaster must qualify under civil-service rules and regulations if he is to retain his post for an indeterminate appointment.

This seems to me to be the essence of the merit system—competitive examinations at the start and full civil-service protection afterward to all who qualify for appointment. This, as I read the Ramspeck bill, is not provided in the administration proposal.

Moreover, my bill specifically provides, in section 1, that—

No recommendation by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or any political endorsement or recommendation of any kind, shall be received or considered in making any appointment or promotion under this act. * * *

Section 2 makes it mandatory that postmasters shall be appointed wherever possible "by promotion of persons within the Postal Service * * *." Here, as I see it, is the very heart of the merit system—that persons serving faithfully in

the ranks shall be eligible to promotion to the highest executive positions in the Postal Service.

In section 3 it is provided that postmasters may be selected outside of the service only upon showing by the Department that no one in the service is qualified for advancement. This provision differs fundamentally from the Ramspeck bill. By that measure the Postmaster General would be authorized to certify at will that no qualified candidates were available in the vacancy office. My bill, on the other hand, provides for such certification only upon showing that ambitious postal employees were unable to qualify under the established civil-service rules.

In section 3 it is further provided that, when the Postmaster General does not select the first name on the eligible register furnished by the Civil Service Commission, he "shall certify to the Commission his reasons for not so doing, which reasons may be made public."

My bill next provides that no appointment as acting postmaster may be made save in accordance with the provisions of the existing civil-service laws governing temporary appointments. This section would eliminate the worst evils of the "acting postmaster" system so vigorously pursued by the Post Office Department since 1933.

To further assure the elimination of political considerations, the bill provides, in section 5, that—

It shall be unlawful for any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives to make any recommendation of any person for appointment or promotion as postmaster.

If the administration wishes to fulfill its many pledges and promises for the protection and advancement of the merit system, here is a short and simple measure aimed at the very core of the problem in the Postal Service. If the administration will take up this bill, or any bill aimed at the same objectives, the legislation could be brought before the House of Representatives under a special rule and passed within 48 hours.

If, on the other hand, the administration is determined to persist in the policy of political spoils and civil-service raids—as I believe it is—then this bill which I have introduced will never see the light of day in this session of Congress.

The administration's failure to act, however, will again demonstrate the utter insincerity of the many repeated pledges by President Roosevelt concerning his hopes for civil-service advance during his administration.

My bill—H. R. 12829—is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, or of any other classes hereafter established, shall hereafter be appointed, without term, by the Postmaster General in accordance with the provisions of this act and the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 (23 Stat. 430): *Provided*, That no recommendation by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or political endorsement or recommendation of any kind, shall be received or considered in making any appointment or promotion under this act: *Provided further*, That postmasters now serving may continue to serve until the end of their terms, but they shall not acquire classified civil-service status at the expiration of such terms of office.

Sec. 2. The Postmaster General shall make appointments of postmasters by promotion of persons within the Postal Service possessing such qualifications as may be approved by the Civil Service Commission.

Sec. 3. If no persons are able to qualify for appointment by promotion under the provisions of section 2, the Postmaster General shall request the Civil Service Commission to hold an open competitive examination under the provisions of the Civil Service Act and rules. In the event the Postmaster General does not select the first name on the eligible register furnished him by the Civil Service Commission he shall certify to the Commission his reasons for not so doing, which reasons may be made public.

Sec. 4. That all appointments of acting postmasters at offices of all classes shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service rules governing temporary appointments.

Sec. 5. That it shall be unlawful for any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives to make any recommendation of any person for appointment or promotion as postmaster.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1936

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, no. 49, permits the P. W. A. to use \$300,000,000 out of the funds of the

R. F. C. and it really takes \$300,000,000 out of the funds available in the Treasury of the United States.

The result of the operations of the P. W. A. insofar as they relate to allotments for local projects has been to increase the cost of these projects so that the locality would have been much better off without any allotments whatever in a very large number of instances. It seems to me we should stop this demoralizing idea of making Federal allotments to local projects. It takes years to provide the employment that such projects give. It will be 2 years from now before this \$300,000,000 is spent. A very large part of it will be spent in the first half of the calendar year 1938. In other words, most of it will not be spent for 18 months from now, and we should not appropriate a lot of money that will be tied up in such things as that. It is not relief; it is not providing for relief. It is providing for the continuance of a bad precedent, and it takes \$300,000,000 more out of the Treasury.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In brief, what is the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TABER. It adds \$300,000,000 to the cost of this bill. It brings this bill up to \$2,675,000,000, and turns \$300,000,000 more provided for in this amendment over to the P. W. A. to allot to different projects in different States and different localities.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. And what is the difference between the Senate amendment and the conference report?

Mr. TABER. There is not a great deal of difference. There is a difference in verbiage rather than intention. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report upon 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 pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1936

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that I am able to make a speech on the bill, and I send the following to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read, in explanation of the P. W. A. three-hundred-million-dollar amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RE FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1936, INSO FAR AS IT RELATED TO THE PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The bill as it passed the House of Representatives contained no provision concerning the Public Works Administration. The Senate added a paragraph which authorized the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works, upon the direction of the President, to use not to exceed \$300,000,000 from funds on hand, or to be received from the sale of securities, for the making of grants to aid in the financing of projects capable of being substantially completed, in the determination of the Administrator, not later than June 30, 1938. The amount of grant which could be made for any project was limited to 45 percent.

The purpose of this provision is to permit the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works to use the cash and credits now in the Public Works Administration revolving fund for an additional public-works program to supplement the work-relief program to be carried on. Since, under existing law, the moneys in the Public Works Administration revolving fund are available only for loans, for the past year the Public Works Administration has been making loans from this revolving fund and grants from rescinded allotments made from the appropriations to carry out title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act and from the \$345,000,000 allocated to the Public Works Administration by the President from the \$4,880,000,000 appropriated to carry out the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

The provision added by the Senate is not intended to disturb the use of the revolving fund for such loans as are authorized under Public, No. 412, Seventy-third Congress, and under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, but it confers supplemental and additional powers upon the administrator and does not curtail any of his present powers or functions.

The Senate amendment contemplates that the Public Works Administration will make loans for non-Federal public-works

projects in the amount of 55 percent of the cost of the project out of its revolving loan fund and will supply the remaining 45 percent as an outright grant. In cases where applicants are able to provide their share of the cost of the projects from the sale of municipal bonds on the open market, only a grant will be made by the Public Works Administration.

The first change which the conferees have made to the Senate amendment has been the deletion in the first and second lines of superfluous language relative to relief and work relief so as to make perfectly clear that the purpose of the paragraph is to enable the Public Works Administration to follow a well-beaten path by providing aid in financing a non-Federal public-works program. This provision in the Senate amendment is also intended to serve as a standard for guiding the Administrator in the selection of types of projects to be financed under the amendment.

Another change made by the conferees in the Senate amendment has been to rephrase the limitation on the time within which it is estimated that a project will be completed in order that it may be eligible for a grant under the bill. The purpose of this change is to make clear that no part of the funds made available by this paragraph shall be granted for any project unless the Administrator has determined that the completion of the project can be substantially accomplished, in his opinion, prior to July 1, 1938, and also to prohibit the use of any funds under this paragraph to finance any project unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, the applicant has on hand or is able to furnish satisfactory assurances that it will provide its share of the cost of the project.

It is expected that under this provision the Public Works Administration will be enabled to carry on a \$600,000,000 non-Federal public-works program. It is contemplated that this will be done by the Public Works Administration agreeing to make grants and loans from its unobligated funds on hand and against commitments from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Public Works Administration will be able to enter into a contract to make a grant or to purchase municipal bonds in reliance upon a commitment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase bonds from the Public Works Administration in a like amount.

Under existing law the only limitation is the limitation upon the amount of bonds purchased from the Public Works Administration which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may hold at any one time. This amount is limited to \$250,000,000 by Public, No. 412, Seventy-third Congress. It is anticipated that through the cooperation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation it will be possible for the Public Works Administration to use from its revolving fund the \$300,000,000 made available under this paragraph of the bill for grants and an additional amount of about \$150,000,000 for loans, but the Senate amendment does not in any way restrict the present power of the Public Works Administration to resell on the open market bonds it has purchased.

To summarize: Under the Senate amendment as modified by the conferees, the President is given power to authorize and direct the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works to use \$300,000,000 from the revolving fund for the making of grants for projects selected by the Administrator, and to use funds on hand and funds to be received from the resale of bonds for the making of loans for such projects. It is anticipated that the Administrator will be empowered to make these grants and loans subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe in order to carry out the purposes of the Senate amendment. The Administrator will, of course, continue to exercise the functions which he has been heretofore authorized to perform under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act and under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, when the W. P. A. portion of this bill came up originally in the House I was against the proposition of taking \$700,000,000 from that fund and allocating it to public works because it would take money from workers under the W. P. A. who could not qualify for P. W. A. work. As I understand it now, this \$300,000,000 is not to be taken from the fund of the W. P. A., but is to be taken from a revolving fund of the P. W. A., together with loans and grants by the R. F. C., and funds otherwise unallocated that have been in possession of the P. W. A.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. This \$300,000,000 was procured by the P. W. A. taking its securities against cities and towns for loans and delivering them to the R. F. C., which passed on them and turned over the money to the P. W. A. These are additional funds.

Mr. CONNERY. That is what I understood, and that is why I am in favor of this proposition, because Mr. Ickes' department, the P. W. A., has always paid the prevailing rate of wage, and Mr. Ickes' P. W. A. has done wonderful work, work which will endure and inure greatly to the

benefit of the American people. They pay decent wages on the P. W. A. work, and now we have that prevailing rate of wage also in the W. P. A., and I am happy to see this \$300,000,000 allocated for the P. W. A. It will go into work and allow bricklayers and masons and other workers of the building trades to be employed at decent wages.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. I am very glad to hear my colleague make that statement, because in my humble opinion the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, is one of the most brilliant and far-sighted and distinguished statesmen of the present administration and has given 16 ounces to the pound of fair and square deal to the taxpayers of our Nation for every dollar expended, and this revolving fund ought to go through. And I would respectfully appeal to the membership of this House to vote for this revolving fund to aid an accomplished Secretary of the Interior to continue his great work in behalf of the American people.

Mr. CONNERY. I am very glad to agree with what the gentleman has said about the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, but I think also that Mr. Harry Hopkins, the Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, in his job has done as much as any human being could do to put people to work. Any man who could put to work 4,000,000 men, at union wages, in 38 days, as did Harry Hopkins on the C. W. A., is a marvelous friend of the working men and women of this Nation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. MAY. What I want to know is whether or not this \$300,000,000 enables the Secretary of the Interior, as Administrator of Public Works, to increase in fact the appropriations made by the Congress out of the Treasury.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, this is in fact not direct, but an indirect appropriation for which the Treasury ultimately will have to pay.

Mr. MAY. It is in addition to what we have passed?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is in addition to the \$1,425,000,000. Add the two together and you have the sum total of relief passed in this bill.

Mr. CONNERY. It is a fine amendment and I hope it passes.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. BEITER. And the adoption of this amendment will also enlarge the unemployment program in that it includes building trades, heavy industries.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; and they need help.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to ask the chairman a question?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. LAMNECK. On page 29 we earmark quite a number of amounts in the appropriation. We also earmark this \$300,000,000. I want to know what a congressional district will do for their unemployed provided they cannot take advantage of any of these earmarkings? How am I going to take care of people in my district when I am bonded now so that I cannot issue any more bonds?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The earmarking in the House bill this year, just as the earmarking in the House bill last year, is not exclusive. In other words, if the gentleman will note the verbiage of the amendment, so much of that money is authorized for these projects. If you have unemployment in your district and there is some project that does not come within the purview of any of them, and that project has been adopted, the money will be spent on it. You will find that ruling in the RECORD, which I put in last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 1 additional minute.

Mr. CONNERY. The chairman of the committee [Mr. BUCHANAN] has made such an illuminating statement of this proposition, assisted by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] and the distinguished gentleman

from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], that I have nothing further to say. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. It will do much to help bring about work at decent wages to the building trades of the country.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAFFIC SURVEY AND REPORT OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on motor-vehicle traffic and include a report of the special committee to the Committee on the District of Columbia and also a short excerpt from the hearings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the problem of traffic safety is one of the most serious problems not only confronting the District of Columbia but every city, hamlet, and village in the country as a whole. Especially is this true when we take into consideration the fact there were over 34,000 deaths due to traffic and motor-vehicle accidents in the year 1935. There have been more people killed in automobile accidents in the years 1920 up to and including 1935 than there have been killed in all the wars in which this country has been engaged. In all wars in which we have been engaged from 1776 to 1935 we have had 244,357 battle deaths, while in the period commencing in 1920, up to and including 1935, we have had in this country alone 388,935 persons killed in connection with motor-vehicle accidents. Over and above this, there have been thousands and thousands of persons who have received permanent injuries. In many cases the injuries have been worse than death. Furthermore, as a result of these accidents, there has been a great amount of property damage.

The situation that every city, both large and small, and the country as a whole is facing in regard to the ever-increasing number of traffic accidents is well expressed in the statement of Frank J. McDevitt, chairman of the Motor Vehicle Commission of St. Louis, Mo., which is as follows:

One of the most serious problems confronting the American people today is the elimination of traffic accidents. St. Louis, as well as other large cities, has shown an annual increase which has been especially marked during recent years. Something must be done to stop the terrific loss of human lives, injuries, and property damage. Few people realize that in the past several years the casualties in this country from motor accidents greatly exceeded the casualties which occurred during the World War. None of us would want to see this country engaged in another conflict, yet we read with complacency accounts on the front page of every newspaper regarding serious traffic accidents.

Notwithstanding all the efforts put forth by the police department, the courts, and the prosecuting officials, accidents continue to increase. This state of affairs will likely continue until each and every citizen becomes safety conscious, having a high regard for his own safety as well as the safety of his neighbor.

As we are all quite aware, the traffic problem is a very difficult one here in the District of Columbia and is increasing every day. So much so the District of Columbia Committee of the House at the beginning of the present session of Congress appointed a special subcommittee to conduct a traffic survey and to make a study of traffic conditions in the District of Columbia, and to report its findings to the full committee. A special subcommittee composed of Mr. SCHULTE, of Indiana; Mr. REED, of Illinois; and myself as chairman of the committee were appointed for this purpose. Exhaustive hearings were held which have now been printed and are available to the committee and the Members of Congress and officials of the District of Columbia. Based upon these hearings, this special subcommittee filed their report with the full committee, which I am sure is of interest to the Congress as a whole, to the residents of the District,

and to the people of this country who visit our Capital City; and, therefore, in accordance with my special permission from the House, I am setting out the report in detail, as follows:

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO MAKE TRAFFIC SURVEY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MAY 11, 1936.

The special street and traffic subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia submits the following report:

It is the belief of the committee that conducted these hearings in regard to traffic safety that we could very well summarize our report in three brief findings.

First. We recommend for the most part not more traffic laws, rules, and regulations, but less confusion, greater simplification, and better observance and enforcement of those we now have.

Second. "That the most effective way to reduce accidents and at the same time act as a deterrent to reckless driving, is the old-fashioned method for which no substitute has yet been produced, namely, the presence of well-trained, intelligent, supervised, and properly disciplined uniformed policemen."

Third. The close cooperation and coordination of the activities, the interest, and efforts of all traffic regulatory and enforcing bodies, together with the general public and all those using the public highways.

However, since our hearings have been so extensive, quite inclusive, and so much time has been devoted to them, we believe that for the benefit of the public in general and future Congresses, as well as the officials of the District of Columbia, we should make a comprehensive report, together with our recommendations which we are making as concise and to the point as possible.

REPORT

Beginning on Monday, February 3, and ending on March 30, 1936, hearings were conducted by the committee on various phases of the traffic problem in the District. The investigation was devoted largely to a study of the traffic problem in Washington, D. C., a determination of the causes of the traffic accidents and a discussion of the best methods which may be adopted to bring about improvements. District officials, civic leaders, and traffic experts best qualified to furnish the committee with information, suggestions, and advice on this subject were called before the committee.

The first part of the hearings was devoted to a discussion of the existing traffic problem and its probable future trend. The second phase of the hearings was devoted to a thorough discussion of the causes of traffic accidents, and the third phase to proposed remedies.

In order to develop the facts regarding the traffic problem, the following outline was used by the committee.

THE PROBLEM

1. Increase in registrations for the past several years—registrations per capita—comparisons with other cities—nonresident traffic—accidents caused by nonresidents.

2. Increase in number of Government employees in the District of Columbia and the relation of this increase to the traffic situation in and around the Triangle.

3. The traffic flow and the relation between the rush-hour and the non-rush-hour traffic pattern—the cordon count—comparison with other cities.

4. The street plan in its relation to traffic movement, including discussion of the traffic circles.

5. The bridge situation.

6. Lack of adequate bypass facilities for interstate traffic.

The outline for the second phase of the hearings which was devoted to a study of all available facts relating to traffic accidents, is as follows:

CAUSES OF ACCIDENTS

1. Statistical analysis showing the causes of all accidents—discussion of the principal causes of accidents—reckless driving, driving while intoxicated, speeding, leaving after colliding, carelessness, both on the part of drivers and of pedestrians.

2. The pedestrian situation—analysis of pedestrian fatalities.

3. Traffic lights—the number now in operation and the results obtained by their installation.

4. The taxicab situation—number of cabs, number of cab drivers, cruising, congestion caused by cruising, relation of cruising taxicabs to other traffic, etc.

5. Mass transportation—streetcars, busses, relation of vehicular traffic to streetcar and bus traffic.

6. Street lighting—relation of street lighting to accidents.

7. Accident-prone intersections—showing intersections at which the majority of accidents occur.

8. Accident-prone drivers—age groups, etc.

9. Accident-prone vehicles—inspection.

The third and last phase of the discussion relating to remedies and recommendations is outlined as follows:

REMEDIES

1. Street widening.
2. Redesign of circles.
3. New bridges and replacement of old bridges.
4. Underpasses and overpasses.
5. Street lighting—appropriation.
6. Traffic surveys and planning—personnel requirements.
7. Educational work—funds for printing, postage, etc.
8. Are more traffic lights needed; and if so, where? Funds.

9. Refinement of present system of traffic lights.
10. Pedestrian protection by traffic lights.
11. Regulation of pedestrian traffic.
12. Installation of safety islands for the protection of pedestrians.
13. Reexamination of all drivers at end of renewal period. Personnel requirements.
14. Photographs of all drivers for proper identification.
15. Suspension of nonresident privileges.
16. Revocation and suspension of drivers' permits.
17. Semiannual inspection of all cars—cost—personnel, etc.
18. Need for additional police to enforce traffic laws and regulations.
19. Better methods of enforcement in courts. Is present enforcement machinery adequate?

All of the subjects referred to in the original agenda were thoroughly discussed by one or more competent witnesses, and these discussions, together with tables, charts, and illustrations, are included in the testimony.

DIGEST OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FINDINGS

Since 1925 there has been a 100-percent increase in motor-vehicle registrations in the District, and at the present time there are about 2.6 persons per car registered, which is the highest in the United States as compared with Philadelphia with 8.5 persons per car, Chicago with 7.15 persons per car, Pittsburgh with 9 persons per car, and Detroit with 4.03 persons per car. Approximately 20 percent of the traffic consists of cars registered from outside the District and they were responsible for about 25 percent of the accidents during 1935.

In spite of this increase in registrations and the consequent increase in traffic, there has been practically no increase in the traffic-police force during the same period of time. In fact the number of motorcycle police has been reduced from 93 in 1928 to 54 today, a reduction of 42 percent. Nearly every witness before this committee emphasized the need for additional police officers.

In 1933 there were about 68,000 Federal and District Government employees in the District. In February of 1936 there were approximately 112,000—an increase of 65 percent. Approximately 50 percent of these employees report for work at 9 a. m. and quit work at 4:30 p. m. During the past 3 years buildings in the Triangle area, bounded by Seventh, Fifteenth, Constitution Avenue, and Pennsylvania Avenue, have been completed, and at the present time there are nearly 25,000 Government employees in this area. By the construction of the buildings several through streets have been closed, which throws a correspondingly heavy load upon the remaining streets.

In 1930 a cordon count in the area bounded by Sixth, Nineteenth, Constitution Avenue, and L Streets from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m. showed 188,489 persons entering this area by automobile, 89,730 by street car, and 10,834 by bus. A cordon count made in 1935 for the same hours showed 209,915 (actual count 8 to 11 a. m. and 3 to 6 p. m., interpolated for hours 11 a. m. to 3 p. m.) persons entering this area by automobile, 110,405 by street car, and 33,617 by bus. In the congested area 130,893 passenger automobiles entered during a 12-hour period from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m. In the congested area in Philadelphia 79,315 passenger cars entered during a similar period, and in the Loop district in Chicago during the same period there were 113,000 passenger cars entering. The District has the heaviest concentration of motor vehicles entering the congested district of any city, irrespective of size, in the United States.

The plan of the District as established by L'Enfant consists of a rectangular street lay-out to which was added a system of diagonal avenues spread out fanwise from the Capitol and White House. This lay-out causes numerous six-point intersections and also is a direct cause of the number of circles which have anywhere from 6 to 10 streets entering in one area. The diagonal avenues are an aid in obtaining the shortest distance for cross-town traffic and generally carry a much heavier volume than the north and south, east and west streets, but they do cause congestion and contribute to accident hazards when they converge.

Generally speaking, the bridges are adequate to carry the present-day traffic, but several should be rebuilt, namely, Chain Bridge, the bridge across Rock Creek on K Street near Twenty-ninth, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge across Anacostia and the Taft Bridge on Connecticut Avenue. The latter is on program for widening. Rock Creek Parkway is inadequate for present and future traffic needs under Massachusetts Avenue Bridge.

Owing to the present location and construction of bridges and the general lay-out of the highways in the District, it is practically impossible to obtain adequate bypass facilities for interstate traffic. Bypasses in the District to be of any considerable benefit must be planned in cooperation with Virginia and Maryland road authorities.

Motor-vehicle accidents have increased during the past several years. During 1935 there were 9,024 accidents in the District of Columbia, of which 2,408, or about one-fourth, involved pedestrians. Of these about one-half were caused by the carelessness of the pedestrian. Of the 113 fatal accidents during 1935, 75 involved pedestrians. Of these, 57, or one-half of the fatalities, were the result of the carelessness of the pedestrian. This carelessness in most cases was evidenced by crossing between intersections, crossing not at crosswalks, or crossing against the signals.

The principal accident-producing violations by motorists during this time were failure to yield right-of-way, reckless driving, speeding, driving while drunk, and turning improperly.

There are 325 intersections and 4 circles in the District controlled by traffic-light signals (Mar. 1, 1936), and statistics show that since the installation of these signals there has been a considerable reduction in motor-vehicle accidents at these intersections.

There are over 4,000 taxicabs in the District, or 1 cab for each 125 persons, which is the highest number of taxicabs according to population of any city in the world. Boston, with 1 cab for each 500 persons, is the nearest. About 27 percent of the motor-vehicle traffic in down-town Washington, and as much as 47 percent of the traffic on some streets, is taxicabs, which is the cause of considerable of the congestion. About 63 percent of these taxicabs were empty cabs, most of them merely "cruising."

About 2 years ago the two streetcar lines were merged, and after study by the Public Utilities Commission and the merged companies a rerouting plan was ordered by the Public Utilities Commission. It is expected to have the construction for this rerouting plan completed by October 1936. Several streetcar lines have been abandoned and busses have taken their place.

Only about 40 percent of the people are carried by mass transportation. Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and other cities carry about 85 percent by mass transportation.

On July 1, 1934, there was about a 10-percent reduction in street lighting, and at the intersections where the street lighting was reduced or eliminated there was a 31-percent increase in night accidents over a like period before the lighting was reduced.

Accident diagrams have been completed at all intersections where over five accidents have occurred in a year, and proper measures have been taken to correct the situation as far as this could be done with existing funds, by the use of stop signs, slow signs, white lines, reductions in the height of hedges, and cutting back of corners where justified.

A study was made of the age of drivers with relation to the number of accidents. This study showed that of all ages, those persons 20 years of age had the most accidents in proportion to the number of drivers.

Mechanical condition of cars contributed materially to the number of accidents—that is, poor mechanical condition was a contributing cause of at least nine deaths, and over 5 percent of the cars involved in accidents were shown to be in poor mechanical condition.

As a result of the evidence and findings, the committee makes the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the enforcement, prosecuting, and judicial officers be urged to continue their endeavor to bring about a reduction of accidents by a vigorous policy of certain punishment in cases of reckless driving, driving too fast for existing conditions, and other serious violations.

2. That additional funds be appropriated by Congress to provide for an increase of at least 10 percent in the present personnel of the police department, of whom enough shall be added to the motorcycle force to increase it to 100 men; and that this appropriation should be increased from year to year in proportion to the increase in motor-vehicle registration.

3. That the Board of Revocations and Suspensions continue its present policy of suspending permits in speeding cases, and extend that policy to include other serious violations.

4. That legislation is needed to provide authority for the suspension of operators' permits of nonresidents when they commit offenses in the District which if committed by residents of the District would call for revocation or suspension. This legislation (S. 3161) has now passed both Houses of Congress and will become a law upon approval of the President.

5. That legislation is needed increasing the penalty for first offense reckless driving, the present maximum penalty being \$100 or 30 days. This legislation (H. R. 11063) has already passed the Senate and has been approved by this committee, by the District Committee, and is now on the House Calendar.

6. That the judges of the traffic court extend the hours of the court to care for the increased congestion, reestablishing the "night court" under the provisions of the Traffic Act if that becomes necessary.

7. That an amendment to the Traffic Act or to the traffic regulations under the act is recommended to control and regulate pedestrian traffic, especially at those points where they are given protection by traffic lights or traffic-police officers.

8. That it is the opinion of the committee that traffic conditions in the area known as the Triangle and the territory immediately adjacent thereto would be greatly improved if there were a further staggering of hours in which Government employees go to and quit work, and we respectfully recommend to the President of the United States and the heads of the various executive departments of the Government that they further extend the present staggered-hour policy according to definite comprehensive plans.

9. We also recommend to the Board of Education that they change the present-opening hour of the schools to a later hour in order to decrease the peak-hour traffic and to reduce accident hazards to school children.

10. That the present appropriation for personnel of the engineering staff in the department of vehicles and traffic should be increased from \$5,680 a year to \$13,760 a year for additional traffic planning and traffic surveys, and it is so recommended to the Appropriations Committee of the House.

11. That an appropriation of at least \$4,000 a year is recommended to carry on educational work of the department of vehicles and traffic in the interest of safer and better driving.

12. That the present appropriation for the examiners of motor-vehicle drivers in the department of vehicles and traffic, amounting to \$6,880, be doubled in order that all drivers may be reexamined at the end of the renewal period (every third year) and that all drivers involved in serious accidents may be called in for reexamination when such accidents occur.

13. That all stopping and standing of vehicles including the stopping of commercial vehicles for the purpose of loading and unloading be banned on the flow side of arterial streets during rush hours.

14. That left turns be prohibited at all intersections in the congested area and on arterial streets where such a prohibition will not result in serious congestion at other points.

15. That provision be made by Congress for establishing facilities for semiannual inspection by the District of Columbia of all motor vehicles. Appropriate legislation on this subject is provided in H. R. 8582 (74th Cong.), which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate.

16. That the Commissioners give careful study to the advisability of establishing additional one-way streets and one-way rush-hour streets in order to further facilitate the movement of vehicular traffic, and to the extension of the time of rush-hour one-way streets to make them one way from 7 a. m. to 12 noon and one way in the opposite direction from 1 p. m. to 7 p. m.

17. That legislation is needed to permit the Public Utilities Commission to regulate the number of taxicabs by the issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity.

18. That the Commissioners be requested to study the advisability of changing the color of the lights displayed on the top of fire-alarm boxes and that consideration be given to the advisability of prohibiting the use of red and green Neon advertising signs at all locations where they are likely to cause confusion with traffic lights.

19. That for the purposes of identification of all drivers the Traffic Act or the regulations under the act be amended to provide for a small photograph to be furnished by all drivers and used on all drivers' permits.

20. That the Park and Planning Commission be requested to give consideration to the establishment of additional playgrounds for children in various parts of the city and to a more complete use of existing playground facilities, including schoolyards to prevent children from playing in the street.

21. That the Commissioners and the Public Utilities Commission be urged to consider a skip-stop system for street cars and busses in order to facilitate the movement of mass transportation.

22. That the Park and Planning Commission be requested to give consideration to the parking of motor vehicles in or near Government buildings in the preparation of all future construction plans, or to provide garage facilities for officials and employees at a nominal cost.

23. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia prepare and submit to Congress at its next session plans and estimates for—

(a) A 5-year program of street widening.

(b) A redesign of Thomas and Scott Circles to meet modern traffic needs and the elimination of the inside sidewalks, if found to be practical.

(c) A 5-year program for bridge construction and replacement to meet existing and future traffic needs.

(d) Underpasses for street cars under Dupont and Thomas Circles.

(e) Widening the underpass in Rock Creek Valley underneath Massachusetts Avenue viaduct.

(f) A 5-year program of traffic lights and traffic-light improvements and refinements.

(g) The construction of pedestrian tunnels at Fifteenth Street and New York Avenue, at Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, and at Twelfth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, and at such other points as they may deem appropriate.

(h) The construction of suitable safety islands at such locations as they may select.

(i) The construction of overpasses for Thirteenth Street at Florida Avenue NW., and for New York Avenue at Florida Avenue NE.

(j) The construction of a low-level highway from K Street to Foxhall Road on the bed of the old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal with suitable ramp connections at Key Bridge in order to establish a suitable bypass for Virginia traffic through Georgetown.

In this connection consideration should be given to the construction of a highway on the towpath of the canal from Georgetown to the Maryland line to connect with a highway to Gettysburg, which would be used as a bypass for interstate traffic from and to the north and west.

24. That in the future appropriations for street lighting in the District shall be increased rather than reduced.

25. Although the Mount Vernon Boulevard is not within the District of Columbia or strictly within the scope of this investigation, it is so closely related that we recommend an appropriation for relighting that boulevard for the safety of the public.

26. That if the population of the District continues to increase in a permanent manner during the next 3 years, that serious consideration be given to the study of subways in the future.

As brought out in the course of this investigation, "the entire problem of traffic control and regulations is 'to move traffic as conveniently and safely as possible.'"

For a further study and analysis of the motor-vehicle situation in the District of Columbia, especially in relation to accidents, we recommend consideration of the printed hearings conducted by this committee.

As indicated in the report, it has been condensed and made as brief as possible. It should, however, be supplemented with the hearings that cover every detail of the traffic problem here in the District of Columbia.

In addition to this I wish to call particular attention of the membership to the appendix of the hearings containing a history of traffic in the District of Columbia, which was ably prepared by William A. Roberts, people's counsel of the District of Columbia, and which contains a very interesting history of the growth of the District of Columbia from the time of adoption of the seat of government act of July 16, 1790, authorizing the selection of a Federal Territory, 10 miles square, to be located on the River Potomac, between the mouths of the east branch and Connogochague, for the site of our Nation's Capital, up to the present time. Over and above its importance from the traffic standpoint, I wish to further recommend this document for its historical interest and value.

TERMS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 59), which I send to the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 59

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House the enrolled bill (H. R. 12848) 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;

That the action of the Speaker and of the President of the Senate in signing the said enrolled bill be rescinded; and

That in the reenrollment of the said bill the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make the following correction, namely: Strike out the word "Pikesville" wherever it appears in said bill and insert in lieu thereof the word "Pikeville."

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

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE MARKS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5805) to effectuate certain provisions of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at The Hague on November 6, 1925.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, just what is this?

Mr. DALY. The purpose of this bill is this: There is an international compact between several nations, some 15 of them, as to trade marks and patents. By agreement all nations have agreed to extend the courtesy of 6 months to every other nation to file trade marks and copyrights after they have been filed in the office of the country of the originator. All nations have subscribed to it. The law in the United States theretofore gave only 4 months, and this increases it to 6 months, to make it uniform all over the country.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Reserving the right to object, I am not familiar with this particular bill.

Mr. DALY. It comes from the Committee on Patents and is a companion bill to the one passed night before last, this being with respect to trade marks, the other being with respect to patents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill, S. 1794, an identical bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

The was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Trade Mark Act of February 20, 1905 (U. S. C. title 15, sec. 84), as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"That an application for registration of a trade mark filed in this country by any person who has previously regularly filed in any foreign country which, by treaty, convention, or law, affords similar privileges to citizens of the United States an application for registration of the same trade mark shall be accorded the same force and effect as would be accorded to the same application if filed in this country on the date on which application for registration of the same trade mark was first filed in such foreign country: *Provided*, That such application is filed in this country within 6 months from the date on which the application was first filed in such foreign country: *Provided further*, That subject to the provisions of section 5 of said Trade Mark Act (U. S. C. title 15, sec. 85) registration of a collective mark may be issued to an association to which it belongs, which association is located in any such foreign country and whose existence is not contrary to the law of such country, even if it does not possess an industrial or commercial establishment: *And provided further*, That certificate of registration shall not be issued for any mark for registration of which application has been filed by an applicant located in a foreign country until such mark has been actually registered by the applicant in the country in which he is located."

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.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

FIFTY-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12831) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Hartford, Conn.

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

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is another one of these bills. They put them in and bring them out, and round and round they go. We are putting in these 50-cent pieces everywhere. After a while you will not know where you are going.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Hartford, Conn., there shall be coined by the Director of the Mint 25,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and fineness and of a special appropriate 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 models for master dies or other preparations for this coinage.

Sec. 2. That the coins herein authorized shall be issued at par and only upon the request of the chairman or secretary of the Hartford (Conn.) Tercentenary Commission.

Sec. 3. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by said commission and all proceeds shall be used in furtherance of the Hartford (Conn.) Tercentenary Commission projects.

Sec. 4. That 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 the coins; for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting; for security of the coin; or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein directed.

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.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT AND HEARINGS, SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING OLD-AGE PENSION PLANS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 56

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the select committee of the House of Representatives appointed to inquire into

old-age pension plans and organizations not to exceed 200,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress; and that, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the aforesaid committee be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 10,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session pursuant to the resolution (H. Res. 443) authorizing the appointment of a select committee to inquire into old-age-pension plans with respect to pending legislation.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the printing of additional copies of the report and the hearings of the committee investigating old-age-pension plans.

Mr. SNELL. This is a report that is to be submitted later?

Mr. LAMBETH. The gentleman is correct.

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

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 278, to modify and extend the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1934, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas explain this resolution?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this is simply a Senate resolution which provides for the extension of the sugar quotas for 1 year. A similar House resolution is on the calendar. Sections 3, 4, and 5 of the resolution have been eliminated. This simply retains sections 1 and 2 and extends the present quotas for another year. I think all of the people in the sugar area are not only willing but anxious to have this resolution adopted rather than have no legislation.

Mr. SNELL. It is agreeable to all concerned, is it?

Mr. JONES. Yes. I understand so. Of course, some want definite changes before any permanent legislation is passed. But they realize that general legislation cannot be had this late in the session.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it understood that benefit payments, excise taxes, and processing taxes are eliminated?

Mr. JONES. Benefit payments have been eliminated from the resolution. There were no taxes in the resolution. But, of course, it is necessary to secure funds before payments can be made. It is evident that no funds will be made available at this session, so that part has been left out.

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

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Is it not true that certain of the cane-sugar growers are opposed to this resolution?

Mr. JONES. A few of the cane growers were opposed to any extension of this resolution, but in the main the sugar areas are anxious to have the quotas extended, and, as a matter of fact, I think the cane areas would rather have this resolution than to have no action taken. In other words, I am sure they appreciate the situation with which we are confronted.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the gentleman from Texas that we of the cane-producing sections of Louisiana cannot vote for this resolution. We are protesting against the unfairness of the quota, and we shall continue to protest. We believe that a new quota should be allocated; in other words, the off-shore quota should be reduced. We do not believe that the producers of sugar in the continental United States should be made to suffer.

My appeal is directed to the consideration of the great and immediate good that will come to the small farmer and laborer by a more liberal attitude on the part of our Government toward the Louisiana sugar industry. Their lands are well adapted to sugarcane culture and they know how

to grow cane. Many of the small farmers were forced out of production during the depression and because of the disease in the sugarcane, but now that the crop is again profitable and the sugarcane is healthy and prolific, Government restriction prevents these little fellows from reaping the benefits which Congress must have intended should be made available to them.

I may say that we appreciate the many courtesies extended to us by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]. We know we have his sympathy; and we have assurance that in the next Congress a bill will be considered which if enacted will give some measure of relief to us in the unfortunate position we presently occupy, and I trust it will be the bill introduced by Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana.

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

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When the gentleman speaks of the next Congress he means the Republican Congress that is coming in with Landon in the fall?

Mr. JONES. That may be true according to the sunflower philosophy, but there are other philosophies.

May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I appreciate the circumstances to which he refers, and I hope the Department will at least partially adjust it from any excess consumption quotas. I believe that was done to some extent the past year and I hope they may make every effort to iron out the apparent inequities in this fashion. I also want to thank my friend for his generous personal reference.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a minority report was filed on the original resolution.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The resolution under consideration continues the quota system, as I understand it.

Mr. JONES. For 1 year.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The minority report to the original resolution also objected to the quota system. Several Members are interested in this matter and ought to be heard.

I should like to ask the chairman of the Agricultural Committee if he could not arrange to have this matter come up at a time when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is present. I understand he had some objection, and I do not see him here.

Mr. JONES. Of course, if the gentleman insists that it go over, that is one thing, but I have talked to most of the Representatives from the sugar areas. I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] said he would endeavor to see most of them. I think the gentleman will find no one, under all the circumstances, will want to make objection.

Mr. GREEN. The Florida cane growers object.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is present. I think the gentleman from Iowa will find that all of those who are interested in these areas are anxious to have this rather than no legislation at all, and they are willing to have this passed.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, with the statement that personally I am opposed to the quota system, I see no use objecting at this time or making a speech, but I wish to extend my remarks, and will not further object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Florida cane growers are opposed to this resolution, and unless the chairman of the Agricultural Committee can give us some assurance that at the next session of the Congress these quotas will be raised, I shall be forced to object.

Mr. JONES. Of course, the gentleman understands I do not have the authority to do that, but I can assure him we will go into the question and hold hearings before permanent legislation is offered. The gentleman realizes if he should object to this he may be responsible for bringing about an upset in the sugar industry, particularly so far as the offshore sugar is concerned, and he may wreck the whole industry in America by allowing the thing to get into a state of confusion. I hope the gentleman will not take that responsibility.

Mr. DEROUEN. As a matter of fact, the Louisiana cane producers can produce over one-seventh of the entire production of sugar consumed in the United States, and we are opposed to the present quota; but we are willing at this time to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] that we trust him and hope that in the next Congress we shall have either a just quota or no quota at all.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] that there were many Members signed the minority report on this bill. One of the reasons we signed the minority report was because we believed the domestic sugar market should be preserved for domestic producers. But we understand also that the sugar industry is very anxious to have these quotas effective for at least another year. In view of the fact that the other objectionable features were removed from the bill, I, as one Member who signed the minority report, am willing that this bill be enacted into law and will not offer an objection. May I say to the gentleman from Florida, if I happen to come back here next year, I shall be glad to cooperate in preserving the domestic market for domestic producers.

Mr. GREEN. Under the circumstances I shall not object, but this is a very serious situation. We have hundreds of acres that have been taken out of cultivation, while our people down there are on a starvation basis and at the same time sugar is coming in from other countries. It is not fair.

Mr. JONES. I think the gentleman will find that his producers are much better off than if we had no legislation. If he should object and the quota restrictions on importation should be swept away his producers would be greatly injured if not entirely destroyed. This resolution may not save the situation but it will go far toward doing so. It is all that can be had at this time. No sugar is produced in the district I represent, and it makes little difference to me. But if my people produced sugar beets, or sugarcane, I should certainly want the resolution passed. It will benefit both producer and consumer.

I am sure the gentleman must recognize this fact.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact my name was mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa, may I say that personally I am very much opposed to any kind of restriction on the production of sugar in the continental United States. At the same time, I desire to say that in view of the whole situation I feel that Hawaii is a part of the continental United States when it comes to setting up sugar quotas. Personally, I feel that Florida and Louisiana have a quota at the present time which is entirely inadequate to take care of their productive facilities, and their actual production, and in the future when this question is brought up for permanent legislation, if I happen to be a Member of the House, this gives an indication of what my inclinations will be at that time.

Mr. JONES. I think we all recognize that. Of course, the gentleman recognizes that the consumer must be protected in all this matter. I understand it is only possible for America to produce a small percentage of our sugar needs. Hence, if we place quota limits on importation we must care for consumer interest through reserves and other safeguards.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]?

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

Resolved, etc., That under the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1934, as amended, no further processing, compensating, or floor-stocks tax shall be levied or collected respecting sugar beets or sugarcane or the products thereof as defined by such act, as amended, nor shall any contract be entered into under the provisions of such act, as amended, with the producers of sugar beets or sugar cane, but in all other respects such amendatory act shall be and remain in force and effect until December 31, 1937, and the

quotas established and allotments heretofore made by the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby ratified.

SEC. 2. In order to regulate commerce with Cuba and other foreign countries, among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, with respect to sugar, the quotas for the respective sugar-producing areas shall be the same (subject to modification or adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture under conditions set out in such act) for the calendar years 1936 and 1937 as those initially established by the Secretary of Agriculture for the calendar year 1936: *Provided*, That for the calendar year 1937 there shall be allotted to continental United States not less than 30 percent of any amount of consumption requirements therefor above 6,452,000 short tons, raw value: *Provided further*, That any sugar-marketing quota may be allotted by the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to prevent disorderly marketing or importation of sugar, on the basis of prior allotments under such act, changes in marketing since the first such allotment, marketings during the calendar year 1935, and ability to perform.

The Senate joint 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.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS IN THE VICINITY OF JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11501) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla., as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon.

I may say this is a bill that came up for consideration the other evening, and all of the objectors withdrew their objections except the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], who has been studying the bill for the last 24 hours, and he has now withdrawn his objection.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is not going to cost the Government anything?

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman is correct. It will cost Jacksonville \$300,000.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrances and without cost to the United States, the title in fee simple to such lands as he may deem necessary or desirable on the St. Johns River in the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla., approximately 1,400 acres, as a site for a naval air station to be returned to the grantor if not used by the United States for such purpose within 5 years.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to construct, install, and equip at said station such buildings and utilities, technical buildings and utilities, landing fields and mats, and all utilities and appurtenances thereto, ammunition storage, fuel and oil storage and distribution systems therefor, roads, walks, aprons, docks, runways, sewer, water, power, station and aerodrome lighting, telephone and signal communications, and other essentials, including the necessary grading and filling and the removal of existing structures and installations. He is authorized also to direct the necessary transportation of personnel, and purchase, renovation, and transportation of materials, as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for the purposes of this act, including the expenses incident to necessary development surveys, which appropriation shall continue available until expended: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1136, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 10, par. 1339), shall not apply to the construction of the aforesaid stations and depots.

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. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1936

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Members of the House that the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill, which passed the Senate yesterday, is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House.

I wish to acquaint the Members of the House with the amazing Nation-wide sentiment for the bill. I want to emphasize that the endorsements which I mention are only a few of those which came to my attention. In addition, there are the thousands of endorsements which were sent by organizations and individuals to Members of the Senate and the House, and to the administrative departments concerned with housing, as well as to the White House.

Of the many national organizations and newspapers which have endorsed the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill and are urging its enactment at this session of Congress, I call your attention to a very few, such as:

Christian Science Monitor; Unitarian Ministerial Union; National Council of Catholic Charities; American Association of Social Workers, housing committee; American Federation of Labor; United States Conference of Mayors; National Federation of Settlements; Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; National Public Housing Conference; National Urban League; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; United Mine Workers of America; National Association of Letter Carriers; National Federation of Rural Letter Carriers; Scripps-Howard Newspapers; Stern Newspapers; New York Times; Baltimore Sun; American Institute of Architects; The National Conference of Catholic Women; and the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association.

I believe it may truthfully be said that no major bill has ever come before the Congress which was able to command such universal and widespread support.

Mr. Stuart H. McDonald, Federal Housing Administrator; Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and P. W. A. Administrator, and as such in charge of the housing division; Mr. John H. Fahey, chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board and Home Owners' Loan Corporation; and Miss Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, have all warmly endorsed the bill.

Several State legislatures, many city councils, the United Conference of Mayors, a large number of mayors from large and small cities, rural and urban communities have all endorsed the bill. State housing authorities, as well as municipal housing authorities, are all united behind the United States Housing Act of 1936.

The endorsements also show that business and labor wholeheartedly support this bill. Chambers of commerce, large business and banking institutions are strongly supporting the bill. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor and William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, have publicly declared that the passage of this bill is by far the most important piece of legislation in which labor is interested. Mr. John Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, is equally emphatic in his support of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill. All important social, welfare, and religious agencies, including national organizations of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, are urging the enactment of this bill. The supporters of this bill constitute a cross-section of all the vital forces in America.

Urban and rural communities alike demand passage of this bill. I hope that the House of Representatives, the popular branch of the National Legislature, will speedily pass this bill and thus complete the action already taken by the Senate.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks and to include therein a partial list of the endorsements of that bill which have come from every State in the Union.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania think we ought to pass bills according to endorsements or according to our

own judgment as to whether or not they are for the benefit of the people and in accordance with the Constitution?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I agree with the gentleman from Texas, but I believe the Members of the House would desire to see what responsible organizations in their own districts are in favor of the bill and have endorsed it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many pages of the RECORD will this take?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I do not know.

Mr. RICH. But the gentleman asked to put in all of these endorsements.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Not from individuals, but only from mayors, city counsels, governors, and State legislatures, and so forth.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to putting all that stuff in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

HON. GLENN GRISWOLD, THE VETERANS' FRIEND

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a brief editorial from the Marion (Ind.) Leader Tribune having to do with the life and public service of our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRISWOLD].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, Hon. GLENN GRISWOLD, who is closing his third term of honorable and distinguished service as the Representative of the Fifth Indiana District, was recently, by unanimous sentiment of his party, accorded a renomination without opposition as a recognition of faithful and efficient performance of the duties of his high office.

I have been closely associated with Mr. GRISWOLD during the last 6 eventful years, and long ago I formed a high opinion of him, because I learned from observation that he is a true Representative of the people. His heart beats in rhythm with the heartbeats of the masses who compose the warp and woof of our citizenship. The limits of space will not permit mention in detail of the many ways he has been helpful to the toilers of the country.

Among those he has served with rare devotion and fidelity are the veterans, and by permission of the House I close my remarks by presenting the text of an editorial printed on February 18 last by the Marion (Ind.) Leader-Tribune. This editorial, entitled "The Veterans' Friend", pays a deserved tribute to Mr. GRISWOLD for his loyal and effective championship of veterans' legislation, and is as follows:

THE VETERANS' FRIEND

GLENN GRISWOLD, Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District, was not present in the House when the final vote on payment of adjusted-service certificates to veterans was taken and because of this his political opponents are reported spreading insidious propaganda that he did not support the misnamed bonus bill.

But when opponents of GLENN GRISWOLD begin attacking him on a basis of his support for veterans they make a grave mistake. Few men in Congress have championed the veteran as has GRISWOLD. He has supported the service man, not one time, or two times, but consistently. That GRISWOLD's opponents, who in previous years have condemned him for his support of veterans, now should charge that he did not back the bonus is more than ridiculous. GRISWOLD has never let politics interfere with his convictions on veterans' affairs, and it is unfortunate that those opposed to him have not been content likewise to divorce politics and legislation for the ex-service man.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is easily available in libraries or elsewhere, and anyone having any doubts as to GRISWOLD's loyalty to veterans can remove those doubts by a check of his activities in the House.

In the Seventy-second Congress, GRISWOLD's first, he was one of the 145 signers on the petition to bring the bonus out of committee for a vote. His name has been on the petition at each session since that time. There are 435 Members of Congress and only 145 names on the petition. On June 15, 1932, GRISWOLD spoke on the floor in favor of the bonus, being the only Member from Indiana, either Democrat or Republican, to do so. On the same date he voted on a roll call in favor of the bonus.

In the first session of the Seventy-third Congress GRISWOLD again signed the petition to bring the bonus to a vote, but sufficient signatures were not obtained. On March 11, 1933, GRISWOLD was the

only Indiana Congressman to speak against the economy bill, and on a roll call that day was one of the few Members of either party to vote against the Economy Act. In the second session of the Seventy-third Congress Griswold again signed the petition to bring the bonus to a vote, and on March 12, 1934, he voted in favor of the bonus bill passed by the House but defeated in the Senate.

After signing the petition again in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress Griswold, on March 21, spoke again in favor of the bonus and that day was called to Indiana by the death of a brother. The following day the vote came up, and Griswold was paired in favor of the bill with Representative SUMMERS of Texas against it. This bill later passed the Senate, but was vetoed by the President.

On the following May 22 he voted to override the President's veto, but the measure was killed by the Senate. Last January 10 the bonus bill again came up in the House; Griswold was present and voted in favor of its passage. When the vote to override the President's veto came up in the House last January 13 Griswold, along with some 50 other Congressmen, was not present. The vote was unexpected and contrary to an agreement that a vote would not come up until the following Monday. But there is no doubt of what the Griswold vote would have been. On that date the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows:

"MR. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Griswold, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would have voted 'aye.'"

Griswold's record on veterans' legislation cannot be challenged. It was his resolution which resulted in the investigation of veterans' guardianships here. He championed service men in combatting the Economy Act and in supporting the bonus measure at every session. Opponents who question his record on veterans' legislation are striking weakly at his strongest point.

NATIONAL INCOME AND CREDIT ACT

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a short commendatory statement.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks and including an article concerning me which appeared in the June 15th issue of the magazine, Money, published at 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

MR. GOLDSBOROUGH KNOWS HOW TO USE MONEY TO END CLASS POWER AND TO ENRICH THE PEOPLE

T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH is ranking member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, occupying a position secondary only to that of its chairman, HENRY B. STEAGALL. For 35 years he has been a diligent student of our monetary problem, and today his understanding of that problem is of profound significance.

On August 22, 1935, he introduced a bill known as the National Income and Credit Issue Act, which embodies his knowledge and long experience. It exhibits entire independence of the conventional assumptions of "orthodox" monetary theories, which make man subordinate to money. In its simple and yet daringly creative proposals and the consequences for our daily lives which it implies this bill is one of the most important measures ever put before Congress.

EARLY OBSERVATION LED TO ACTION

In his public career T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH has followed the traditions of his family. His great grandfather, Charles Goldsborough, was elected in 1805 as a Federalist to the Ninth Congress of the United States, and served for five succeeding Congresses before he became Governor of Maryland. He followed the tradition begun by his grandfather, Robert Goldsborough, who was a member of the Continental Congress in 1774 and 1775, and in 1776 was called upon to frame a constitution for the Province of Maryland and thereafter served in the State senate.

T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH, as Charles and Robert had, equipped himself for the law first, and, once admitted to the bar, was soon in public service. In 1904 he was coauthor of the road law of Caroline County, Md., and from 1904 to 1908 served as prosecuting attorney for that county. He was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1921 and he has been reelected ever since.

During this period Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH has served on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and from the very beginning has shown a constructive interest in the problems of money.

As a boy of 10 T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH used to accompany his grandfather, who was a country doctor, on his daily rounds. The boy never got over the impression he received then of poverty amongst farm and industry workers. It set him thinking. Gold was scarce then, and continued to be so until 1898, when large quantities of it were discovered in the Klondike regions and in South Africa. Then prices climbed steadily, and the country enjoyed prosperity. But the prices rose too fast for a permanent prosperity based on gold production. Goldsborough realized that as long as the money supply depended upon gold there could be no stability, and there would always be one class of people who suffered as others profited during recurrent periods of rising and falling prices. His first answer to the problem was to stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar by relating it to the production of commodities instead of gold.

REIGNING MOTIVE FREEDOM

The desire for equality, for justice to all and not to a class, seems to have been the energizing motive of all Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH's activities and to have determined their direction. Legislation must look to economic freedom as well as political freedom if the individual is to be given the opportunity to seek and find his own freedom, which is essential to any concept of liberty. To achieve economic freedom through a release of the pressure of monetary monopoly has always been T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH's aim.

His attitude may be illustrated by reference from a speech May 23, 1922, which he himself quoted in Congress 10 years later:

"Years of reflection convince me that equality of economic opportunity is probably the most serious concern of statesmanship. Class legislation lessens the creative enthusiasm of the group favored by it and restrains the economic development of the group outside the favored class. * * *

"Stabilizing the purchasing power of money, if it can be done, strikes at the very root of class advantage and tends to prevent the inception of movements of special privilege. It is mighty easy to get in the habit of losing sight of the under dog, mighty easy to garb with the cloak of conservatism the golden calf of indifference to the common weal."

HIS PROGRESS EVOLUTIONARY

It is exceedingly interesting to trace the evolutionary progress of T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH's proposals to Congress from his first bill which advocated stabilizing the purchasing power of money by the use of what is known as the commodity dollar to the present bill, H. R. 9216, which does not attempt to control price levels specifically, but strikes deeper at the core of our modern economic evils. He has advanced from a preoccupation with monetary standards of value upon which to base purchasing power to a knowledge of the use of credit to evoke real values; from a belief in the submission of man to natural forces to a belief in a creative demand upon nature by man; from gold standard to commodity standard, to a credit standard based on our capacity to produce. The first purely artificial, the second nearer the truth but only touching the surface of it, the third fundamental. This progress really marks a revolutionary change in attitude—from a concept of money as the controller of our lives (even as a benevolent despot) to the concept of the monetary system as a mere convenience to enable us to do what we want to do.

The Goldsborough bill of 1922 assumed that the gold standard and the elements of a "sound" banking system were laws of nature and must be retained. As the price of commodities rose or fell the gold content of the dollar was to be proportionately altered, conversely, of course. By this means it was felt that the dollar could be given a stable purchasing power.

The intent of the legislation cannot be better formulated than in a speech which Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH made in 1924 before the Maryland State Banking Association:

"* * * there is no attempt in this legislation to control the price level of individual commodities. They will move in accordance with the law of supply and demand, but the purpose is to keep the average the same, so that the value of money in an aggregate of the general commodities which it will buy will not appreciably change. In other words, while flour and butter and eggs and chicken and meat and sugar and coffee will individually vary in price, the filled market basket made up of these different commodities can always be purchased with the same amount of money."

It is not at all certain that existing gold reserves would have been adequate in practice so as to insure the success of an attempt to maintain the dollar's purchasing power at a constant level by varying in gold content. Oil and water will not mix and neither will the gold dollar and the commodity dollar.

THE 1934 BILL

This artificial mechanism was abandoned in the bill introduced by Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH in 1934. "To establish the Federal Monetary Authority and to control the currency of the United States."

The Federal Monetary Authority as contemplated by the bill, was in a sense a central bank of issue. It was given power to "issue circulating currency in such amount as the Authority from time to time finds necessary to carry out its powers." The bill declared it to be the policy of the United States to restore and maintain the normal purchasing power of the dollar "which shall for the purpose of this act be the average purchasing power of the dollar for all commodities during the year 1926." The powers given to the Monetary Authority were very broad and very indefinite. "The powers of the Authority", the bill says, "shall be exercised to such extent and in such manner as in the judgment of the Authority will best effectuate the declared policy." Whatever the deficiencies of the bill, it clearly recognizes that the community's credit was to be used for the welfare of all. A monetary authority was established which had the right of issuing money for the public good and quite apart from any private financial interest.

CURRENT BILL HIS MOST FUNDAMENTAL

The complete development of Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH's thought is to be found in the National Income and Credit Issue Act which he introduced last August and on which hearings have been recently held before the Banking and Currency Committee. Here is no attempt to stabilize prices while leaving them open to the arbitrary manipulations of a privately controlled monetary system. The private monopoly of credit is abolished outright. Congress

resumes its constitutional duty and right of issuing money and regulating its value. Through the medium of a retail discount and national consumer's dividend, based on our unused productive facilities, credit is issued "to provide monetary income to the people of the United States" * * * ample at all times to enable the people to buy wanted goods and services at full capacity of the industries and commercial facilities of the United States."

The provisions of the pending bill are foreshadowed by the remarks of Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH at the hearings on the Banking Act of 1935. We quote a few of these:

"I never had in mind, and I never introduced in Congress, any bill which would require the national debt to be paid immediately. There is only about \$5,000,000,000 of bonds which are callable now. It seems to me that to start a system of teaching society that banking is one thing and the issuance of currency an entirely different thing would not only relieve society of a tremendous burden of interest, but would be a great educator, because, in my opinion, we are never going to do anything by creating more debt except to create a pseudo prosperity which will carry us along a few years longer and then, as by building up capital goods and selling on the installment plan with the use of more credit, have a greater collapse than we have now."

"When you reduce taxes you declare a national discount, do you not?"

"What I am suggesting is that in a country as rich as this is we ought to be stockholders and not bondholders, and we ought to get rid of the enormous creditor element and creditor complex and manipulation which is going on in this country. That is what I am talking about, and, in my judgment, unless it is done, we are ultimately destroyed; the debtor is a slave to the creditor, and the tremendous banking forces of this country absolutely run the country. Either that class has got to take its normal position in society, or else it is going to swallow us all up, and for this reason: In this machine age, where, as a matter of fact, labor is constantly being released from industry, you have got to get some system whereby you can declare a national dividend either by a direct dividend or by a discount system. It cannot be done in any other way, in my opinion."

CONGRESS WOULD LAY DOWN POLICY

"During all of the ages the battle of the people has been for a government of laws and not of men, and all of my investigations during a period of 35 years have taught me the truth of the saying of one of the Rothschilds, 'If you give me control of the credit and money of a country, I will control everything in it.'

"So it seems to me that a legislative direction ought to be directly injected into the monetary system, and that too much discretion, except insofar as the mechanics and the technical phases of the law are concerned, should not be left to the administrator. It seems to me it is the duty of Congress to lay down the policy on behalf of the people, that policy to be carried out by the technical experts."

Whatever may be the fate of the specific bill now pending, T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH has made a place for himself in history as one of the first to recognize the essentials of financial freedom. These are the transfer of the control of credit from private hands to the community and, no less important, the use of that control in a way to permit the unimpeded operation of our economic system for such purposes as we the people choose. We have come a long way. Much has been done. But much remains to be done. GOLDSBOROUGH has a clear vision of what is necessary. Although he would be the first to disclaim the title, in a true sense he is a seer.

HON. A. J. SABATH

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including some statements of various Members of the House upon the services of the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the following speeches were delivered in the House of Representatives April 1936, by the Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. BYRNS, of Tennessee; Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas; Hon. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR., of Massachusetts; Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois; Hon. DONALD C. DOBBINS, of Illinois; Hon. CLAUDE A. FULLER, of Arkansas; Hon. MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, of Colorado; and Hon. CHESTER THOMPSON, of Illinois, on the occasion of the seventieth birthday and completion of 30 years' service by Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, a Representative from the State of Illinois:

HON. MAURY MAVERICK, OF TEXAS

Distinctive career of Congressman SABATH a credit to his people and to our Nation.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR, OF COLORADO

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted a few moments ago to hear our distinguished majority leader, Mr. BANKHEAD, pay an eloquent and richly deserved tribute to our colleague,

Mr. OLIVER, of Alabama. Such kind words of sincere friendship and admiration are a wonderful inspiration and a dearly cherished feature of our lives. Expressions of that kind lighten our frighteningly onerous and strenuous service and go a long way. On this occasion I take pleasure in calling the attention of the House to the fact that tomorrow the dean of this House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], will reach the period of three-score years and ten, his seventieth birthday. [Applause.]

It has been a genuine delight for me to have served with Mr. SABATH for nearly 28 consecutive years in this House. His services here have been characterized by a high order of American citizenship, by exceptionally efficient and distinguished statesmanship. He has served his great State loyally and well. He has done a world of patriotic and public-spirited good work during these past 30 years that he is now rounding out in this House. He has the admiration and respect of the entire House. During the entire history of our Government, from the time the First Congress met on March 4, 1789, in New York, we have had almost exactly 10,000 Members of the House of Representatives. Of all those 10,000 Members, our colleague from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is the only Member of foreign birth who has ever served 30 years in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

We have had a thousand distinguished men in this House who were born in foreign lands, but the gentleman from Illinois has the rare distinction of being the only one of all of them who has honorably represented our country in the Congress of the United States for 30 years. I feel that is something he and this House have a right to be proud of. In fact, the American Republic has a right to be proud, because it sets a high and encouraging example. It holds out a hope and an inspiration to all other citizens of our country who have come from foreign lands.

I may say that the gentleman's brother, as judge of the domestic relations court in Chicago, has had a most distinguished career. For 30 years he has made a world's record of beneficent services to troubled humanity. I know we all hope that ADOLPH SABATH may have good health and be spared for many more years of membership in this House.

HON. CLAUDE A. FULLER, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, during my service in Congress I have been thrown in close contact with ADOLPHUS SABATH, a distinguished Member of this House, who has had 30 years of continuous and able service in which he has reflected credit upon himself and the position with which he has been honored. Although he is a Representative from a great city, he has always been interested in agriculture, labor, and industry. His every act, every thought, and every heartbeat has been in the interest of his country and those in distress. He is one of the hardest working Members of this body and one of the most conscientious and patriotic citizens with whom I have ever come in contact. I have never known of a more loyal party man. To him it is almost impossible for his party or his friends to do wrong. He possesses and demonstrates the highest principles of statesmanship. For almost 2 years I have served as vice chairman, under him, of what is known as the Sabath real-estate bond investigating committee. It is almost entirely due to his untiring efforts that multiplied millions of dollars have been saved to bondholders, most of whom are in need and have invested their life's savings in these bonds. Often have I sent him home when he was physically exhausted working in their behalf. One of his greatest faults is taking his responsibilities too seriously, often to the impairment of his health.

He is a striking example of what a poor boy of foreign birth can accomplish in America. He knows what it is to feel the pangs of hunger and to long for the friendly voice or handshake of a friend. He knows the rough and rugged road one travels from obscurity to a position of honor and esteem. He never forgets those who have befriended him. He is an untiring worker not only for the constituency of his district but for the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

May he live long in this land he loves, surrounded by his loved ones and friends. May the winter of his age be as green as spring, as full of blossoms as summer, and as generous as autumn. May all of this period of his life be spent in the Halls of Congress, an honor he so richly deserves. When at last the fires of life grow dim, may the memory of his wonderful achievements in Congress, in behalf of his constituency and all America, fill his soul with peace and perfect joy.

I am sure it is the profound wish of every Member of this House that he enjoy good health, happiness, and Heaven's richest and best gifts during his journey through life.

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, to one who is a newcomer in the field of public service there is a great element of inspiration in the life of our distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois, my good friend, Mr. SABATH. As you reflect upon his whole existence you get a better idea of the fluidity and the speed with which history passes. He was born in the old country only 4 or 5 years before Germany had vanquished France and heaped upon that prostrate country a great indemnity which was really the seed for the World War. He was born just a year after Lee surrendered his sword to Grant at Appomattox; and from the date of his birth and from the time he came to this country as a lad, he has seen the swift-moving panorama of history and has been identified with that portion of American history which is glorious indeed. He came here under an illustrious Roosevelt, and we honor him today under another Roosevelt.

I am glad to add my little meed of praise to the service he has rendered to his constituency, to the State of Illinois, and to the people of the United States.

It was my good fortune to serve during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses on the Select Committee Investigating Real Estate Reorganizations, of which he is the distinguished chairman. I know with what vigor and energy he has applied himself to this work. I know, too, the tax that work has been upon his vitality. No person can go through daily hearings morning and afternoon and then sit in the smoke-filled room in some hotel in a city distant from home pouring over records to prepare for the morrow without having some high regard for the energy, the vigor, and the sincerity with which he has addressed himself to a task that was assigned to him by the Congress of the United States.

He has been a faithful and diligent public servant, and as one of his colleagues from the State of Illinois and from the Republican side of the aisle, it is really a privilege and a pleasure to add my meed of praise to his record of public service today. His has been a distinguished and praiseworthy career.

HON. DONALD C. DOBBINS, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not wish to let pass this opportunity to felicitate our beloved and respected colleague from my own State upon his reaching such an important milestone in his busy and useful life. Now, I want to say to all of you that which I have heretofore said privately and to smaller groups of our Members. ADOLPH SABATH deserves the congratulations of all of us for a record of worthy accomplishment. That record, if we are to judge from his undiminished mental vigor and his fortunate state of health, as well as from the approving regard of his constituents, is one which we may confidently expect to be enlarged to by the addition of many more years to his long period of devoted public service.

One of the commendable qualities possessed in a rare degree by the dean of this House is his willingness to share without stint the benefits of his long experience and his familiarity with public affairs among the younger Members who feel the need of his counsel. Few of us have failed to profit by that generous spirit; and I, for one, wish to make public acknowledgment of my indebtedness to him in that respect, as well as in many, many other ways.

We may well congratulate our colleague upon this propitious birthday; and I think all of you join with me in the happy belief that Judge SABATH is surely destined to have his years of active and outstanding service in this House extended beyond the time that any Member has served here since the birth of the Republic.

HON. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that these eulogies of my very dear friend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] would not be complete if I did not speak on behalf of the entire Democratic delegation from New England as the senior of that delegation, in paying a tribute to him the eve of his seventieth birthday and congratulating him upon having served 30 years in the Congress of the United States. Any Member who has served for even 1 year knows the strain, mentally and physically, which devolves upon every Member of this House. When we consider that ADOLPH SABATH has survived 30 years in Congress through all its legislative battles and through all of the legislative trials and tribulations which he must have undergone, and we look at him today, his fine, hale, and hearty physique, we are all happy that he is with us. I want to congratulate him on behalf of the New England Democratic delegation and to speak the thoughts of every Member of that delegation in wishing him many, many happy, successful, and healthful years. Ad multos annos. [Applause.]

HON. MAURY MAVERICK, OF TEXAS

Distinctive career of Congressman Sabath a credit to his people and to our Nation

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words in tribute to the service of our beloved colleague from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who, when I came to Congress, was so kind to me as a new Member. I have asked favors of him time after time, and he has been patient and sympathetic. I have always appreciated it.

I want also to add that his career is distinctive of the United States of America. As is well known, he was born in Bohemia, a foreign country, and is of Jewish blood. His life demonstrates that, after all, the American people are not prejudiced against a man because he is of foreign birth. It also singles out the United States of America as a nation tolerant of a man of Jewish extraction serving in the chamber of deputies, the parliament, the Congress, or the law-making body of the Nation. He has been a shining light to his own people and an example to the race from which he sprang. He has also been a shining light to the American people.

He is honest, sincere, and has never cared for riches. He has preferred to serve his country and humanity simply, fairly, and courageously.

As a new Member of Congress and as a Member of Congress from the far, great State of Texas, I add my praise of a man who has given this Nation more than a generation of faithful, patriotic service. [Applause.]

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, very few men in the history of this country have ever had the pleasure and privilege of rendering such noble and distinguished service to our country as the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, who today reached his seventieth birthday. As one of his colleagues I desire to congratulate him. I also congratulate his constituents for their selection of such an able and courageous man to represent them in the United States Congress. Judge SABATH, as he is known by his colleagues, is dean of the House, having served in the House of Representatives longer than any other one person. As he was a distinguished judge in the great city of Chicago for a number of years, his background is ideal for the type of service that a Member of Congress is called upon to render. The country is fortunate in having a man of his ability, foresight, and knowledge in the House of Representatives.

Judge SABATH, whose every heartthrob and pulse beat is with the plain people of this country, is a friend of the worker and the poor people. He is a friend of veterans of all wars and their dependents. Judge SABATH was a member of the steering committee for the passage of H. R. 1, known as the bill to pay three and one-half million World War veterans the remainder due on their adjusted-service certificates. He was a member of that committee for a number of years and at the many conferences and meetings of this committee, of which I was chairman, Judge SABATH was seldom absent. His advice and counsel were relied upon by the other members of that committee in our efforts to go in the direction of the best and most effective results. Our efforts were finally crowned with victory and no other Member of this House is entitled to more credit for the payment of these certificates to the World War veterans than is Judge SABATH.

Again, I congratulate him on his 70 years of good living, right thinking, and able and courageous service.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, OF TENNESSEE, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my hearty approval of what has been said in regard to the services of the Honorable A. J. SABATH, of the Fifth District of the State of Illinois.

There is no one in the House who enjoys to a greater extent the respect and the confidence of his colleagues. Neither has anyone ever served his district and his country with greater ability and greater loyalty. He was a Member of the House when I first came to Congress, and for many years has enjoyed the distinction of being one of its leaders. During that time he has not only served as a member of many of its important permanent committees but he has been appointed on a number of important special committees, and is now serving as chairman of the special committee which is investigating the issuance and the pyramiding of bonds upon hotels, apartment houses, and other large buildings in various cities of the country. It can be truly said that by his earnest, able, and conscientious work as chairman of this committee he has saved many millions of dollars to the small investor, and if he had done nothing else as a Member of Congress this accomplishment makes his career a notable one.

The fact that he is also chairman of the steering committee is a further mark of confidence and esteem which his colleagues hold for him.

He has always been loyal to his party and to his administration, and the House loves and admires him because of his loyalty to every obligation and his very earnest, active attention to his duties.

I take pleasure in paying this brief tribute to the distinguished service which he has rendered as one of the leaders of the House, and to express the hope that he may be spared for many years to come in the service of his constituents and his country. [Applause.]

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON, OF TEXAS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I served with the gentleman from Illinois 20 years in this House. No man here has a more genial and delightful personality. I believe that I speak the sentiments of the House when I say that everyone who has served with ADOLPH SABATH is his friend. I do not know of an enemy that he has made in this House and in serving 30 years that is quite an accomplishment.

I think that ADOLPH SABATH is a remarkable Representative of the people. He has not only been a faithful friend of agriculture, but he has been an active farmer himself. He has been one of the great producers of this Nation, and I want to add my humble word of praise to that which others have expressed. [Applause.]

HON. CHESTER THOMPSON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the dean of this House, ADOLPH J. SABATH, has just reached his seventieth birthday and is now serving his thirtieth consecutive year in the House of Representatives, a record never before attained by a foreign-born Member of the House. He has thus served here during peace, during war, during the reconstruction period following the close of the World War, during the "wild" twenties, during the depression, and during the present recovery period. He has seen at first hand real history in the making, and I know is exceptionally proud of the fact that it was his privilege to play such an active part in it all.

It is certain that the United States is a greater nation, a more potent influence in world affairs, because of the service of ADOLPH SABATH, of the great city of Chicago. ADOLPH SABATH never sold his country "short" and was always on the side of patriotic Americanism and righteousness for all the people. He has sponsored much progressive legislation during his many years of service in this House, and his name will go down in the archives of this, the greatest legislative body in all the world, as one of its outstanding Members. He has served on the most important committees and all such service has been most effective. He has never been found wanting or hesitating when the welfare of his adopted land was at stake, and has often raised, effectively, his voice in defense or in opposition to policies of government as he saw them. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the dignity of this branch of our Government has been enhanced because of Mr. SABATH's long service in it. And I speak for the entire Illinois delegation here when I say that we all hope that he will be here many more years in order that the Nation can continue to have the benefit of his wisdom and rare legislative ability.

While Mr. SABATH has been in Congress for the past 30 years, and necessarily absent from his home city of Chicago a greater part of that time, he has nevertheless kept in very close touch with affairs in that great city, and especially with the people in his own section of the great metropolis on Lake Michigan. He has long been a recognized leader there and his advice and counsel has been sought by civic leaders for the last 40 or 50 years, or since he attained his majority. Before coming to Congress he served with much honor and distinction upon the bench in his chosen city, a position which is now occupied by his brother. No task, no job, no effort has been too great for ADOLPH SABATH to tackle if he thought it would be for the benefit of his people, his city, his State, or his Nation. His own people have been coming to him for advice for many years, and he is the real leader in his section of Chicago. He understands the problems, hardships, and handicaps of the poor of a great city, many of whom, like himself, came to the United States from a foreign shore. The name Sabath is legend in Chicago, and with all respect to other members of his fine family, our colleague here in the House is the reason therefor. This man has surely lived a busy, useful life, and the manner in which he has stood up under it is the marvel of his many friends and associates. Mr. SABATH is the head of a large and successful law firm with offices in Chicago, and has, in addition to his fine services in the Congress, attained much prominence in his chosen profession. Chicago is one of the greatest cities in all the world, and it has been leaders like ADOLPH J. SABATH that has made it such.

Not only has our dean given a lifetime to his Nation, his adopted country, but he has not neglected the Democratic Party, with which he became identified early in his career. He has been a member of the Democratic county committee of Cook County for over 40 years and has thus been high in the councils of his party for most of that time. He is still a member of that committee, and if I know anything about practical politics in my State, he will be for many years to come. With all his service here in the House, he has not forgotten the people who live in his district and his ward on the west side of Chicago. With all his contact, official contact with high officials of the United States, and the solving of the problems of a great National Government, he has not neglected his own neighbors and friends at home. They have not and never will forget him; make certain of that; and when I make the statement that A. J. SABATH will be here many years yet and also be a most vital part of the Democracy of the third largest State in the Union, Illinois, I think I know whereof I speak. Mr. SABATH's political activity has not been confined solely to his own ward, district, city, county, or State, but he has taken a most active part in the affairs of the Democratic Party nationally and is frequently in consultation with leaders from throughout the country.

I do not believe that another individual has done as much toward swinging the foreign vote in the great metropolitan centers of the Nation toward the party of which he and I are a part as Mr. SABATH, and a good many of my friends of the Democratic side of the House received much larger majorities in their own districts at various elections because of the effective work done by the gentleman from Illinois among the foreign born and those of immediate foreign extraction. He has always been at the service of his party wherever and whenever possible.

Mr. Speaker, several gentlemen spoke about Mr. SABATH on last Friday and on behalf of the Illinois Democratic delegation, the third largest in this House, I want to thank them. I have always thought it much better to send flowers to the living instead of to the dead, and I know of no better subject of such felicitations than the dean of this House, now 70 years young and in his thirtieth consecutive year in this great legislative body.

A statesman, a friend, an able legislator, a good citizen, may he be spared to us for many, many more years.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I would not be honest with myself nor with the Members if I did not admit that I greatly appreciate the complimentary remarks that have just been made, on the occasion of my seventieth birthday, about me and my 30 years' service in the House. I want you to know that I am sincere when I say that I have always tried, since first entering the House, to be of real service to a great Nation which gave such wonderful opportunities to me and to millions of others. Like many of them, I came from a land that had suffered much, to

find in the United States a country offering liberty, freedom of thought, and opportunity. All my life I have lived among the poorest of people. Because I know what it is to want, and what it means to suffer, I can never forget these people, and during later years, when by their will I represented them in Congress, I was ever mindful of their needs, their hardships, and their problems.

I have always been proud to be a Member of Congress, and have declined other public offices, even though more highly paid. It has been my honor to serve with such outstanding gentlemen as the late Champ Clark, John Sharp Williams, Claude Kitchin, Bourke Cochran, and Henry T. Rainey on the Democratic side and with "Uncle Joe" Cannon, Nicholas Longworth, Jim Sherman, Sereno E. Payne, John Dalzell, and James R. Mann on the Republican side, as well as with hundreds of other able and fearless legislators. All of them at one time or another were subjected to criticism and attack. I have naturally resented the charges that have been brought against Congress, particularly during the past few years, and as one who has served 30 years I think I am qualified to judge as to the loyalty, honesty, and ability of this Congress. In that connection may I say that I consider the membership of this body more truly patriotic, able, honest, and sincere than any other group of people in the Nation, whether they be leaders of industry, of finance, or of any of the other professions.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER] stated that I have always been an ardent Democrat. That is true. I have studied the history of our Nation, and, in my opinion, the principles of the Democratic Party as set down by Jefferson, its founder, embody a more humane understanding of the problems of the poor and the oppressed. I have always felt that the Democratic Party is nearer to the people than any other.

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the expressions of friendship from both sides of the House. It is something I will remember in the years to come. I hope it will be my honor and distinction to continue to serve my country.

May I also express the wish that my old friends, Ed TAYLOR and the Speaker, as well as those other Members who have been so kind as to speak of me today, and the other Members present, equal or surpass my 30 years of service. [Applause.]

LEVISA FORK OF BIG SANDY RIVER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12490) authorizing a preliminary survey examination of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this one of the surveys made in the regular course of operations of the Department without expense?

Mr. MAY. Yes; that is the character of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy with a view to the control of floods in the said Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for control of floods of the Mississippi River, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1917, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "examination", insert "and survey." Page 1, line 9, after the word "for", insert "the"; and in the same line, after the word "of", insert "the."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "River", insert the words "and of the Sacramento River, Calif."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing a preliminary examination of the Levisa Fork of Big Sandy River in the vicinity of the Breaks of Sandy."

CAPT. JAMES W. DARR

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the action of the House taken at my request today in recalling the bill (S. 3405) from the Committee on Military Affairs and laying it on the table.

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

There was no objection.

SUPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it shall be in order

for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause I of rule 27.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course we want to cooperate with the gentleman in facilitating the business of the House, but I wish the gentleman would tell us what he has in mind and why it is necessary to do this at this time. There are several rules that I suspect are going to be called up in the next day or two.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no idea of the particular suspensions, because, of course, that is a matter for the Speaker to decide. I understand there are pending some requests for recognition under suspension of the rules, and this would afford an opportunity to dispose of business more quickly than by special rule. We have rules pending, all of which we may not reach if we are going to adjourn Saturday night.

Mr. SNELL. Is it the gentleman's real, honest hope that we may conclude the business of the session on Saturday night?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is our hope.

Mr. SNELL. But that may be deferred? Of course, I do not care to object to the request but I do feel that if we allow this to go through by unanimous consent we ought to have reasonable notice of what suspensions are to be called by the Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York allow the Chair to make a statement? This request is made by the gentleman from New York at the request of the Chair. It is the hope, as expressed, that we may be able to adjourn sine die Saturday night. Many matters might come up that will require some affirmative action, matters that are not privileged, for which no rule has been provided. The Chair assures the gentleman, if this consent is granted during the remainder of this week, that the Chair will furnish ample notice of any suspension he permits to be called.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, a great many Members are interested in particular bills. If this consent is granted, it will make it necessary for everybody who is interested in any individual bill to be on the floor almost entirely from now until late Saturday night.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I wonder if the Speaker will assure the House that he will not entertain a motion to suspend the rules except during certain portions of the day at least for the next 2 days. A great many Members are interested in individual bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not like to have that put upon his discretion. The Chair assures the gentleman that if any motions are to be entertained to suspend he will give ample notice in advance of the time they are to be called up.

Mr. MAPES. But as I understand it there are several rules that the chairman of the Committee on Rules proposes to bring up tomorrow, so that there will be little, if any, opportunity to consider motions to suspend the rules in any event.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, as a matter of fact, if we are going to finish Saturday night, from now on Members, to be cautious, should be on the floor all of the time, whether or not we have suspensions. Under the rules during the last 6 days the Speaker is authorized to recognize gentlemen for suspensions. If we had known the first of this week that we were going to adjourn on Saturday night, we could have suspended the rules without asking unanimous consent or bringing in a rule. As a matter of fact, we could have brought in a rule more quickly than all this discussion has taken.

Mr. MAPES. Does not the gentleman intend to occupy practically all of tomorrow with rules?

Mr. O'CONNOR. As far as I know, that is the program, subject to the Speaker's direction.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, one other matter. Of course, it is the duty of every Member to be here all of the time, and each Member wants to be here, but there are con-

ferences which Members have to attend. Could we have it understood that where there are matters that are controversial the ones interested in them will be notified?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If anybody knows they are interested; but it is a rather difficult thing to know whether certain Members are interested or not.

Mr. BLANTON. There are a great many matters that are known to be controversial that have run along through the session. Take, for instance, the proposed \$100,000 resolution to have a committee investigate the Black Legion, and wasteful, useless things of that kind.

The SPEAKER. The Chair demands the regular order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it proper to state that, owing to the death of the Senator from Florida, it is the expectation to adjourn in a short time. A number of gentlemen are seeking recognition, and if the request is made to meet earlier tomorrow, I think we could take care of all these matters before we go on with the regular program.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from New York had assured the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow] that the House would not meet until 12 o'clock tomorrow. With that assurance given, just a short time ago there was a conference arranged with the Senate for 11:30.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object, because I have a conference with the Senate conferees at 11:30.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I make the point of order that the Chair had submitted the unanimous-consent request, and there was no objection made.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I did object; and I was on my feet to have an understanding about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The RECORD will show that the unanimous-consent request was submitted and there was no objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I was on my feet, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is proper to recognize the purpose and intention of the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. It was upon the assurance of the gentleman from New York that we would not meet until 12 o'clock that this conference with the Senate was arranged.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LARRABEE, indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4424. An act to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the development of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 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. 1392. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the island of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Addie I. Tryon and Lorin H. Tryon;

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. 6258. An act for the relief of D. E. Woodward;

H. R. 9153. An act for the relief of Evelyn Harriett B. Johnstone;

H. R. 9185. An act to insure the collection of the revenue on intoxicating liquor, to provide for the more efficient and economical administration and enforcement of the laws relating to the taxation of intoxicating liquor, and for other purposes;

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. 9484. An act to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

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. 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. 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. 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. 12419. An act to apply laws covering steam vessels to seagoing vessels of 300 gross tons and over propelled by internal-combustion engines;

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 laws on all property and premises belonging to the United States of America; and

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.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1318. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and adjust irrigation charges on irrigation lands within projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes;

S. 1795. An act to effectuate certain provisions of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at The Hague on November 6, 1925;

S. 1976. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes", approved April 15, 1926, so as to equalize the allowances for quarters and subsistence of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

S. 3257. An act to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act;

S. 3344. An act to appoint one additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky;

S. 3488. An act to provide for an examination and survey to determine the best utilization of the surplus waters of the San Juan River and the Animas River and to determine the feasibility and cost of storing such waters and of diverting them to the Rio Chama and Rio Grande;

S. 3784. An act 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;

S. 3805. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve certain lands on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Walker River Indian Reservation;

S. 3907. An act for the relief of the State of Nevada;

S. 3997. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Eighteenth National convention of the American Legion, at Cleveland, Ohio, during the month of September 1936;

S. 4038. An act to amend an act of Congress approved March 3, 1863, entitled "An act to reorganize the courts in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

S. 4105. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission of Maryland for park, parkway, and playground purposes;

S. 4132. An act to amend section 4b of the National Defense Act, as amended, relating to certain enlisted men of the Army;

S. 4252. An act to provide for the modification of the contract of lease entered into on June 12, 1922, between the United States and the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans;

S. 4461. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownville, Nebr.;

S. 4462. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa;

S. 4463. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the cities of South Sioux City, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa;

S. 4584. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), to extend and adapt its provisions to the convention between the United States and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals concluded at the city of Mexico February 7, 1936, and for other purposes;

S. 4618. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

S. 4654. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1923;

S. 4658. An act to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes;

S. 4667. An act to prohibit the commercial use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation pursuant to the obligation of the Government of the United States under article 28 of the Red Cross Convention signed at Geneva July 27, 1929;

S. 4680. An act authorizing the State of Wisconsin to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near La Crosse, La Crosse County, Wis.;

S. 4709. An act authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County, Pa.;

S. 4710. An act authorizing the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the West Branch of the Delaware River between a point in the vicinity of the village of Hancock, Delaware County, N. Y., and a point in the town of Buckingham, Wayne County, Pa.;

S. 4734. An act to provide for hurricane patrol in the Gulf of Mexico and environs during the hurricane season;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1936, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski;

S. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for participation by the United States in the 1936 Sixth World's Poultry Congress;

S. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Indians of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor; and

S. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Gros Ventre Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, officers of a constitutional government, in dealing with any problem, must act within powers granted to them by their constitution. Worthy motives and a friendly disposition toward humanity have no significance unless these good intentions can be translated into workable legislation. A political party must stand or fall on the record of its accomplishments.

The Constitution of the United States establishes a dual system of government. By the Constitution the people gave the Federal Government certain limited powers. They reserved certain others powers to the States. Some powers the people denied both to State and Federal Governments.

The first duty of statesmanship in attempting the solution of any problem is to decide what part of the problem is appropriate for Federal action, what part must be left to State action, and what part is completely outside the field of government. No statesman, whatever his aspirations, deserves credit for proposing a solution of a problem in which he assigns to the Federal Government what is reserved to the States, to the States what belongs to the Federal Government, or to either what is beyond the jurisdiction of both.

The position of government can be illustrated by a reference from the field of agricultural cooperation. Suppose the apple growers of the entire United States decided to organize cooperative associations for the national marketing of apples. A plan is adopted by which all producers of apples who join the organization set up National and State associations. Under the plan every apple grower is a member of the national association. The articles of incorporation provide that the national association may market apples in foreign countries and in all cities having a population in

excess of 100,000. The State associations are responsible for preparing the crop for market, and are allowed the privilege of marketing it within the State of origin outside the metropolitan centers. It is further provided that neither the national association nor the State associations may interfere with the individual grower in respect to the raising of apples for his own consumption or in making local sales directly from his farm.

In the course of time, the directors of the national association may be convinced that it is unwise longer to permit the State associations to conduct any marketing operations or for the individual producer to make local sales. The sensible thing for the directors to do would be to call a meeting of the members, explain the whole matter to them and ask them to vote on a charter amendment giving the national association increased authority and cutting down the power of the State associations and of the individual grower. What would one think of the business judgment of the directors if, instead of following the orderly legal and corporate processes for carrying out their ideas, they should issue a series of arbitrary orders denying the granted privileges of the State associations and the producers? Such edicts would have no binding authority. Even if accepted by many producers, they would be sure to be ignored or challenged by others. Dissention and conflict would disrupt the organization. The outcome would be a period of futile activity, at the end of which the evils sought to be removed would be as prevalent as ever. It would be no answer to a charge of bad management against the directors that they were genuinely devoted to the interests of the producers.

Dictatorship has significant advantages over representative government in the attainment of immediate objectives. The American people have always preferred Democratic processes to the swifter action of the dictator because they have believed that the benefits of dictatorship are purchased at too high a cost.

One basic defect of the Roosevelt administration has been that it has constantly sought to attain its ends by the methods of dictatorship and has neglected its opportunities for the solution of problems within constitutional limitations. A President and the political party are not restricted in their influence to Federal agencies. The President is the leader of his party and can accomplish much, not only through the State organizations of his party but through appeals to public opinion. Centralization of control in Washington is not the only way to bring about reforms. Uniform State laws and interstate agreements can reach many evils with which a President and his political party may legitimately be concerned.

President Roosevelt, when Governor of New York, was an eloquent advocate of home rule by the States. In his radio address, March 2, 1930, he said:

It was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation, such as was wholly practical to Great Britain, would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself.

In the same speech he made this prophetic comment:

The doctrine of regulation and legislation by master minds, in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find master minds so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost Godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interests of the country, but there are none in our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the technique of history.

Now, to bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles of which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger.

President Roosevelt would be entitled to a higher rank as a constructive statesmen if he had followed the advice of Governor Roosevelt instead of taking counsel of impatient innovators with little faith in American institutions. He has forgotten to weigh the advantages of reaching desirable ends by constitutional instead of unconstitutional methods. The President has expressed at times his irritation that the Supreme Court has thwarted his laudable aims by declaring unconstitutional most of the Democratic legislative program. The Supreme Court, however, has not been concerned with President Roosevelt's good intentions. Its function has been to declare the law. It has found the Federal Government was attempting to exercise powers which the Constitution denied to it.

The Constitution, however, can be amended. When the people's demand is clear, amendment can be brought about with great rapidity. The twentieth amendment, changing the time of the Presidential, Vice Presidential, and congressional terms, was submitted to the States March 30, 1932, and proclaimed in effect October 10, 1933. The twenty-first amendment, repealing national prohibition, was submitted to the States February 21, 1933, and its ratification proclaimed December 5 of the same year. The Democrats during President Roosevelt's administration have controlled both Houses of Congress by a large majority. If the Democratic Party believes that the people should give the Federal Government increased constitutional authority, it has the numerical strength in Congress to propose to the people that this authority be granted. No such action has been proposed.

The Republican Party stands for the Constitution and the preservation of American ideals of liberty and home rule. It opposes the increase of centralized authority in Washington because it fears the growth of Federal bureaucracy and the consequent destruction of our dual system of State and Federal Governments. The Republican Party, however, has never resisted a real popular demand for constitutional modification. Whenever the people themselves are convinced that the Constitution in its present form impedes the proper solution of present-day problems, especially by unduly restraining the power of the States, the Republican Party is ready to invoke the orderly processes provided in the Constitution itself for its amendment.

INCREASING YEARLY DEFICITS

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was seeking election to the office of President of the United States, he promised the electorate that he would balance the Budget and end the deficits in the Federal Treasury. On March 4, 1933, he took the oath of office as President. He was then in a position to fulfill his promises. What has he done? During the first full fiscal year he was in office, 1934, the deficit was \$3,989,496,035; in 1935 it amounted to \$3,575,357,964. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau estimates it will be \$5,966,000,000 for the fiscal year 1936. The deficit for these 3 years will amount to a total in excess of thirteen and one-half billion dollars.

Postmaster General Farley and other administration spokesmen are beginning to bombard the people with arguments to the effect that what Mr. Roosevelt said before election was all right for campaign purposes, but that he could not be expected, after election, to do what he had promised. Of course, there is an old saying about a man's word being as good as his bond, which certainly has no application to President Roosevelt and the New Dealers. However, it is not my purpose at this time to discuss the question whether it is proper or right for a Presidential candidate to campaign for office on one set of promises and to perform entirely differently when he assumes office. Nor am I now concerned with the argument that when President Roosevelt assumed office on March 4, 1933, he found that conditions were different from those he had anticipated. This argument, of course, resolves itself into the simple proposition that Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate did not know the true condition of the affairs of the Nation. Instead, I am concerned with the question of the effect on the country of President Roosevelt's actions while in office. What has been done is a matter of record.

We cannot change it, but it is our duty to consider the President's activities and to attempt to determine their effect on us as a Nation.

What is the meaning of deficits? How do they affect governments and people? Where are the Roosevelt deficits taking us, and what will be the effect? These are the questions with which I am now concerned and to which I shall direct myself.

The word "deficit" means, in plain language, that during a given period of time the Government has spent more than it earned. The Government is no different from any citizen so far as its revenues and expenses are concerned. It receives income in the form of taxes and other collections from the people. It spends this money in hundreds of ways; many of these are plainly evident; others are not so obvious. When it spends more than it takes in it has a deficit and it is compelled to borrow the difference. There is nothing mysterious about the deficits of the Government. They mean simply that the Government has spent more than it has received in revenues.

There are times in the lives of all of us when unexpected things happen which compel us to spend more than we earn. Often we have to borrow the additional moneys we need. This is to be expected because life is full of uncertainties. However, when such a situation occurs the prudent individual hitches up his belt and begins to live sufficiently within his income to permit him to pay off his debts. This is not only the honest thing to do, but it is a matter of prudence because other similar occasions will arise in the future, and the individual's ability to secure assistance in meeting future crises will depend to a large extent upon the manner in which he has handled such situations in the past. If he does not curtail his expenditures, and if he continues year after year to spend more than he earns, his debts become larger and larger until he is forced into bankruptcy. The longer an individual continues to spend more than he earns the harder it is to avoid bankruptcy and to regain solvency.

The same principles which are applicable to individuals are equally true of nations. Emergencies arise in the histories of nations just as they do in the lives of individuals. In the case of nations these emergencies may be in the form of war, of earthquakes, of drought, or other catastrophes, but a nation cannot afford any more than an individual to continue year after year to spend more than it takes in. If it does, it inevitably winds up at one of two places—bankruptcy or wild inflation, and wild inflation means ultimate bankruptcy. The way this works is simple. For a time the Government is able to borrow by issuing its bonds to people who are willing to lend it money. Then comes the time when the Government's credit is no longer good, and people are not willing to lend money to it. The Government is then compelled to either repudiate its obligations or to print paper money. Repudiation is bankruptcy. The continued printing of paper money means that the money has less and less behind it; therefore, the money buys less and less, until finally the whole system collapses. We have had examples of this in recent years. We can all remember when a loaf of bread in Russia cost a million rubles. Similar conditions prevailed in Germany, Poland, Austria, and other nations. The collapse of a monetary system is likely to involve the collapse of government, with all the attendant injurious effects on the life of the nation.

In the light of these facts, the acts of the present administration are too serious to ignore. Since March 4, 1933, the Federal Government has spent almost \$2 for every dollar of revenues received by it. Receipts and expenditures have been as follows:

Fiscal year—	Receipts	Expenditures
1934.....	\$3,115,554,050	\$7,105,050,085
1935.....	3,800,467,202	7,355,825,166
1936 (estimated).....	3,875,000,000	9,882,000,000
Total.....	10,791,021,252	24,342,875,251

In 3½ years from March 4, 1933, to June 30, 1936, the Federal Government under President Roosevelt will have spent more than \$26,000,000,000. This is \$5,000,000,000 more than the total amount of the public debt when he took office. This is more than all the Presidents of the United States from Washington to Wilson spent in a period of 124 years. To make matters worse, every fiscal year of President Roosevelt's administration has seen an expenditure greater than the preceding year.

This is a horrible performance by an administration which came into office pledged to reduce Federal expenditures by 25 percent and to bring expenditures within revenues. But of far more importance than broken promises is the fact that the country is being hurtled into disaster by the mad, reckless spending of the President. As a candidate Mr. Roosevelt could see the dangers involved in such a situation. His speeches were full of warnings against it, and they contained promise after promise to make the Federal Government live within its income. Since he became President he either cannot or will not heed sound advice and the truths of history. He is intoxicated with the joy of spending. He forgets that his responsibility includes the welfare of more than 125,000,000 men, women, and children, and those generations who are as yet unborn. He forgets that a continuance of his extravagant, wasteful, and reckless expenditures will inevitably bring disaster, and that this disaster will envelop not merely one group of people but every person in the country.

The Democratic Congresses have made no attempt to curb the President. They have voted him unheard-of amounts to spend in any way he chose. In 1933 they gave him \$3,300,000,000 which he could allocate and spend without restriction. In 1935 they gave him \$4,880,000,000 with no restrictions whatever. These moneys were in addition to all the other billions which were provided him for the regular operations of the Government. No other President has ever been given such power or such money. No other President has used the people's money so recklessly. It is high time for the American people to put a stop to this flagrant extravagance in the Federal household. There is one way to do it—vote the present administration from office.

CENTRAL VALLEY WATER PROJECT—ITS FEASIBILITY

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it has become quite apparent that many of those who have voiced arguments in opposition to the subject of reclamation in general, and to the Central Valley water project of California in particular, are far from being perfectly informed in respect to these great conservation projects concerning which they assume to speak.

So much misinformation has been spread over the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these last few weeks that I, in the interest of a better understanding, am constrained to offer, with as little personal comment as possible, a few excerpts from several reports rendered upon the Central Valley water project by various governmental agencies and officials—reports which, all will agree, are of the highest authority. A merely superficial consideration of the extracts and quotations which I shall include herein will demonstrate the woeful lack of knowledge on the part of those who have assumed the role of critic, a lack of knowledge which might be described by another less friendly as an ignorance approaching completeness.

Notwithstanding the great distances they have traveled from the truth, I do not desire to be understood as questioning the honesty of their motives nor the sincerity of their purpose, and least of all do I desire to indulge in personalities in the presentation of the case of the Central Valley water project, the attainment of which is so important to the welfare of some 900,000 people who have established their homes and are now dwelling within this great interior basin of California. Therefore it will be my purpose in these remarks to confine myself to a dispassionate discussion of a few of the demonstrable facts regarding this great conservation project, facts as they have been developed and

revealed by reliable agencies of the Federal Government itself, facts which have been disputed by those that are unfriendly to this projected development in central California.

Climatic conditions and farming methods are widely different in the semiarid West from those that pertain in other parts of the Nation. There being no rainfall during the summer and fall seasons, agriculture is largely dependent on irrigation, which makes water the first necessity for successful agriculture. Therefore, projects in aid of agriculture in the West generally involve water-conservation developments. These projects, to be economic, are often large and complicated and involve other uses of water besides irrigation, such as navigation, flood control, and the development of the electric power. It is not my purpose to attempt to describe the Central Valley water project in detail, as an adequate description of it could not be compressed within the limited space which has been made available to me.

Because of exhaustive studies heretofore made, it is possible to develop the facts regarding this project from the writings of those in highest authority, namely, from the reports of Federal agencies, all official in character, which were written after the completion of painstaking and thoroughgoing investigations. For years the Central Valley water project has been under study by the most eminent engineers, by official agents of the State of California for more than two decades, and by the Federal Government, through its various agencies, for more than 6 years.

During this time the Central Valley project has been subjected to every analysis, both in the field and office, and has been reported upon by the following Federal agencies: By various committees of the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate; by the Departments of Interior, War, and Agriculture; by the Public Works Administration; by the Federal Power Commission; by the President's Water Flow Committee; by the National Resources Board. Finally, and within recent months, it has been reported upon by the President of the United States himself.

In arriving at a conclusion as to just what are the real facts concerning the Central Valley project, it is my hope that you will consider neither the assertions of the proponents nor the arguments of the opponents of the project as they have been bandied about on Capitol Hill, but that you will accept the carefully considered conclusions of your official advisers as set forth in these reports of the officials of the various national agencies which I have just named. These reports, remarkable in the unanimity of their findings, are, and of right should be, accepted by the membership of this House as entirely trustworthy in their treatment of the facts involved.

FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

A hasty reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose that doubt exists in the minds of some of the Members of this body concerning the financial feasibility of the project, its engineering adequacy and cost, and its necessity as well as its effect, good or bad, on agriculture as an industry. These questions are all answered authoritatively in the reports which I have already referred to.

As we begin our investigations in relation to the question of financial feasibility, admittedly a most important phase of any engineering project that may be advocated, we find that there is a wealth of pertinent data to which resort may be made. Preliminarily, it is well to refer to the fact that the State of California in 1934 made application to the Public Works Administration for a loan and grant for the construction of the project under the approved financial standards then in force, namely, a 30-percent grant and a loan of the balance at 4-percent interest.

The application was given the usual careful check by the Public Works Administration, first in California by the P. W. A. State engineer, who rendered a favorable report, and later by higher authority in Washington. The conclusions of the Public Works Administration investigation were set forth in a lengthy report from its Finance Division, which was dated July 9, 1934. The writers of this report, impressed

with the possibilities involved in the projected development, recommended a further study of certain phases of the scheme. From this report I offer the following quotation:

While an approval of the loan could apparently be made based upon the applicant obtaining contracts for the sale of sufficient water and power, the securing of part of the loan by general-obligation bonds, and provided numerous conditions were also complied with, this examiner feels that the magnitude of this project is such, and its effect may be so far reaching in relation to the United States as a whole, that further studies should be made. These studies should, among other things, consider two important factors, namely:

1. The advantages or disadvantages should be analyzed of including this project, in both its initial and ultimate development, as a part of a long-range public-works program.

2. An economic study should be made to determine as accurately as possible the effect upon the State of California, and the United States as a whole, of the construction of this project.

It will be noted that the force of the recommendation of this report is that, while an approval of the loan could apparently be made under certain conditions without further investigation, in the opinion of the Finance Division further studies should be made and consideration given to every phase of the economic problem involved before final action by the Public Works Administration should be taken.

Pursuant to this recommendation, an economic study was made under the auspices of the National Resources Board, and an exhaustive report was thereafter, in February 1935, rendered. This report is a complete review of the entire project from the economic and social viewpoints. It has been described as the most complete study ever made of any national project. This report is likewise so voluminous as to prevent the inclusion at this point of but a few quotations, each of which is characteristic of the thought which inspired the document. I quote:

Project of the order of that herein stated is imperative.

The expenditures * * * are economically justifiable.

The interests of the Federal Government in the Central Valley project are greater than the proposed plan of financing recognized.

Federal participation is not only economically justified but necessary.

During the years 1933 and 1934 the Central Valley project was also under investigation by the War Department to determine its feasibility. The conclusions of the Chief of Engineers regarding this phase of the project can be found in House Document No. 191, Seventy-third Congress, second session, from which the following is quoted:

* * * Plans for the Kennett and Keswick Dams, the Friant Reservoir, and irrigation canals in connection with the latter, are well developed from an engineering standpoint and may be promptly undertaken when funds for the purpose are made available. Should they be incorporated in the public-works program provided in the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Federal contribution of 30 percent of the cost of labor and material employed on the project, as provided for in that act, would, from the figures presented by the division engineer, place these projects on a self-supporting basis. Subject to these remarks, I concur in the conclusions and recommendations of the Board.

While the War Department was engaged with its investigation, the project was carefully studied by the Federal Power Commission on its own responsibility, particularly in connection with its power possibilities. The report of the Federal Power Commission, dated June 4, 1934, was transmitted to the Public Works Administration by the chairman of the Commission. His letter of transmittal contains the following statement:

The Commission has examined and considered docket 7030 and the Chief Engineer's report, and find that if the United States shall make a direct and special contribution to the cost of the Kennett Dam, covering the benefits to navigation, flood control, and salinity control, as determined and recommended by the Chief of Engineers, War Department, and approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, and if the Administrator shall include the project in the comprehensive program of public works provided for by the National Industrial Recovery Act, and allow the usual 30-percent grant, with interest rate of 4 percent on the net loan and a 50-year term for complete liquidation thereof, the project will be self-liquidating.

The reports of the Public Works Administration, National Resources Board, War Department, and Federal Power Commission, just quoted, all deal with the feasibility of the

Central Valley project under the P. W. A. application. It is gratifying to note in passing that the deferred P. W. A. decision, deferred pending the rendition of an economic report, when finally released, proved to be as unqualifiedly favorable as were the reports of the War Department and Federal Power Commission hereinbefore referred to.

An important point should be noted in connection with all of these reports. Their consideration of the subject of financial feasibility was entirely controlled by the then prevailing standard for financing, namely, a grant limited to 30 percent. At present P. W. A. financing is authorized on a 45-percent-grant basis instead of the earlier 30 percent, a change in policy which is manifestly much more favorable to the borrower. If an appropriation is made for the Central Valley project under the terms of the bill which is now under consideration by this House, neither of these financing plans will be availed of. On the contrary, the money would be loaned and repaid under the terms of the reclamation law; that is, on a basis of interest-free lending, full repayment of the principal advanced, an arrangement which works out about the same from the borrowers' standpoint as would the 45-percent grant, and much more advantageously than it would under the old 30-percent-grant basis, in contemplation of the continuation of which the reports were made. Therefore, these agencies having found the project financially feasible on the 30-percent-grant basis, there should be no doubt of its financial integrity under the terms of the more favorable plan.

The Commissioner of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the President of the United States have found the Central Valley project feasible from the engineering, agricultural, and financial standpoints and as a Federal reclamation project.

In further emphasis of the project's feasibility as a reclamation project I am including in these remarks at this point a copy of a letter which I, under the comparatively recent date of June 15, 1936, received from John C. Page, Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, the body of which is as follows:

In answer to your inquiry by telephone, may I say that the Bureau of Reclamation is pushing the preliminary work on the Central Valley project to a rapid conclusion at this time.

The engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation are completely satisfied that the merits of this project warrant and demand its immediate construction. They have checked the plans made by the State of California, and to date these studies have served only to emphasize the fact that the State's plan is economical and agriculturally sound, and that it is excellent from a technical engineering standpoint.

I have no doubt that the project will be self-liquidating under the Reclamation Act and that it is an excellent investment of Federal funds. The grave situation created by the water shortage in the San Joaquin Valley is a national concern.

That the project is considered as having met the standards of the reclamation law is evidenced in the following letter which was sent to the President of the United States by the Secretary of the Interior under date of November 26, 1935:

I find that the project is feasible from engineering, agricultural, and financial standpoints, that it is adaptable for settlement and farm homes, that the estimated construction cost is adequate, and that the anticipated revenues will be sufficient to return the cost to the United States.

The Commissioner of Reclamation has approved and recommended the construction of the project. I therefore recommend the approval of the Central Valley development as a Federal reclamation project.

On December 2, 1935, the contents of this letter were approved by the President of the United States, and, by adoption by the Chief Executive, became the feasibility order for the project.

In connection with the feasibility of the project I wish to quote also the following excerpt from a letter from President Roosevelt to Senator HIRAM W. JOHNSON, of California, dated November 4:

I realize that the basis of this development is the conservation of the waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that through such conservation there will be a great increase in the volume of water available for irrigation, domestic uses, and the generation of hydroelectric power. I am satisfied that the

demand both for water and cheap power in California is so great that no difficulty need be anticipated in finding a market for both as soon as development has reached a state where their delivery is assured and contracts with definite terms are possible.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the conclusions of the national agencies, above quoted, should be accepted as determinative of the matter of the financial feasibility of the Central Valley project; and since no Federal agency has reported adversely in respect to feasibility as a reclamation project, that phase of the investigation ought to be deemed and treated as settled.

ENGINEERING ADEQUACY

The adequacy of certain features of the engineering plan of the project has been questioned in this House. In view of the overwhelming evidence on this point, it is difficult to understand the basis of such charges. If there has ever been any real reason for concern on this score, the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, from which I quote further, ought to dispel every doubt:

After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views and recommendations of the Board. The comprehensive State plan for the conservation of water resources in the Central Valley affords, in my opinion, the best general plan for the improvement of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers for navigation and for the prosecution of this work in combination with the development of water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation.

The Chief of Engineers, in a hearing before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House on the Central Valley project held April 13, 1934, further expressed his complete approval of the Central Valley plan from the engineering standpoint in these emphatic words:

I believe (this great system) to be as well devised as anything that has come to my engineering attention and thinking * * *.

The concluding part of the Federal Power Commission report, passing upon the engineering feasibility, is equally final:

The Central Valley project is a proper, logical, and desirable undertaking in the development of the natural resources of California.

The report of the Public Works Administration, Finance Division, from which I have heretofore quoted, states conclusions no less commendatory:

The project, based on available data and investigations, appears highly desirable, and the indirect and intangible benefits should apparently be great and affect the entire State.

The President's Water Flow Committee, in 1934, issued a comprehensive report on water projects in the entire United States, a report which has become widely known as House Document No. 395 (73d Cong., 2d sess.). This committee selected what were, in its opinion, the best 10 water-development projects in each of 6 regions of the United States, and from the selected 60 it designated the 10 which are now regarded as the most promising projects in the United States. The committee rated the Central Valley project as no. 1 in the Pacific region and as no. 5 for the country as a whole. In its report the committee states, in regard to this California project:

It is the most carefully considered and complete plan of its kind ever drawn up.

Despite anything that may have been said to the contrary, the engineering plan of the Central Valley project is the best plan that has been devised, and the only one that is possible of attainment, which will serve to arrest the development of the conditions of the desert which threatens the homes and happiness of more than 50,000 persons who, in their despair, are appealing to this Congress.

The project necessarily involves bold engineering features which will not be here explained, but suffice it to say that they have been exhaustively reviewed and possible alternatives considered, first, by the State itself, and, later, by the Federal agencies and departments. In view of the fact that all of the reports of these various agencies proclaim the project to be sound from the engineering standpoint, it would seem that that finding should be considered determinative insofar as the engineering problems are concerned.

NECESSITY FOR THE PROJECT

The overwhelming necessity of the Central Valley project, the only means by which the existing agricultural development and civilization in central California may be saved from destruction, has been thoroughly explained on the floor of this House time and time again. That a crisis exists is admitted by practically all of the national agencies that have given consideration to the subject. The quotations from their reports afford ample support to this assertion. That it should remain a point in controversy seems incredible.

But because of the tremendous importance of this phase of our problem I cannot resist including at this point a few further quotations which bear upon and relate to the increasing demand for water relief in the San Joaquin Valley basin. Let me point out that the Department of Agriculture made a special investigation and report on the water shortage in this section in 1934. From that report the following is taken:

For permanent relief of the general shortage of irrigation water in the upper San Joaquin Valley in California, irrigation engineers of the United States Department of Agriculture report that water should be brought in from some region where an excess is available, and this should be supplemented by capacious local storage to even the supply. The shortage of irrigation water in the upper valley is acute this year and is likely to be critical in 1935 and after.

About 1,250,000 acres in the upper valley are considered to be the irrigated area needing protection, but approximately 3,750,000 acres are considered as ultimately irrigable.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture also issued, in 1934, a report entitled "Drought Conditions in Irrigated Sections." In the portion of this report devoted to California it was declared that because of drought the loss in that year, to farmers alone, in the San Joaquin Valley alone, was \$20,000,000.

In further proof of the rapidly increasing water shortage the report of the President's Water Flow Committee, from which I have heretofore quoted, sets forth this alarming statement:

The interior valley of California, comprising the Sacramento and San Joaquin Basins, has the most acute water shortage of any part of the United States. Disregarding the warnings of engineers and irrigators, the irrigated area of the San Joaquin Valley has been extended far beyond what the available water supply will serve. This is especially true of that section of the basin that is irrigated from wells. Large tracts of citrus orchards and vineyards have been destroyed by exhausting this underground supply.

The National Resources Board report, heretofore quoted, has the following to say:

Without more adequate water supplies the farm abandonment, financial readjustment, and social rehabilitation will be extensive. It would be economically and socially wasteful to permit these losses to occur.

A project of the order of that herein stated is imperative.

The letter of transmittal of the report of the Federal Power Commission, heretofore quoted, contains this statement:

The Central Valley contains about half of the agricultural land and two-thirds of the irrigated land of the State. The two great metropolitan areas, San Francisco and Los Angeles, enjoy an enormous business annually with the great Central Valley. If the areas now threatened should be allowed to revert to desert, the inevitable result would be an enormous shrinkage in this business.

EVERY STANDARD MET

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the engineering adequacy, necessity, and financial feasibility of the Central Valley project have been demonstrated beyond question in the various reports of the competent and impartial agencies of our National Government from which I have quoted. There is no substantial disagreement in any of them. They are in striking accord all along the line. The findings and conclusions which appear in each of them are verified, summarized, and adopted by the President of the United States. He, too, finds the project feasible from the engineering, agricultural, and financial standpoints.

UNREASONING FEAR

Before concluding these remarks I desire to comment briefly on some of the alleged facts—"facts" which are fictions—which seem to have filled the hearts of some of my more timorous colleagues with a fear most awful. As I delve into them I am reminded of that ancient Scotch litany which runs on something like this:

From ghoulies and ghosties,
And long-legged beasties,
And things that go flop in the night,
Lord, God, deliver us.

But we have not been "delivered" from the "ghoulie and ghostie" arguments with which our opponents seek to frighten us. So, with your further indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will briefly discuss some of them in the hope that when I am through they may be deemed, as they have been under the light of the day, to have "gone flop in the night."

FACTS AND FALLACIES

In an effort to again be serious, first, there is the item of cost. It has been stated that the cost would be \$683,000,000. Very definitely there is a misunderstanding here, as this is simply not the fact. The total cost is estimated by competent engineers of the State of California to be \$170,000,000, and by the engineers and economists of the Bureau of Reclamation at a somewhat smaller figure. The cost item is specifically fixed in the letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the President, the letter which was later approved by the President, at \$170,000,000. The project is definitely described in California legislation, which fixed its cost at a figure not in excess of \$170,000,000.

Second, the pumping of water a vertical distance of 200 feet has been criticized as uneconomical. Despite the fact that this has been thoroughly disproven by many Federal agencies, I will not disregard this item, since it affects my own particular district. No general rule can be laid down as to what distance it is feasible to pump water, since this varies widely with crop value and cost of pumping. It is true that the project will pump part of its water 200 feet. Because of the great efficiency which is developed in larger pumping installations and of the cheap power which the project will itself supply, the unit cost will be less than half that which the 25,000 irrigation wells in the San Joaquin Valley are now paying per gallon. Therefore, a 200-foot pumping lift on the project is about equivalent to a 100-foot lift on an existing well.

The best guide as to whether or not this is economical is to compare it with the present pumping lifts, and in seeking for comparisons we find in the San Joaquin Valley large areas are lifting water from 200 to 400 feet successfully and economically with pumping costs several times larger than those which the operation of the Central Valley pumping system would render necessary.

However, water cannot be pumped if it has become exhausted, is too salty for use, or is at too great a depth to be economically raised. These conditions, already present in many parts of the southern San Joaquin Valley, will become general if more water is not brought in, and, in this connection, the needed water which the project will import from the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento Basins can come only from these distant sources, as it simply does not exist locally. Federal reports verifying this conclusion.

Third, the charge has been often made by a number of my colleagues that the completion of the project will bring large new areas into production and thus detrimentally affect the general agricultural situation as well as to run counter to the program of farm relief. This has no foundation in fact. What the project actually will do will be to bring back into cultivation—save from destruction—some 50,000 highly fertile acres recently abandoned for lack of water, land which has long been serviced by irrigation systems that no longer can provide water; and it will at the same time retire from irrigation some 250,000 acres of marginal land now being inefficiently watered and cultivated. Thus there will be a net decrease of irrigated lands of around 200,000 acres.

Increase in acreage in the future will be small, and if it does occur it will come about slowly, for the very good reason that the project will deliver little, if any, water beyond that required for the maintenance of the developed areas now short of water, which total about 1,500,000 acres in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys and in the delta—estimated by the Department of Agriculture as 1,250,000 acres in the upper San Joaquin Valley alone.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, it is a misnomer to call this a reclamation project, if by that is meant the reclamation and irrigation of new lands. It is, rather, a water-conservation and farm-relief project. It will serve a variety of purposes, including navigation, flood control, electric power, industry, salt-water control, and, above all, the maintenance of an existing highly developed agriculture, which will go to ruin if more water is not made available. To my mind, it is entirely in line with the agricultural-relief program of the administration, which is to maintain existing agricultural development on good-quality soils. This program has gone forward through the A. A. A., Soil Conservation, Resettlement Administration, and Farm Credit Administration activities, and to some extent, through flood-control protection. These measures are wise and helpful, but let me point out that the first and most necessary item of agricultural relief in the West, when water supplies are insufficient, is water. If the farmer does not have water he does not get a crop, and when that occurs he is not much interested in farm prices or even in interest rates. Agricultural relief in the West should include as a governmental policy the maintenance of water supplies to serve already developed lands, and, in the last analysis, that is the underlying purpose of the Central Valley project.

I have dwelt mainly on the agricultural phase of the project, because that is the problem of my district. It has, however, numerous other features and advantages. It will produce a large amount of cheap electric power; it will provide much-needed navigation and flood control in the Sacramento Valley; it will control the threatened salt incrustation of a half million acres of highly developed lands in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and it will solve the water-shortage problems of the great industrial area surrounding Suisun Bay. It is a multiple-purpose project. Chief among its anticipated blessings are water conservation and agricultural relief. The State of California is solidly behind it, as evidenced by its legislation, by a State-wide election, and by the passage, at two different sessions of the legislature, of joint resolutions unanimously endorsing the Central Valley project "as of first and prime importance to the State of California." It has received the approval of Congress in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935 (H. R. 6732, 74th Cong.).

To recapitulate: The Central Valley project is not purposed to bring new land into cultivation or even to maintain agriculture on inferior lands. It is not a scheme to develop a vast new and uninhabited country. Its financial feasibility does not depend on the immigration of settlers from other regions. The people are already on the land. Their farms are already developed to a high point of productivity. To successfully produce their highly specialized crops they must have water, and if supplied with an abundance of water, as the project contemplates, they would be able to pay the cost of their relief two times over.

About 900,000 people live in this great Central Valley of California. Its assessed valuation, calculated on a basis of 40 percent of actual value, is over \$1,350,000,000, representing a total actual value of over \$3,000,000,000. Conservatively estimated, the annual agricultural production of this blessed territory contributes to the national wealth in an amount which exceeds \$300,000,000. As stated in one of the national reports hereinbefore referred to, "surely this is an agricultural region of importance."

Mr. Speaker, no project in the United States has been as thoroughly investigated from all angles as has the Central Valley water-conservation project of California. No project is supported by greater necessity nor holds forth greater promise of financial integrity. It has received the endorse-

ment of many competent, impartial Federal departments and agencies, and has received the approval of the President of the United States. I venture the opinion that a decade from now, when this project is operating and has cured the distress and tragedy which has already taken substantial form, it will be regarded, I am sure, as the finest example of the proper exercise of national assistance in this particular field of endeavor. In the light of the tremendous benefits that are to follow in its wake, the development of the great Central Valley water project of California will contribute more to the common welfare and the upbuilding of our national wealth than could any other enterprise that our beloved Government might undertake.

HALLIE FLANAGAN, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL THEATER PROJECT OF WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, under the aegis of the Works Progress Administration the Federal theater project, of which Miss Hallie Flanagan is director, new life has been given to the American stage and to actors, actresses, musicians, stage managers, stage hands, and others formerly connected with the stage in all its various aspects from high drama to light vaudeville. This development under the direction of Miss Flanagan has not been confined to large cities nor to any section of the country, but has spread from coast to coast and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

The public have responded to an amazing extent to the project to give them first-class speaking stage entertainment and, irrespective of whether the plays were given in makeshift auditoriums or in regularly equipped theaters, have shown by their attendance the great interest that has lain latent in the lives of the people. Shakespeare has proved as popular as light comedy, and the auditors of drama have often been greater in numbers than those who came merely for amusement.

Great credit is due Miss Flanagan for bringing about this condition of things and for the restoration of keen interest in the speaking stage. The younger generation who knew not the great lights of the speaking stage of the last century and the beginning of this one evidenced as high an interest in good plays as those who knew Booth, Barrett, Anderson, Marlowe, Roland Reed, Robson and Crane, Nat Goodwin, Louis James and Marie Wainwright, Modjeska, Minnie Maddern, and joyful Maggie Kline, the Boston Museum, Union Square Theater, Daly's, Wallack's, and Harrigan and Hart.

Critics came to scoff and remained to be astonished at the fine quality of the performance given and the sincerity of playing that was presented in every form of dramatic art offered by the Federal theater project under the direction of Miss Flanagan. Just as Marie Dressler rose to great heights in the motion-picture world because of her previous training, so many competent players who could find no opening for their talents before the advent of the Federal theater project, many sterling artists who had been forced into an unwanted retirement came out of the shadow into the sunlight of performance and aroused the enthusiasm of cynical ones who thought the American speaking stage folk had forever passed into oblivion.

Burns Mantle in his comment on the work of the Federal theater project wrote:

The W. P. A. theater has, in fact, turned the theater back to people to whom it rightfully belongs and taken it away from a monied aristocracy that has for some years been able to dictate its course and definitely influence its productions.

This comment has been fortified by many other criticisms of the work of the Federal theater project under Miss Hallie Flanagan and all the criticisms of note have been enthusiastic in the praise of the renascence of the theater in the United States as a consequence of the results produced by the plan to give the people, all the people, stage productions that are worthy to take a high place in the art of the stage.

It is my sincere hope that Miss Flanagan may be enabled to continue the work she has so splendidly carried on so far and that from a temporary expedient to furnish employment to unemployed persons of the speaking stage there may grow a

permanent organization covering all forms of dramatic art producing plays of all sorts of stage value, not for a few but for all the people of the United States, urban, suburban, and rural, until they shall have become as familiar with the entrancing work of playwrights and players as were the folk of 1880's, 1890's, and 1900's.

DR. STEPHEN S. WISE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address delivered by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Sunday, June 14, 1936, on the occasion of a banquet tendered to Dr. Stephen S. Wise:

It is a privilege to be invited to speak before this splendid gathering, and to join with you in honoring Dr. Stephen S. Wise, a great spiritual leader and a great American. How appropriately you have chosen this day, nationally proclaimed as Flag Day, to pay tribute to a man who has devoted his life to the spiritual welfare of his people, and toward the maintenance of those principles and ideals for which our flag stands. The red, white, and blue * * * represents a democracy under a constitutional form of government. The Constitution established a democracy not only in form but in substance, defining the powers and duties of the Government, the rights of individuals, and the protection of those rights, even as against the Government itself. Yes, the Constitution is something more. It is the Bible of an American citizen, an instrument of tolerance, broadness, and understanding among men. Intolerance is the enemy of the Constitution. The attempt to array American against American because of difference of race, or creed, or color, thus creating misunderstanding and hatred, resulting in persecution, is subversive of that great document, properly termed "the charter of a free people."

Our form of government is the culmination of generations of effort and of sacrifice of the noble men and women of the past to remove intolerance, hatred, and persecution—evils and curses of mankind. Their success was the result of an aroused public opinion which created the Constitution, with a determination, as the founders intended, to make it a living, progressive document, capable of serving a people, no matter what economic and social change might occur, and of guaranteeing the rights of personal liberty.

History has shown, and present conditions in some countries vividly demonstrate, that it is only under democratic processes of government that personal liberty can exist as an absolute right. Look at some of the other nations of the world today for indisputable support of that assertion. In all nations of the world where democratic form of government does not in fact exist, personal liberty has been destroyed. What little does exist under dictatorships lives by mere sufferance only, not as matter of right. Wherever dictatorship governs, whether by military power or of the proletariat, or by any other form, personal liberty and the rights of minorities have been suppressed. This should cause us to "stop, look, and listen." Under such forms of government persecution as a national policy will continue to exist or will always be imminent until democratic processes of government are established or restored. Such establishment or restoration of personal liberty, of which religious freedom is a cornerstone, cannot be accomplished by changing from one form of dictatorship to another. Democracy is the only safeguard. Persecution in some form always exists in every country dominated by a dictator. It is not confined to one race or creed; one sect is persecuted today, another tomorrow. Whatever the form of persecution, it is contemptible and indecent, particularly in these supposedly enlightened days. A constitution, written or unwritten, might establish the right of personal liberty, but it can only in fact exist through the will of a people who are determined to protect and preserve the natural rights of mankind. Catholic, Protestant, Jew, and all other religions must mutually respect each other's right to be free to worship God in the manner their conscience dictates. Thus is laid the foundation which brings peace and happiness and makes for a contented people. This great right the founders gave us. We must ever keep it inviolate.

I have referred to the destruction of personal liberty under dictatorships. As Americans we should more thoroughly appreciate the blessings of liberty that we possess when we compare our own position with that of the unfortunate people of other lands. Our efforts to properly enjoy this freedom, guided and directed by a wise government founded in justice and equality, had made this the greatest of all nations.

We should show no mercy to those forces who would attempt to destroy our Government by force and violence, or to those vicious groups whose desires are to impose upon our people some form of dictatorship, whether of the left or of the right. This applies also to those subversive influences, either from within or from without, who are or who may attempt to array American against American, by an appeal based on bigotry, the objective being to affect our country's policies. That is what Nazi Germany attempted a few years ago. That is what the special committee of which I was chairman so effectively stopped.

What I have said applies to any organization which impugns the honesty and motives of other persons because of a difference of

race, color, or creed. This equally and forcibly applies to any nation which employs a policy of bigotry and of persecution against any part of its people, however small.

I have always believed that the right of religious freedom, and of the free exercise thereof, should be recognized by all nations as a universal right of all peoples; that it should become a cornerstone of international law, just the same as it is a cornerstone of American liberty. I further believe that in the not far distant future the time will arrive in the progress of mankind that any nation which engages in a policy of persecution, particularly because of religious views of some of its people, that such a nation will be considered and treated as an outlaw among the nations of the civilized world. Every effort should be made to have the right of religious freedom incorporated into the Code of International Law.

What I have said tonight in this respect is a suggestion for consideration, but it expresses my personal views on this all-important question. The ultimate removal of persecution of minorities, whether racial or religious, or its reduction to a minimum, can only be brought about by an aroused world-wide public opinion demanding that end. Other steps may be taken to meet the immediate situation, but they will not be a final solution of the matter to which I have referred as one of "the evils and curses of mankind." The only way to assure a permanency of tolerance throughout the world is by an aroused public opinion that will ultimately result in the elimination of dictatorships and the establishment or restoration of democratic processes of government. I will join with any person or movement the objective of which is to remove this curse of mankind.

Tonight I appeal to people of all races, nationalities, and creeds to join together in an effort to assist the unfortunate groups of other lands who are being persecuted for no other reason than their religious beliefs, or of their national or racial origin.

Persecution is not confined to one group or to one creed. In Nazi Germany—not the real Germany—Catholic and Jew are persecuted; in Russia and Mexico religion as such is persecuted. It is one religion today, it may be another tomorrow. A movement for world-wide tolerance, of the universal recognition of religious freedom, is a fight to remove from mankind one of its most dreadful curses and disadvantages. It is a fight for decency. Those of us who have the honor of being American citizens or citizens of other countries who enjoy personal liberty as a right, cannot and must not ignore the fact that we have a duty to perform in preserving that God-given right for ourselves and our posterity.

While by law we are guaranteed the right of personal liberty, unless public opinion supports its most cherished possession, that right can be undermined from within. In the final analysis, it is public opinion that rules a democracy. It is our duty to see that this opinion is properly formed and maintained at all times. While the Constitution guarantees our inalienable rights, public opinion defends them or will destroy them. We know that always there are certain groups who would seek to destroy them by purporting to claim them for themselves and deny them to others. Such forces must be militantly fought at all times. They must be exposed, and when they violate the law they should be prosecuted fearlessly and punished under the law. Sympathy should not be extended to the enemies of the personal liberty guaranteed by the Constitution, whether from within or from without. We must constantly be on our guard, protecting our Government, our individual rights, against un-American activities, against such organizations who challenge the Constitution, and who attempt under one guise or another with irrational and emotional appeals to establish a reign of terror and to destroy a reign of law.

Mindful that this is Flag Day, let us remember that of all the symbols since the world began there is none so full of meaning as the flag of our beloved country. That flag symbolizes years of struggle upward and forward, and as one great speaker once said, "The blossomed flower in the fight of liberty—the human hope in bloom." It stands for humanity and equal opportunity for all. It is the greatest instrument of government ever created for the expression of the will of a free people, and guaranteeing to all liberty and justice under the law.

And this great man, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, whom we honor tonight, has by his exemplary life characterized the true American spirit. May he live long and happy in the continuance of his great work. May the flag of our country ever symbolize the aspirations of a free people, and as the late Vice President Thomas R. Marshall once well said, "Till the heavens fold together as a scroll."

ATTITUDE OF THE NATIONAL RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION CONCERNING THE PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the National Retail Hardware Association, under the signature of its managing director, Herbert P. Sheets, which, in part, reads as follows:

I am informed that under date of May 27 you caused to be introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement to the effect that the National Retail Hardware Association was and is opposed to the passage of the Patman bill.

Such a statement is wholly incorrect, as was made clear in the second paragraph of my letter of March 25, addressed to you and other members of the Judiciary Committee.

In that paragraph the declaration was specifically made that "The retail hardware trade has strongly supported antidiscrimination legislation and has specifically urged action on the Patman bill."

The objections in that letter, as was made clear to you, were directed to an amendment made by the House Judiciary Committee and not to the measure itself.

I did not intentionally give the wrong impression concerning the attitude of the National Retail & Hardware Association. I accept its statement that it has supported the bill. Nevertheless, a letter which I have received from this association reads in part as follows, and it is this part which I put into my minority report:

Where such differentials are established, the bill would require that the "character of the selling of the purchaser and not the buying shall determine the classification."

But the character of the selling cannot determine wholesaler classification, because in today's strife for business there is little adherence to type of selling.

A further provision is that wholesale price differentials, where established, shall be applied only with respect to the wholesaler's sales to retailers. Such a provision would be wholly unworkable and inequitable in the hardware field because of the character of the wholesaler's selling.

The average hardware wholesaler sells from his wholesale warehouse (1) to retailers; (2) to industrial plants; (3) to contractors; (4) to institutions; (5) to municipal governments; (6) to United States Government branches; (7) to Government work projects, such as W. P. A. projects, C. C. C. camps, etc.; (8) and to officials and employees in all these classifications merchandise for personal use and not for resale or for further use in manufacture.

It would be obviously impossible for a manufacturer to allow a wholesaler a price differential on lock sets, hinges, nails, or any other commodity where such commodities were to be sold to retailers and then establish a different price which such wholesalers should pay for the same commodities where they were to be sold to contractors or to others than retailers.

The wholesaler would necessarily buy on the basis of prices made on the assumption that his selling would be to retailers. But a wholesaler cannot be classified as such solely on the basis of sales to retailers.

There are a large number of wholesale firms in the hardware business whose sales are mainly to industrial plants, railroads, and the like, and who sell practically nothing to retailers.

There are also a large number of retail concerns which have developed a large industrial, contractor, and institutional business in addition to their regular retail sales to consumers, but which make no sales to other retailers.

Under the language of the amendment both these types of firms would be prevented from obtaining the same prices as wholesalers on commodities which they buy and sell in wholesale quantities.

Yet the wholesalers who would, because of some sales to retailers, receive preferential price treatment are in direct competition with these two types.

Enforcement of this amended section would destroy hundreds of large retail hardware establishments in the United States whose sales to industrial plants, contractors, and institutions aggregate a much larger volume than their strictly retail sales. It would further destroy a large number of business concerns generally known in the trade as distributors or mill supply houses, which sell almost solely to industrial plants.

In each case where a differential was established and wholesalers would exert great pressure to have such steps taken, such concerns would be denied the right to purchase commodities on a basis which would enable them to meet the competition of the wholesalers who sell to the same types of customers.

These classifications would also destroy wholesale houses owned solely by retailers. There are in the United States a number of wholesale hardware houses which are owned by hardware retailers and which serve only those stock-holding retailers.

The language " * * * (1) as a wholesaler on purchases for sale to retailers only, not owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the purchaser * * * " would prevent such wholesalers from buying on the same basis as privately owned wholesale establishments.

Yet these dealer-owned wholesale hardware houses have demonstrated their ability to distribute hardware commodities at a much lower cost to the ultimate consumer than do old-line wholesale establishments.

Likewise these classifications would prevent, where wholesale price differentials are established, the grouping of purchases by retailers which effect a saving for the manufacturer and therefore result in lower prices to such retailers and subsequently to the consumer.

This practice is general in the hardware trade on many commodities in connection with which retailers do not require the services of the wholesaler. These lower prices enable such retailers (1) to more nearly meet the competition of quantity buyers such as syndicate stores, and (2) the competition of regular wholesalers in sales to contractors, industrial plants, and the like. * * *

As amended, it becomes a measure primarily for the protection and preservation of the wholesaler, and would place the hardware retailer in a more difficult position than he now is.

It is hardly conceivable that the large purchaser, such as a mail-order house or syndicate of stores, will ever be required to pay the same prices for merchandise as does the very small retailer. To some extent the quantity purchased will doubtless always govern the prices paid.

The primary hope for preservation of the retailer lies, first, in limiting such quantity prices so they will not become excessive and tend to monopoly. But it is equally important that the retailer be left free to attain, as nearly as possible, the same quantity prices allowed these large competitors.

LET US DO SOMETHING FOR THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY AND ITS EMPLOYEES

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, passage of a national textile act is an absolute necessity if an already disorderly industry is not to be plunged into a state of absolute anarchy. One of our basic consumers' goods industries, the stabilization of textiles is not one whit less important than the stabilization of steel or coal. We cannot evade the fact that over 1,000,000 wage earners are normally attached to textiles and that these workers are faced with certain starvation unless the Government affords them a minimum amount of protection.

A SERIOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS

Break-downs in code standards have been legion. The violation of established labor standards is proceeding apace, the last few months bringing reports of more and more textile concerns who have slashed wages, increased hours, increased work loads, and otherwise have disregarded fair standards of decent working and living conditions.

The direct method of cutting wages is not the only manner in which textile workers are seeing their weekly stipends diminished. The stretch-out is one of the most insidious of the indirect wage-cutting tactics of modern industry. Congressmen must not forget that a national textile act, providing for the establishment of a living wage, where the manufacturers have dropped below such a standard, is the only way in which textile workers can be protected against the increasing cost of living. As the prices of commodities necessary to their everyday lives increase, the purchasing power of their few dollars decreases. This becomes particularly acute when we consider the extremely low wages customarily paid in the industry. Textile workers are among the lowest-paid workers in American industry.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR HAS RECOMMENDED PASSAGE OF A BILL

I beg, therefore, that Congress give close, sincere, and studied attention to the proposed regulatory legislation known as the National Textile Act, which the Labor Committee reported favorably. The part of the country I come from is in dire straits. Not only New England workers, but New England manufacturers, are faced with the complete demoralization of the textile industry in this part of the country unless some equalization of labor standards is provided for.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY CAN ONLY BE SAVED BY CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The duty of the legislators of the United States Congress toward their constituents, and toward 1,000,000 industrial workers, demands that we act favorably and quickly on this proposed textile legislation. We owe allegiance to all the people in our constituencies, not to a special and favored few. We can prove that we respect this sacred bond of allegiance by legislating in favor of the majority of the people concerned with this act, for the National Textile Act is not only imperative if the future welfare of the textile workers is to be safeguarded, it is also necessary if the manufacturers themselves are not to be torn apart by anarchic inner strife and cutthroat competition.

THE NEW DEAL ATTACK UPON THE RIGHT OF PETITION

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House, it appears to me that this bill is an unwarranted interference with the personal liberty of the free citizen as we have known it for a hundred and fifty years, and is such a restriction upon the people's rights as even the New Deal should blush to recommend. The substance and intent of the bill is to chloroform and make impossible the organized efforts of responsible citizens to influence the election or defeat of elective Federal officials, the enactment or defeat of any legislation or appropriation by the Congress, the repeal or nonrepeal of any existing law, or the adoption or defeat

of any proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whatever its ostensible purpose, its real intent and purpose would seem to be to hinder the activities of organizations now claiming widespread popular support and to prevent them from reaching the ears of Congressmen with their petitions. The National Union for Social Justice, the Townsend clubs, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, certain labor organizations, and other groups would be tremendously hampered in securing a legislative hearing because of the unreasonable restrictions which this proposed legislation would seek to impose. How, for example, is it physically possible for any organization which depends for its existence on the small contributions of interested citizens to prepare the regular and repeated statements and lists required by this bill with regard to those who have in any way, great or small, contributed to the organization or its representative? When you consider that a violation of the provisions of this bill, if enacted, carries a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for 12 months, or both, it begins to appear as if the New Deal has learned nothing from its imprisonment of the New Jersey tailor for charging a few cents less than the code price for pressing a pair of trousers and from the repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in protecting the free citizen from similar encroachments on his liberty.

The question now involves not the prevention of lobbying but the vastly more important one as to whether or not we shall retain the vestiges of freedom that are left to us. Even those who are most vigorous in their opposition to any of the organizations I have mentioned should concede to them the right of petition—the opportunity to make their views known and have their voices heard. As was once written, I may disagree with what you say, but I shall fight to the death for your right to say it.

This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the New Deal administration has sought to make it impossible for certain of its citizens to communicate with their own Representatives in Congress without obtaining the permission of a New Deal bureau and revealing the nature and character of their communications; and if it is illegal, as it is under some of this New Deal legislation, for a constituent in certain circumstances to advocate his views to his own Representative in Congress without obtaining the permission of a New Deal bureau, what is to be said of the Congressman who, presumably knowing the law, asks such constituent for his opinion with regard to such legislation or its constitutionality? Does he thereby become particeps criminis; and if so, will such a law be upheld by the courts? The trouble with so much of the legislation which emanates from the White House today and is passed here with so little thought and foresight is that it strikes at the heart of representative government and the effective right of petition by organized citizens and leads directly or indirectly to bureaucracy and autocratic dictatorship.

This bill is merely an extension of the restrictive tendency apparent in other administration measures, a tendency from which we here should not depend upon the wisdom of the Supreme Court to rescue the Nation. It is a sad day for free America when our people may not have the liberty to speak or write to their own selected Representatives without becoming liable to fine or imprisonment on the ground that they have somehow violated the sacred ukase of a New Deal bureau or administrator. Certainly such a condition is suggestive of Soviet Russia rather than the America of our fathers.

When you consider, further, that there is nothing in this bill to curtail the lobbying activities of President Roosevelt's own pet lobbyists, nothing to prevent administration employees from coming here and sitting in the galleries and attempting to influence legislation desired by the White House, you can see the real viciousness of this bill. If it is proper for the President to influence legislation, why is it improper for the veterans, the National Union, the Townsend groups, or any other of the humble citizens who have none of the power that surrounds the President?

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for America to return to the old and secure ideals of opportunity and freedom. The cure for the evils of this autocratic administration is not less liberty but more. The cure for the evils of democracy is more democracy. Certainly every man who believes in freedom of speech and the right of petition should vote to defeat this iniquitous measure and table the conference report, so that, at least while we are here this year, the freedom and traditions which the New Deal has so seriously endangered by its socialistic and totalitarian experiments may not be entirely and forever destroyed.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS

Mr. TURPIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at the Flag Day exercises at Betsy Ross House, Philadelphia, on June 14, 1936, under auspices of Patriotic Order Sons of America, and broadcasted over a national hookup of the National Broadcasting Co.:

As we gather today at this—one of America's most cherished and historic spots, one of her most sacred shrines, the birthplace of our American flag, the home of Betsy Ross whose esthetic dream and loving handiwork brought forth an emblem never to be surpassed in beauty nor excelled in its significance—it is fitting, as we pay humble tribute and loving homage to our flag on this revered ground where our immortal Washington accepted her gift to the newly born Nation as the flag of his country, of your country, and of mine; it is fitting that these ceremonies should be under the auspices of one of our country's earliest patriotic organizations.

Ever since the inception of the Patriotic Order Sons of America in 1847 its sons have shed their blood upon the battlefields of all our wars, have given their lives in the furtherance of Christian principles and human rights, and are organized to carry on in time of peace or war the unfinished work our country's hero dead have bequeathed to all posterity. It demands, without apology to native born or to the alien within our borders, that our Constitution, which, next to the word of God, is accepted as the most inspired work ever composed by man; that our Constitution shall be respected and its precepts adhered to.

It upholds and respects the right of every human being to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; it believes firmly in equal rights to all men, with special privileges to none.

It labors constantly to advance the free American public-school system so that every child may have an education and be able to take his place in our social life and body politic.

The Patriotic Order Sons of America believes in free speech and in the freedom of the press, but abhors those who abuse these privileges in an effort either to overthrow or to disrupt our Government, to misuse this freedom to encourage class hatred and create unrest and discontent among our people, or to foster a disregard of our laws, the church, or the God to whom our churches are dedicated.

OUR FLAG IS A FLAG OF PEACE AND GOOD WILL

The American flag is not a symbol of war; it is a flag of peace. We seek only peace and friendly relations with the nations of the world. While other nations are filled with hatred and suspicion, one toward the other, and continents are in a state of turmoil and unrest; while their borders are dotted with forts and patrolled by armies, America gives to them a glorious example of good will toward men with its 3,000 miles of border lines that are without a single fort, a single gun, or a single soldier along its entire length.

America does not seek to dominate nor to acquire possessions. America stopped the atrocities of Spain; it took Cuba under its care, freed it of yellow fever and pestilence, gave to it our American free public-school system, taught it government, and then gave to Cuba its freedom.

Also, America, having conquered Spain, instead of demanding gold, paid to Spain \$20,000,000 for the Philippines, taught their people civilization, and then gave to the islands their independence.

Never has the stain of lust or selfishness marred our beloved Star-Spangled Banner. America, in the 160 years of existence, is the only land, in all this time, that has not changed its form of government. It is for you and for me, fellow Americans, to see that it is not changed.

America has been the haven of the oppressed from its earliest days. In years gone we have welcomed those of all other countries to our shores. We respect those who having come here have renounced all allegiance to other countries and sworn allegiance to our flag and all that it stands for and have become good citizens.

But, much as we sympathize with the less fortunate of other countries today, our portals must be closed to further immigration—not because of racial prejudice, not because of class distinction, not because of differences of color or creed, but because we have more Americans, native and naturalized, within our borders now than we can find employment for.

For its own preservation and for its own people America must be for Americans.

Yes; our flag is a flag of liberty, of freedom, of peace, and of justice. Yet we must not forget that only through the sacrifices of those who have fought and died under the Colors of our country has it been able to acquire and preserve that liberty, that freedom, and that peace which we now enjoy.

THROUGH SACRIFICE WE ENDURE

As we affectionately salute our national banner today, let us pause to recall not only the battles that Washington and his men fought to bring forth a new nation of free men but let us also remember the physical sufferings of his little volunteer army—as poorly clad, cold, hungry, impoverished by the long sieges, facing without shelter the snows and winds of winter, they still fought on throughout the years, inspired by the sight of the new flag, which reminded them of the principles to which it was dedicated and for which they were fighting—not so much for themselves but for posterity, for you and for me, for our children, and for our children's children.

Let us not forget that the preservation of our Union—of which both the North and the South are so justly proud today—was brought about by the sacrifice of years and many thousands of lives. American bone opposing American bone, American flesh defying American flesh, American blood flowing freely to conquer American blood; it was not until the army of the South had been almost annihilated and the southland itself devastated that our flag was again crowned with victory and the Stars and Stripes once more waved over a united America.

Again in 1898, when the roll of the army drum, the fife's shrill note, the blare of the bugle, the clanking of steel, and the tramp of marching feet was heard throughout the northland—when once more the rays of the southern sun were reflected by the buttons of brass and the glint of the defending bayonet throughout the southland; again in our Nation's history an army of northern boys marched South and once more an army of southern boys marched North, until meeting on the common battlefields on which their fathers had met in deadly conflict—the army of the North swinging to the left and the army of the South wheeling to the right—stood shoulder to shoulder under Old Glory, demonstrating to the world that we were indeed and in fact a reunited country with but one flag.

In 1917, when the call to our colors was sounded, again our boys from the hillsides and from the dales, from the mountain tops and from the valleys, from the North and from the South, and from the East and from the West gathered in the camps of war. They sailed away singing, "We Won't Come Back 'Til Its Over, Over There." And upon the appearance of the American flag in France the exhausted Allies saluted it and cheered with thrills of renewed hope and courage.

Anxious years rolled by. Finally upon the horizon of the crimsoned seas could be seen the returning ships. As the boats pulled into the docks, the old flag—battle-torn and bullet-pierced; accustomed to shrieking shot and bursting shell; its silken threads shattered by the vibrations of booming cannon and the roar of musketry; soiled by the smoke of contending armies and stained by the blood of our American youth—was once more unfurled on its homeland shores, to be tenderly caressed by the homelands winds. As the boys came down from the ships they did not march with the elastic step the playing of the martial bands inspired. Great, awful gaps in the ranks of the marching troops brought home to America the full significance of

"Crosses, row on row,

On Flanders Field where poppies grow."

These great gaps represented more than a hundred and thirty thousand American boys who marched away but never returned; they represented a large part of 200,000 others who were wounded in action. Today over 700,000 of these boys are peacefully sleeping within the walls of the silent city of the dead under the bronze marker and the little soldier flag of red, white, and blue. Once again the Stars and Stripes—through the patriotism of American manhood—brought peace to a troubled world.

NOT THREATENED ALONE BY WAR

Not alone are countries threatened by armed forces of other nations; they are also menaced in times of peace—by propaganda. Much has been said lately about abolishing the Supreme Court. Let us pray that this will never happen.

If our laws are wrong, let us repeal them or change them; if our Constitution is wrong, let us amend it—but any attempt to jeopardize the Supreme Court should be viewed with alarm. To abolish the Supreme Court means to do away with the Constitution that we as a nation have cherished since its inception.

Whether or not they are conscious of what they are doing—those who advocate this measure are working hand in hand with the Communists. For with the abolishment of the Supreme Court all acts of Congress when approved by a President would become final—and from them there could be no appeal.

It would only be necessary then for a President—ambitious for greater power, with a subservient Congress, to pass a law changing the term of office of the President from 4 years to life—to pass to his eldest son at death—and we would automatically be back into a kingdom, a kingdom from which our forefathers fought so heroically and unflinchingly to free us, or, in a lesser degree, to put our Nation into the hands of a dictatorship such as is now ruling foreign lands.

The future of our Government is not so much in the hands of the Government itself as it is in the patriotism that swells

within the heart of each individual citizen. We are not unmindful that millions of patriots of every creed, of every nationality, fill the homes of the cities and hamlets throughout our land today; but, lest they forget, we cry out to them, "Americans, oh Americans, wake up!"

A smoldering fire is always a threat of conflagration. Americans should continue to organize and to show their contempt for those who have no respect for our Constitution, for our flag, or for the country it represents. They should be alert, and in every lawful manner seek to put out any communistic smoldering.

UNGRATEFUL BENEFICIARIES

America, with its millions of square miles of territory, does not have a square foot of land to which a Communist is welcome, nor long must he be allowed to stand upon it if he is here. If communism is so fine, then let him stay in a communistic country and enjoy it, or, if he is already in America, we'll send him back and make him happy, for America should be a most miserable and unhealthy place for him.

We should be alarmed that the communistic seed so stealthily sown within our gates is finding fertile soil within our colleges, our schools, and, be it said in shame, in some of our homes, dangerously misleading the youth of the land.

The Communist does not respect our churches; he does not fear our laws or the police who enforce them; he does not fear our jails. The only thing he does fear is deportation—deportation back to the communistic country from which he came. And that must be his lot.

Had our flag, which is so peacefully acknowledging the caresses of the summer winds above this gathering today, ever been unfurled in a war of aggression; had its Stars and Stripes ever been stained by the blood of American youth in a war of oppression; had its silken folds ever been shattered or torn in battles fought to conquer weaker nations, and take from them that to which we had no right; had it ever been flung out on the battlefields at any time except for the birth and preservation of our Nation—except in the cause of freedom and liberty—or to aid the oppressed—then in a small way we might understand the attitude of some of our American youth of today.

In our schools and colleges we find the youth of our land, who, enjoying all the privileges and benefits brought about by the sacrifices of their forefathers, who enjoy a freedom and liberty such as no other country can give, announce that they would not go to war to preserve their homes and their native land against either foreign foe or domestic enemy.

Theirs is a selfish life—willing to accept all that has been handed down to them through the sacrifices of those who have gone before—yet in return they are not willing to carry on.

I recall one Bergdoll who said the same thing in 1917—and who today is a man without a country—and not a welcome guest in any land. I would suggest to these boys that they organize—make themselves known—name their organization after Bergdoll—and then join him on foreign shores.

It would not have been good for the physical comfort of boy or man a decade ago to publicly show disrespect to our national emblem—yet today it is a common occurrence to read that children—who surely do not know better—that children have been instructed by their elders to refuse to salute the Red, White, and Blue floating over the American schoolhouse that is giving to them a free education and an opportunity in life such as they could receive under no other banner.

I wonder if these same people who teach these children to refuse to affectionately salute our flag—I am wondering if they also teach their children not to salute their mother with a kiss of affection, or not to doff their hats to those entitled to this courtesy.

PRAY THAT WAR SHALL BE NO MORE

While the honor of our flag must be maintained and our Government respected—let our prayers be that our flag will never be unfurled in war again—but if it is, then only in defense of our own America and not through entangling alliances.

Oh, come with me to almost any State in the Union, to the veterans' hospitals of cold, gray stone, listen to the tap of the cane as the blind walk by, visit the wards where row upon row of beds hold those who have seen no sky other than the ceiling above their heads since the last battle in which they fought and who have seen nothing of the outside world except that glimpsed through a window; listen to the hollow cough of the gassed and the tubercular who, living without hope, still smile.

Witness the shell-shocked lads whose minds have become deranged because of the awful havoc of the battlefield, see the countless maimed whose bodies have been mutilated by bullet and bursting shell, who greet you with an empty sleeve or supported by crutches, with trouser leg pinned up, salute you.

Look out upon the broad lawns surrounding the hospitals and see the torn and emaciated forms in wheel chairs, visiting with loved ones who have found it possible to call upon them for a few brief hours but with whom they may never return to their homes again. See the loving mothers and sisters, wives, and children, with tear-stained faces, as they leave their loved ones behind them waiting until a kindly providence ends their suffering, and I am sure you will pray that wars shall be no more.

LOYAL AMERICAN MOTHERHOOD

Let us rejoice, even in the sadness of realizing the awful cost in human life that our Nation might be free and endure, in the sadness of realizing the suffering of those to whom the war will never end until their eyes are mercifully closed in death; let us rejoice that our American mothers, the silent defenders of our Nation's welfare, who gave their sons in defense of human rights, that these patriotic American mothers, themselves in the gloaming of life, sequestered by tender memories of boyhood's affections, that these mothers at the close of this significant day, as the setting sun and storm-swept sky blend into peaceful twilight, when the dull red glow of the rising moon softens the deepening shadows of eventide and the great worlds beyond burst forth as myriads of starry jewels to adorn the wondrous love of their Creator, that these loyal American mothers will kneel in their humble homes and, raising their faces, their arms, their voices to Heaven, will thank God that they have reared such sons that when liberty and freedom were endangered that their sons were patriotic and brave enough to do and to dare and to fight, yes, and to die, for flag, for God, for home, and native land.

Let us today rededicate ourselves to the proposition that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Let us cherish our flag and defend it against all enemies from within or without but never may it be the aggressor.

Let us resolve today as we meet on this consecrated ground, that in the midst of our acute economic depression and the afflictions that go with it, we will continue to uphold the same principles as shown by our immortal Washington and his men under more trying conditions, and, above all, to maintain the traditions of our flag and the ideals that have been handed down to us, to repledge our loyalty to our flag and all that it represents and to our free American institutions.

THE MEANING OF FLAG DAY

Mr. MERRITT of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address by me, at the annual Flag Day ceremonies of the American Legion at Fort Totten, N. Y., June 14, 1936:

"A nation is made great, not by its fruitful acres, but by the men who cultivate them; not by its mines, but by the men who work in them; not by its railways, but by the men who build and run them. America was a great land when Columbus discovered it; Americans have made of it a great nation."

But America is still in the making. What its future destiny will depend upon the loyalty and devotion of every citizen to its free institutions. The greatest danger that threatens us as a Nation, is the indifference of all classes of citizens to the vital issues which affect us as individuals, and as members of a great free democracy. To overcome this indifference, and arouse all classes of citizens from their fancied security, is the purpose of Flag Day.

It is not our desire to arouse within our citizens the ambition and avarice that has converted Europe into a bloody shambles. Our only ambition as Americans should be to make our beloved land so free that every man would be able to find opportunity for development, and to assure to his children the protection of that flag, which symbolizes every aspiration for freedom and equality that man can cherish.

To do this it is not necessary to emulate the example of militarism set by European nations. We do not need a great standing army, nor an immense fleet of vessels to guard our shores, but we should maintain a sufficient force on land and sea to protect our commerce, to defend us from any possible invasion by unscrupulous foes, to hold the respect of foreign nations, and enable every American to point with just pride to that starry flag not only at home, but everywhere the wind may unfold its beauty, as the banner of freedom and the sure protection of all who claim its shelter in the sacred name of humanity.

As long as there is discord and oppression in the world we shall have wars and rumors of war, until the leaven of right dealing between man and man, and between nation and nation, shall cover the earth as the waters cover the great deep. Wise men recognize this truth and prepare for possible calamity. As a people, we are in no immediate danger of foreign invasion, but no power can insure us against that black cloud of war which may break upon us at any moment, scattering ruin and desolation in its path. It is the unexpected that happens, and not to take all possible precautions against unexpected danger, such as embroilment with foreign nations, is the sheerest folly a people can be guilty of.

Recently in an address at the Ohio State convention of the Reserve Officers' Association Assistant Secretary of War Woodring made this statement: "We know that little real progress has been made toward abolishing war. Even a casual survey of present-day world conditions impresses upon us the fact that very few of the grave problems causing dangerous international friction have been solved since the last great war.

"There exists in Europe today the sad spectacle of 10,000,000 more men under arms than at the end of the World War. Great

modern superforts line the frontiers. Asia and Africa are torn with strife and unrest.

Increasing dictatorships throughout the world are rapidly destroying the last vestiges of that personal liberty which 18 years ago we hoped would act as an effective check against wars.

"Under such conditions, how can any true-thinking American criticize the people of this country who, through their Representatives in Congress, demand the protection of adequate military preparedness, people who realize that our military effectiveness must be such that whatever aggressive nation, or combination of nations, threatens us with war shall find us so well prepared that it will not dare attack us."

But, my comrades, there are things that are much more to be deplored than war: The lusts and passions; the covetous spirit that craves for what is not its own; the cruelties and injustices that we wink at, because they put money in our purses; the grinding face of the poor; and the inhumanity of man to man, these are things worse than war, and you may be sure that God will keep his greatest curse for the evils out of which war springs, rather than for the blood poured out upon the battlefield. There are men today who are crying "Peace, peace", but no true man should ever pray for peace, unless he has himself fought for justice among all men.

And there are other things awaiting our endeavor. There is today a great association of the allied veterans of the World War, of which the American Legion is a part. The organized veterans of seven other nations as well make up the international organization. Its personnel is composed of men who have come through the service of war to a great desire for peace. The veterans of these eight nations in this great organization are working in association with all their powers for a better understanding among the nations such as will clear the path for permanent and lasting peace. Thereafter the nations of the world may take eyes of each other and develop each its own ideal through the medium of its own culture. Here in America there will be busy streets of cities, where men and women shall go about their work securely, content and confident, each one, of justice and of liberty. There will be pleasant avenues of homes, and highways leading out among flourishing farms. Athletic fields there will be, and libraries, and above all schools; nor shall any child any longer be kept out of school. And here and there along the streets you will see the clubhouses of the veterans whose service helped to bring these things about. And as your gaze climbs higher you will see floating above the clubhouses of the veterans the flag of America, and above all the schools you will see the flag of America, and above all office and public buildings the flag of America; until the blue of its field enlarges into the blue of the heavens, and the stars of that field take on the splendor of the eternal stars above. And as our eyes are fixed upon our radiant flag symbolizing the unity of our free and mighty people, may there come from our hearts a prayer of thanksgiving to the God of our fathers, for the continuance of His goodness and mercy, and may we as a people prove worthy.

Flag of our great Republic—hallowed by noblest deeds and loving sacrifice, guardian of our honor, an inspiration in every battle for the right—whose stars and stripes stand for beauty, purity, truth, patriotism, and the Union. We salute thee, and for thy defense, the protection of our country, and the conservation of the liberty of the American people, we pledge our hearts, our lives, and our sacred honor.

HOW SMALL STOCKHOLDERS WERE CREATED AND USED BY THE UTILITY HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing my remarks on public-utility legislation to safeguard the people against the holding-company monopoly under consideration before Congress July 1, August 1, and August 22, 1935, I find certain paragraphs explaining the sale of stock to their customers and which are of special interest at this time.

If these small stockholders in the utility holding companies only knew the facts and how and for what deliberate purpose they were sold stock they would have resented with indignation the call made upon them to write or wire their Congressman to oppose or vote against the bill.

STOCKHOLDERS DELIBERATELY CREATED FOR A PURPOSE

Looking ahead for the last 25 years to the developments of electricity seen coming, the public-utility holding company interests have been organizing to monopolize and control the production and distribution of electric power and have been building up their defense behind unsuspecting individual stockholders.

Under this investigation it was found the policy carried out through an army of utility employees to sell and scatter a certain amount of their stock among single individual stock investors and then to have their employees frequently contact or keep in touch with these small stockholders to

urge the importance of upholding their companies to maintain the value of their shares of stock.

HOW STOCKHOLDERS ARE CREATED

Classified lists have been made and kept of all persons to whom stock was sold not only for the purpose of frequent contacts and to receive holding-company literature but for the purpose of prompting and calling them to aid in their defense against any unfavorable legislation. This system of creating scattered stockholders to be held ready and in waiting in every legislative and congressional district was known as the "Illinois plan" and was first perfected and sponsored by the Insull public-utility corporations.

As before explained, this plan was later adopted as the model plan and system by the National Utility Association, which completed its organization in 1927 to oppose so-called unfriendly legislation in Congress, at that time for a trial of public ownership. This policy of public-utility corporations, using the employees to sell stock and to scatter shares among individual men, is all set forth in the summary report of the Federal Trade Commission, under Senate Resolution No. 83, and explains by whom and the system under which Congress is being bombarded on this bill at this time.

HOW STOCKHOLDERS ARE USED

It was from behind the breastworks of these small public-utility stockholders that Samuel Insull and Martin J. Insull joined the electric-power monopoly in its fight in Congress in 1927 against the development of Muscle Shoals as a step to try out public ownership. But the small stockholders of the Insull Public Utility Corporation must be exonerated from opposition to this bill. They have been busy keeping trace of Samuel Insull in his wanderings in Europe and over the seven seas, trying to escape trial in America, and only to be extradited and returned to trial and found "guilty but not proven" under the technicalities of corporate law.

DEFENDING IN THE NAME OF OTHERS

The holding companies appearing here made no defense in their own names. They are assuming to rise above interest of self. In their concern for the small stockholders they are assuming to forget self. They are assuming to forget the high salaries and the millions collected in dividends forced from the operating companies, which are in fact in danger, and not the small stockholders.

They are pleading only the cause of the small stockholders; the cause of the widows and orphans; the cause of churches, schools, and benevolent orders—the buyers of their watered and diluted stocks, induced under a policy program to create sympathy-appealing investors. And the pity of it all, the tragedy of it all, and the humiliation of it all is that those great utility holding corporations are organizing these small stockholders to whom they have deliberately sold stock to use and hold as hostages and behind whom to make their defense.

This is a subterfuge as old as history. Every man who has enslaved another man has enslaved him under the claim and plea that it was to better the condition of the enslaved. Every marauding despotic king, conquering and subjugating a defenseless people, has conquered them under the claim that it was for the benefit of the conquered. Every burden and imposition heaped upon men has been under the claim and pretext that it was for the benefit of the burdened.

This was an organized defense plan and known as customer ownership and investment, built up under a special sales campaign, to place a few shares of nonvoting stock in the hands of unsuspecting electricity consumers first, in the hands of the more influential, and through their influence to the people generally.

THE STRATEGY OF CREATING AN ARMY OF NONVOTING STOCKHOLDERS

The policy of this sale of nonvoting stock was to create a financial or self-interest in a great number of persons to

whom an appeal could be made for the support of utility corporations on the grounds of having a common interest, and thereby to harness them in their defense.

This strategy of creating an army of small nonvoting stockholders was carried out and directed by a customer-ownership committee, under Emery E. Wilson, chairman of the National Electric Light Association, the corporation organized over all utility companies. This chairman of the customer-ownership committee, explaining this plan on March 9, 1925, to the Academy of Political Science, or, more properly speaking, the strategy of politics, said:

At last (we have) found the material to make impregnable the wall around private (utility) business (Federal Trade Report 71-A, pp. 11 and on).

Danger from losing control of this vast army of small scattered stockholders was shrewdly safeguarded against by selling them only nonvoting stock, making them, in fact, voiceless investors and leaving them helpless and at the mercy of Wall Street gamblers and manipulating financiers.

THE ORGANIZATION OF 5,000,000 SMALL SHAREHOLDERS ADMITTED TO CONTROL CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS

Phillip H. Gadsden, chairman of the committee of utility executives, called before the lobby committee to answer for directing the expenditure of \$5,000,000 in lobby funds during the consideration of the utility bill has admitted that 2,000,000 of these stockholders were scattered through congressional districts. Later, speaking to newspapermen, as a challenge to and defying Congress, Mr. Gadsden declared that there were 5,000,000 stockholders; that each stockholder would control two or more votes, giving the utilities 10,000,000 voting strength, an irresistible balance of power to sway the election in every congressional district.

Under this unconsciously drilled and trained army these recruited customer-stockholders, instilled with the spirit of their own interest, the people, the electric-consuming public have been encompassed and held as helpless as the plebeians and slaves of Rome were held in subjection and from revolt by the Roman legion soldiers.

With this army of made-to-order stockholders, kept and held mobilized and ready as a balance of power at the polls, in every legislative and congressional district, it was only necessary to recount and parade them before the members of the legislature, or the Members of Congress in Washington, to reflect a made-to-order public opinion and to bring Members of the legislature or Congress to a stern realization of the voting strength of constituents favoring utility holding companies during the consideration of the holding company bill and the balance of power they must reckon with back home. (See House of Representatives lobby hearings.)

THE DOLLINGS AND INSULL STOCKHOLDERS RECALLED

The small individual stockholders, who have given up their good money, may wake up some morning only to find their treasured stock as worthless as the Dollings stock, or as worthless as the Insull stock, which swept away the life savings of millions of honest people.

The small individual investors are making a colossal mistake in allowing themselves to be led to oppose those who are trying to save them from the salary grabbers and manipulators feeding upon the earnings and incomes and the property behind their stock.

While the utility holding companies were assuming to forget self and their own interests and pleading the cause of the small stockholder and the widows and orphans as investors, the following from the lobby committee hearings was published in the Washington News August 15, 1935, at page 43:

One of the investors in H. C. Hopson's Associated Gas & Electric Co., who bought in at \$60 a share with her life's savings, has taken to circularizing members of the Senate lobby committee.

Her mimeographed letter, signed by Vanita Crofoot, and giving her address in Seattle, urged support of the Wheeler-Rayburn utility bill "or its equivalent." The letter continues:

"I should gladly welcome Government control even to the extent of the Government owning such companies in order to protect

future investors. I placed my life earnings in the Associated Gas & Electric Co., paying \$60 a share, and now it is quoted on the New York Curb at 11/16. The company's statements do not warrant this drop.

"The Associated Gas & Electric Co. has sent me several communications asking me to write Senators and Representatives of the evils of the Wheeler-Rayburn bill. On the contrary, I wish to urge you to vote for the annihilation of the holding companies because of the benefits that will accrue to the stockholders of the future."

THE ONLY HOPE FOR SMALL STOCKHOLDERS

With the shadows of the Dollings and Insull companies and their movements, manipulations, and final failures hanging low in the investment horizon, the duty of this Congress is plain if the common people are to be protected from exploitation. There is only one hope remaining for the small individual stock investor holding shares in great corporations. There must be intervention by the State and Nation to stay the hands of speculation and high finance and to compel open operations and administration and observance of honesty among corporations. Gambling and stock manipulation, watered and diluted stock issues, thrown upon the market without supporting assets, confiscatory salaries and fees are incompatible with security and a stable basis for investments.

The one and only hope of the small stockholders is to allow the operating distributing companies—the companies producing light, power, and heat—to keep and hold their earning and incomes to pay dividends to the stockholders and to keep the company property intact, necessary to maintain the value of their shares.

The only hope for the small stockholders is to protect the operating companies from the high salaries and tributes exacted by the so-called holding companies.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TERRORIZED AND STAMPED

It was this avalanche of letters and telegrams carrying a mail-order demand that terrorized and stamped Members of Congress to desert lifelong association and principle and drove them to vote for the utilities.

So real and actual was this manufactured demand made to appear before Members of Congress that Members of the House, whose conception of duty and highest aim and ambition is to abide the will of their constituents, were frustrated and terrorized. And resolving all doubts in favor of what they believed was a bona-fide expression of popular will in their district voted—many reluctantly—to sustain the holding companies. And having once taken a position, may now be slow to change their votes, as showing a wavering position.

THE SHOWER OF TELEGRAMS

Great and impressive as was this army of made-to-order holding company stockholders, it was made to appear even greater by telegrams showered upon Congressmen during the consideration of the holding company bill, signed by names taken from telephone directories, assuming to come from people favoring holding companies, but unauthorized and without knowledge of the signers. The hearings of the Senate lobby committee show that the holding company agents in one district of the State of Pennsylvania spent over \$8,000 sending out unauthorized telegrams assuming to come from anxious constituents, all protesting against the elimination of unnecessary holding companies.

Thus thousands were added to the army of made-to-order stockholders by an even greater make-believe army, brought and paraded before Members of Congress, shaking and trembling in their political boots, a strategy as resourceful and effective as Benedict Arnold's military maneuver of marching his army around a hill and presenting an unending column before the enemy.

This recruited army of unsuspecting stockholders has long been kept and held mobilized in formative line and in readiness to march on notice under and carrying the colors in defense of the public-utility corporations and under the command and leadership of utility lawyers and legislative lobbyists.

It will flash before the mind of every man acquainted with or having knowledge of these utility stock manipulators that had these shares been of special, preferred value as the utility employees were made to represent, the stock would have been gobbled up by the managers and not a single share sold to customers.

The number of these specially created stockholders remains indefinite, undisclosed, but estimated as from two to three million individual men and women and spread through legislative and congressional districts to constitute a balance of political power and a voting strength at the polls capable of electing friendly candidates or of defeating unfriendly Members of Congress and legislatures. (Federal Trade Commission Report 71-A, pp. 31, 32.)

The lobby investigation made after the close of the consideration of the utility bill shows that these small stockholders were deliberately sold stock by the utility holding companies under a carefully prepared but secret plan to create an army of individual men and women and hold them ready to be used as tools and cat's-paws in defending their monopoly of electricity whenever an effort was made to break their strangle hold.

This lobby investigation further shows that these small stockholders were kept and held in waiting for this purpose, and the order in the form of an urgent request for them to write or wire their Congressman was sent out by the big holding companies of the East. They used the army of small stockholders to conceal themselves from Congress and to make it appear that the opposition to Government regulation or control of electricity was coming from the people.

Unless the Government comes in to regulate and control holding companies and protect these small stockholders from the stock manipulators and gamblers, these small stockholders will go the way of the Insull and the Dilling stockholders under which millions lost their savings of a lifetime.

The pity and tragedy of it all is that these small stockholders created for the special purpose of using them as a screen to shield the holding companies and behind which to make their defense are being misled to oppose the Government in its efforts to protect them and save them from the loss of their money and hard-earned savings.

TAX MONEY—WHERE AND FROM WHOM IT IS COLLECTED; WHERE AND BY WHOM IT IS SPENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the present administration points with pride to the relief funds being distributed throughout the United States, apparently desiring that you believe that it provides these funds in some mysterious manner without increasing the burden of taxation upon you, your children, or your grandchildren and that these funds come from some source other than the taxpayer's pocket.

The administration assumes that the expenditure of these funds is an act of generosity on the part of the President. One would think, reading their propaganda, that the President and his advisers are giving of their own money to those receiving these public funds.

True, many States and municipalities have received public grants, but the funds so received were the taxpayer's money, not the money of the President, and all too often the amount originally allocated has been trimmed at various stages on its downward course until the sum received by the local unit or individual represented altogether too small a part of the sum originally intended for it or him. Too many political henchmen took their toll as the relief funds went through the mill.

The money disbursed for relief or relief projects is your money, regardless of the fact that you may not have recognized the fact that it was being taken from you by taxation, direct or indirect; and, of taxation, President Roosevelt said:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. If they are excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxation.

The foregoing quotation from the President may contain the answer to the idle factories, the tax-sold farms, and the increase in unemployment, which has not been materially lessened by the President's demand for, and expenditure of, billions of dollars collected from the taxpayers. Why does he not follow his own prescription uttered when he was criticizing a Republican administration?

THE MONEY—WHERE DOES IT COME FROM AND WHERE DOES IT GO? WHO PAYS IT AND WHO GETS IT? AND WHY IS YOUR TAX MONEY PAID TO THOSE WHO ARE RECEIVING IT RATHER THAN TO OTHERS?

Many national newspapers recently carried a full page showing the amount collected in internal revenue from various States and the amount paid to those States from the United States Treasury for direct relief. They are so important in bringing home to us the actual situation and an understanding of what is being done and of how the administration is purchasing support for its policies by the use of other people's money in buying votes, that here again is given the amount collected from these States for the United States Treasury and the amount paid to them from the United States Treasury:

For year ending June 30, 1935		
Alabama:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	\$17,298,104	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	12,709,165	
Alabama received, over and above what it paid	<u>4,588,939</u>	
Arizona:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	6,902,501	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	1,745,295	
Arizona received, over and above what it paid	<u>5,157,206</u>	
Arkansas:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	16,948,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	3,178,317	
Arkansas received, over and above what it paid	<u>13,769,683</u>	
Mississippi:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	12,700,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	2,533,879	
Mississippi received, over and above what it paid	<u>10,166,121</u>	
Montana:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	9,084,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	6,165,173	
Montana received, over and above what it paid	<u>2,918,827</u>	
Nebraska:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	12,825,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	12,454,094	
Nebraska received, over and above what it paid	<u>370,906</u>	
Nevada:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	2,307,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	2,126,621	
Nevada received, over and above what it paid	<u>180,379</u>	
New Mexico:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	7,700,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	1,038,463	
New Mexico received, over and above what it paid	<u>6,661,537</u>	
Utah:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	8,270,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	6,304,221	
Utah received, over and above what it paid	<u>1,965,779</u>	
West Virginia:		
Received from the U. S. Treasury	17,600,000	
Paid into the U. S. Treasury	10,605,166	
West Virginia received, over and above what it paid	<u>6,994,834</u>	

These 10 New Deal States received from the Federal Treasury \$52,774,211 more than they paid into it. The President said that we must not rob Peter to pay Paul, but he has no objection to taking money from industrial Republican States to give to Democratic Western and Southern States, and, doubtless, untold sums will soon be thrown into the remaining Republican States to swing their votes in favor of the policies of the administration.

Arkansas, the State of Democratic floor leader, Senator JOE ROBINSON, received from the Federal Treasury \$13,769,683 more than it paid in. Apparently "the laborer is worthy of his hire."

The practical, political significance of the foregoing figures is apparent when it is remembered that these 10 States have 20 Senators in Congress and that those Senators are the fighting nucleus of the New Deal. They are the ones who are carrying out the President's policy of putting across this method of enriching the people of their States at the national expense.

Note the situation in connection with my home State:

Michigan paid into the U. S. Treasury-----	\$135,853,971.41
It received from the U. S. Treasury-----	49,075,534.00
	86,778,437.41

It received \$86,778,437.41 less than it paid in. For each dollar received by Michigan from the Federal Government it paid to the Federal Government \$2.7685. But Michigan is a Republican State! What do you honestly think of this plan of taking Michigan's money and distributing it for relief in these and other States?

No doubt this policy of corrupting the voters by extending relief and special advantages to various classes will be continued, and, if successful, in a short time, perhaps within the next 4 years, the President will find himself so entrenched, so powerful in national affairs, that he will be able, in the event of the death of members of the Supreme Court—no uncertain contingency, for all the Justices are well past middle age—not only to change, because of death, the members of that Court but, by the appointment of New Dealers, of—as George N. Peek, the President's former Administrator of the Triple A code, has designated them—"collectivists" or "internationalists", obtain legal sanction for those theories of government which will make him our dictator.

It has long been considered a crime for any individual, using his own money, to buy votes or political support or to purchase support of legislative measures. How much more reprehensible it is to use the money taken from the taxpayers, ostensibly for the purpose of relief, to purchase political support.

In his message to Congress on January 3 of this year the President, among other things, said:

Shall we say to the several millions of unemployed citizens who face the very problem of existence—of getting enough to eat—"We will withdraw from giving you work, we will turn you back to the charities of your communities and to those men of selfish power who will tell you that perhaps they will employ you if the Government leaves them strictly alone"? Shall we say, "Your problem is a local one, except that perhaps the Federal Government, as an act of mere generosity, will be willing to pay to your city or to your county a few grudging dollars to help maintain your soup kitchens"?

History discloses that it was a previous Democratic administration which gave us the soup kitchens on a national scale. The experience of the last few years demonstrates that, despite the spending of billions of dollars for relief, for made work, no appreciable improvement has been made in the unemployment situation.

Always, in previous depressions, the unemployed have been cared for by local communities and by their States. This is the first time in the history of our country that the Nation engaged in wholesale corruption. This is the first time the voters have been told, in unmistakable terms, that if they or their communities desired to share in the distribution of the relief funds, in the funds for local projects and local improvements, they should "vote right" with the administration; that they should support the Democratic ticket.

Big Jim Farley, National Democratic Committee chairman, and incidentally a Cabinet officer, has pointed out the answer to the President's question, and his answer is, and it is known at this time to practically everyone, that these funds are used for Democratic voters and Democratic communities.

Not long ago I put into the RECORD a stereotyped form which required one seeking employment on relief work to state when and how much he had contributed to his local

Democratic committee. Could anything be more vicious, more destructive of our Government?

The President asked—I quote again:

Shall we say to the several millions of unemployed citizens who face the very problem of existence—of getting enough to eat—"We will withdraw from giving you work, we will turn you back to the charities of your communities and to those men of selfish power who will tell you that perhaps they will employ you if the Government leaves them strictly alone"?

Why should he ask this question? His political manager, Jim Farley, and those working under them have already answered it—to the knowledge, but to the disgust, of every thinking man and woman who knows that this Government of ours has said, in substance and in effect, to the unemployed, to those in need, "We will withdraw from giving you work unless you vote right."

Here on the floors of Congress practically every relief bill that comes up contains appropriations that we all know will be used to further the advancement of the present administration and those claiming power under it, and many are forced to vote to continue that corruption or to vote against a relief bill.

Here are the figures which prove where the relief money is going. Note the favoritism shown the States friendly toward the administration. The first five States listed below are represented by Democratic Senators, except that California has one so-called Republican Senator—he supported Roosevelt. Those States can be counted upon to cast the electoral vote for the New Deal in the next election. The last five are Republican States. Note the vast difference in relief per family.

State	Families on direct relief in 1935 (average of March and July figures)	Federal direct relief to States in 1935	Average per family of Federal funds
California (Democratic).....	183,854	\$91,680,011	\$499
Louisiana (Democratic).....	46,350	18,564,020	400
Montana (Democratic).....	21,045	9,084,850	432
Colorado (Democratic).....	46,724	19,746,708	423
Nevada (Democratic).....	2,125	2,307,225	1,086
Delaware (Republican).....	3,934	—	163
Rhode Island (Republican).....	16,525	3,038,106	184
Maine (Republican).....	19,807	5,661,016	286
New Hampshire (Republican).....	11,216	2,158,515	192
Vermont (Republican).....	6,943	1,759,747	253

How long, O Lord, how long will the voters stand idly by and see their money used by a great national party to purchase political support, to perpetuate itself in power, to take the first steps toward a dictatorship which will reach its destination and be an actuality in 4 more short years, if this administration is returned to power?

Are we dreaming? No; we are not. Not long ago the President said:

Remember well that attitude and method—the way we do things, not just the way we say things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

Every act of this administration is a part of a patterned whole, and it is no idle dream to say that at the present time only by the decisions of the Supreme Court in the N. R. A. and Triple A cases are men enabled to conduct their businesses and to farm their lands unhampered by the autocratic rule of an Executive officer—a dictatorship in fact if not in name.

Do you remember when the Marine Band was withdrawn from a meeting of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense because a speaker had criticized the New Deal? Do you remember that just a few days ago the Army Band and companies of soldiers marched in a political parade at Baltimore when and where the President made a political speech?

The Army has been used to give color to and to aid a Democratic political rally. How long will it be before it will be used to police the polling booths to determine the result

of an election? How long will it be before the members of the C. C. C. camps are mobilized as a political force? Are not some of them being so used at the present time?

Many people say, "Why criticize?" and "What have you to offer?" We criticize because the system is wrong. There is not any doubt about it, and it can end only in disaster; and I offer the same constructive suggestion that I would if I were driving with a drunken, speeding driver, namely, "Slow up and watch where you are going." To the Government I say, "Cut out these needless, useless expenditures. Quit taking the money of Michigan to give to the people of some other State for the building of useless projects. Quit paying Michigan's money to unnecessary officials for expenditure on needless, worthless projects."

Michigan and Kansas have pointed the way. Their budgets are balanced. Put the Nation on a like basis. By so doing, at least 15 to 20 percent of the dollar which you pay for taxes, direct or indirect, can be saved. The 15 or 20 cents thus saved you will buy far more than the 5 or 10 cents given back to you by the Government out of the dollar which it collected from you.

Restore liberty. Deny to the President the lawmaking power which he has exercised by sending down to Congress his "must" bills. Take away from him the authority, through Executive order, to rule this country and spend the people's money. Deny his request that he be given billions of dollars of your money to be expended under his direction by a Tugwell, a Hopkins, or a Wallace. Kick out of the Nation's Capital the Frankfurters. Kick out all that horde of professors, of theorists, none of whom knows the cause of sweat, the feeling of a blister or a callous; none of whom ever accomplished anything of moment in industry, finance, or agriculture; all of whom believe that they are the Lord's anointed, ordained to save the world rather than America.

Let us return once more to the thought that America is for Americans who believe in the principles of a government established by our fathers and written in the Constitution, equal justice for all and the practice of the Golden Rule.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution.

Senate Resolution 323

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, late a Senator from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 10 o'clock antemeridian tomorrow.

THE LATE HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I announce the death of Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER at 10:30 a. m. today. Within less than 6 weeks Florida has lost two Senators. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, for more than 27 years Florida's United States Senator, played an active part in life and has left behind him friends who will never forget his activities. He loved his State. He loved his friends, but above and beyond that he had a national and an international mind.

At this time I could not pay to him the tribute that he deserves, but at a later date I hope I may have the privilege of appearing before my colleagues and paying tribute to Senator FLETCHER.

I offer a resolution, Mr. Speaker, which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 554

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, a Senator of the United States from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of five Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee: Mr. SEARS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CALDWELL, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. WILCOX.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 2293. An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 3111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHANDLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12064. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, to prevent loss of assets and excessive charges in connection with certain reorganizations, compositions, and extensions, and to aid the district courts in the administration thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 4062. An act to provide for a survey of the Cabinet Gorge on the Clark Fork of the Columbia River; without amendment (Rept. No. 3014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 571. Joint resolution to provide for the participation of the United States in the commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Antietam; without amendment (Rept. No. 3016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 596. Joint resolution to enable the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee to conserve and stabilize the coal-mining industry within said States; with amendment (Rept. No. 3017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11217. A bill to amend section 76 of the Judicial Code, as amended, with respect to the terms of the Federal district court held at Tallahassee, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 3018). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12796. A bill 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); without amendment (Rept. No. 3019). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 3869. An act to authorize payment of the amounts due on delinquent homestead entries on certain Indian reservations; with amendment (Rept. No. 3021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 4551. An act to authorize the addition of certain names

to the final rolls of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians in the State of Montana; with amendment (Rept. No. 3022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 12324. A bill to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 3023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 4493. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Uintah County, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 3024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCORMACK: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 12876. A bill 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 3025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 12972. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 3015). 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. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 13001) to eliminate unnecessary expense in the administration of estates of deceased and incompetent veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUCAS: A bill (H. R. 13002) providing for the examination and survey of Meredosia Bay, on the Illinois River, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: Resolution (H. Res. 552) pertaining to motions to suspend the rules; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: Resolution (H. Res. 553) granting rule for consideration of H. R. 3251, an act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 633) to appoint a nonpartisan committee to formulate a permanent Federal relief program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 634) to enable farmers to pay off their seed and feed loans by working on farm-to-market roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUCKEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 635) making an appropriation for the establishment and maintenance of the Great Plains Forest Experiment Station (during the fiscal year 1937); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. O'DAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 636) to authorize the Director of the Mint to prepare a medal commemorative of the 50 years of continuous effort and service of Carrie Chapman Catt for the betterment of the status of women in the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BLOOM: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 60) to authorize the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of H. R. 12624 to insert additional language in connection with Senate amendment no. 14; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATMAN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the special committee of the House of Representatives appointed to investigate the lobbying activities of the American Retail Federation; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, to enact the Guffey-Vinson bill, designed to regulate the bituminous coal industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAM: A bill (H. R. 13003) for the relief of Henry Hillgamer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LORD: A bill (H. R. 13004) granting a pension to Laura A. Gundlach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 13005) for the relief of Dorothy Krick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 13006) for the relief of B. N. Reddington; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11114. By Mr. McCORMACK: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of Federal legislation requiring the marking of articles made of imitation leather; to the Committee on Labor.

11115. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Roumanian Branch, No. 4503, I. W. O., of Dearborn, Mich., protesting against the activities of the Black Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11116. Also, petition of the Roumanian American Citizens Club, of Dearborn, Mich., protesting against the activities of the Black Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11117. Also, petition of a mass meeting held at C. R. Hall, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the Benson-Dickstein concurrent resolution calling for investigation of the Black Legion; to the Committee on Rules.

11118. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution memorializing Congress in favor of Federal legislation requiring the marking of articles made of imitation leather; to the Committee on Labor.

11119. By Mr. TONRY: Resolution of Holy Name Society of St. Patrick's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing legislation proposing a bridge or tunnel across the Narrows of New York Bay from Staten Island to the Bay Ridge section of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

11120. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John H. Brown, of Topeka, Kans.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, June 15, 1936)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar days Tuesday, June 16, and Wednesday, June 17, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Borah	Chavez	Gerry
Ashurst	Brown	Clark	Gibson
Bachman	Bulkley	Connally	Glass
Bailey	Bulow	Copeland	Guffey
Barbour	Burke	Couzens	Hale
Barkley	Byrd	Davis	Harrison
Benson	Byrnes	Dieterich	Hastings
Bilbo	Capper	Duffy	Hatch
Black	Caraway	Frazier	Hayden
Bone	Carey	George	Holt