CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of June 15), 1936

SECURITIES EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert E. Healy to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Benigno Fernandez Garcia to be attorney general of Puerto Rico.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Robert A. Reid, Montevallo.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Mahony, Derby.

MISSOURI

Velma B. Watt, Green City.

NEW YORK

Otis J. West, Bayville.
Claude K. Cooper, Williamson.

NORTH DAKOTA

Theodore A. Marquardt, Cooperstown.

OHIO

Orville R. Bently, Bay Village.
Hattie E. Lewis, Greenwich.
Viola L. Wisnieski, Independence.
Otto K. Evers, Napoleon.
Homer W. Rider, Spencerville.

TEXAS

George S. Brownwell, Charlotte.
Jerome H. Moyers, Ferris.
Edith Koonce, Ganado.
Henry F. Priesmeyer, Garwood.
Ruth S. Marion, Kermit.
Lizzie Crawford, Marathon.
Corinne H. Sewell, Pearsall.
Naomi M. Lewis, Royalty.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 18 (legislative day of June 15), 1936

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Bellew to be postmaster at Mansfield, in the State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN

Frank L. Thome to be postmaster at St. Johns, in the State of Michigan.

NEW YORK

Elmer C. Wyman to be postmaster at Dover Plains, in the State of New York.

Robert L. Molyneux to be postmaster at Ransomville, in the State of New York.

OREGON

George D. Wood to be postmaster at Brookings, in the State of Oregon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who art our everlasting Father, we bow in prayer at the altars of our souls. Far out beyond our fondest dreams Thy love extends and Thy bounty reaches. The voices of Thy mercies make up the sweetest harmonies of the world. Thou art the rock of our salvation, and we most humbly ask Thee to bring sight out of blindness and purity out of every stain. Today may we magnify Thy name with truth, honor, and wisdom. O Lord God, we bear upon the lips of our parting prayer a petition for our President, our Speaker, the officers, the employees, and the pages of the Congress. Almighty God, give them health, strength, and peace through all the months which are to follow; stand, Heavenly Father, with love and mercy in all their earthly experiences. Bend over our whole family of loved ones, dispel all earth-born clouds, and be gracious to every State under the folds of our flag. Keep us all within Thy shadow, for there is no life without its pain, there is no hope without its cloud, and there is no prayer without its doubt; so be with us until we reach the last mile, and then let us fall in Thine arms. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 16, 1936, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7690. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 8234. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Elgin, Ill., and the erection of a heroic Pioneer Memorial;

H. R. 11072. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 11533. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg; and

H. R. 11920. An act to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 10356. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey a right-of-way over certain lands situated in Solano County, Calif., to the State of California for State highway purposes;

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution affecting the enrollment of H. R. 12624, the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936; and

H. R. 8368. An act to enforce the twenty-first amendment.

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

S. 4719. An act for the relief of the Bridgeport Irrigation District; and

S. 4784. An act to permit mining within the Glacier Bay National Monument.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed, without amendment, to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution affecting the enrollment of H. R. 12848.

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

S. 2712. An act to amend section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935;

S. 3841. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

S. 4026. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had directed the Secretary to return to the House, in compliance with its

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

request, the engrossed 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed, without amendment, to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution 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.

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. 10630) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate nos. 24 and 54 to the foregoing bill and recedes from its amendment no. 53 to said bill.

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. 12624) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate no. 49 to the foregoing bill and recedes from its amendments nos. 29, 30, and 41 to said bill.

MAKING DECEMBER 26, 1936, A LEGAL HOLIDAY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 241, to declare December 26, 1936, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentlewoman from New Jersey inform us as to whether it has been the custom lately to give the employees a holiday the day after Christmas?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from New York that on December 11, 1925, President Coolidge issued an Executive order closing all Government departments in the District on Saturday, December 26, of that year and Congress enacted the necessary legislation at that time making that day a holiday. That was the last occasion on which it was done.

Mr. SNELL. I thought they had been doing that right along.

Mrs. NORTON. No; that is not true. The Commissioners have asked that this legislation be enacted.

Mr. SNELL. Does this pertain only to the District of Columbia employees?

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, no; it applies to all Government employees.

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

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

Resolved, etc., That December 26, 1936, is hereby declared to be a legal holiday in the District of Columbia for all purposes: *Provided*, That all employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia and all employees of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to pay for such holiday the same as on other days.

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

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES, 1937

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 272, to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1937.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

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

Senate Joint Resolution 272

Resolved, etc., That $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, is hereby appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District from January 15 to January 26, 1937, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, traveling expenses, hire of means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating streetcar loading platforms, for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public-comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners. Said Commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property, and to make special regulations respecting the standing, movements, and operating of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors to sell goods, wares, and merchandise on the streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and to charge for such privilege such fees as they may deem proper.

SEC. 2. Such regulations and licenses shall be in force 1 week prior to such inauguration, during said inauguration, and 1 week subsequent thereto, and shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and in such other manner as the Commissioners may deem best to acquaint the public with the same; and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any of such regulations shall be enforced until 5 days after such publication. Any person violating any of such regulations shall be liable for each such offense to a fine of not to exceed $100 in the police court of said District, and in default of payment thereof to imprisonment in the workhouse of said District for not longer than 60 days.

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

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES, 1937

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 273, authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

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

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, and such other officers of the District of Columbia and the United States as control any public lands in the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to grant permits, under such restrictions as they may deem necessary, to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies to be appointed with the approval of the President-elect for the use of any reservations or other public spaces in the city of Washington under their control on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1937: *Provided*, That in their opinion no serious or permanent injuries will be thereby inflicted upon such reservations or public spaces or statuary thereon; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such and other purposes on the occasion aforesaid such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in said city of Washington under their control as they may deem proper and necessary: *Provided, however*, That all stands or platforms that may be erected on the public space, as aforesaid, including such as may be erected in connection with the display of fireworks, shall be under the said supervision of the said inaugural committee, and no stand shall be built on the sidewalk, streets, parks, and public grounds of the District of Columbia, not including the area on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue directly in front of the White House, except such as are approved by the inaugural committee and the building inspector of the District of Columbia, and no stands shall be built on the sidewalks or streets on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue directly in front of the White House, except such as are approved by the inaugural committee, the building inspector of the District of Columbia, and the Secretary of the Interior: *And*

provided further, That the reservations or public spaces occupied by the stands or other structures shall after the inauguration be promptly restored to their condition before such occupation, and that the inaugural committee shall indemnify the appropriate agency of the Government for any damages of any kind whatsoever upon such reservations or spaces by reason of such use.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the committee on illumination, of the inaugural committee for said inaugural ceremonies, to stretch suitable overhead conductors, with sufficient supports wherever necessary, for the purpose of connecting with the present supply of light for the purpose of effecting the said illumination: *Provided*, That, if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation: *Provided further*, That the said conductors shall not be used for conveying electrical currents after January 24, 1937, and shall, with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the streets and avenues of the said city of Washington on or before January 31, 1937: *Provided further*, That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, who shall see that the provisions of this resolution are enforced, that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public, and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *And provided further*, That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removal of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to loan to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., belonging to the Government of the United States (except battle flags), that are not now in use and may be suitable and proper for decoration, and which may, in their judgment, be spared without detriment to the public service, such flags to be used in connection with said ceremonies by said committee under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the said Secretaries, or either of them, in decorating the fronts of public buildings and other places on the line of march between the Capitol and the Executive Mansion, and the interior of the reception hall: *Provided*, That the loan of the said hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., to said committee shall not take place prior to the 11th of January, and they shall be returned by the 25th day of January 1937: *Provided further*, That the said committee shall indemnify the said Departments, or either of them, for any loss or damage to such flags not necessarily incident to such use. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to loan to the inaugural committee for the purpose of caring for the sick, injured, and infirm on the occasion of said inauguration such hospital tents and camp appliances, and other necessaries, hosptal furniture, and utensils of all descriptions, ambulances, horses, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government of the United States as in his judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the inauguration: *And provided further*, That the inaugural committee shall indemnify the War Department for any loss or damage to such hospital tents and appliances, as aforesaid, not necessarily incident to such use.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior be, and they are hereby, authorized to permit telegraph, telephone, and radio-broadcasting companies to extend overhead wires to such points along the line of parade as shall be deemed by the chief marshal convenient for use in connection with the parade and other inaugural purposes, the said wires to be taken down within 10 days after the conclusion of the ceremonies.

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

ISAAC GANS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 280, to ratify and confirm the appointment of Isaac Gans as a member of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

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

Resolved, etc., That the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of Isaac Gans as a member of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years beginning February 4, 1936, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

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

HEATING OF CERTAIN BUILDINGS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12532) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, be, and he is hereby, authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant to such buildings as may be erected by the District of Columbia on the property bounded by Fourth and Fifth Streets, and D and G Streets NW., in the District of Columbia, and known as Judiciary Square: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia agrees to pay for the steam furnished at reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That the District of Columbia agrees to provide all necessary connections with the Government mains at its own expense, and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

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.

TRUST COMPANIES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4512) to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 641 of chapter XVIII of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any company transacting the business of a trust company and heretofore or hereafter organized or operating under the provisions of this chapter shall have perpetual succession from the date of its organization, or until such time as it be dissolved, or until its franchise shall become forfeited by reason of violation of law, or until terminated by either a general or special act of Congress or until its affairs be placed in the hands of a receiver and finally wound up by him."

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.

CONSTRUCTION OF PETROLEUM PIPE LINES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4568) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, authorized and empowered to grant permission to the Steuart Bros., Inc., a corporation organized in the State of Delaware, owner of that part of square 1024, bounded by L Street SE. on the north, Twelfth Street SE. on the west, Thirteenth Street SE. on the east, and the right-of-way of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad on the south, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, its successors and assigns, to lay down, construct, maintain, and use not more than five pipe lines for the carriage of petroleum and petroleum products from a point or points north of said railroad right-of-way within the square 1024, in and through Thirteenth Street SE. due south to the Anacostia River.

SEC. 2. That all the construction and use provided for herein shall be under such regulations and rentals as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may make and establish in connection

therewith and all plans and specifications for such construction shall be subject to their approval. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have full authority to designate the location and to cause such repairs or relocation of said pipe lines as the public necessity may require, any such repairs or relocation to be at the expense of the Steuart Bros., Inc., its successors or assigns.

SEC. 3. That no permission granted or enjoyed hereunder shall vest any title or interest in or to the land within Thirteenth Street SE.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 11325) were laid on the table.

METROPOLITAN POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND FIRE DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12681) to amend section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia", approved May 27, 1924, and for other purposes; and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill:

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia", approved May 27, 1924, be amended by striking out all of said section following the second period which appears after the words "driver-privates shall have the same rank and pay of privates of the above classes", and place in lieu thereof the following:

"Members detailed to motorcycle service shall each receive an extra compensation of $120 per annum, and members of the force assigned to special service in the prevention and detection of crime shall be in two classes and receive extra compensation as follows: Class 1 shall receive extra compensation of $600 per annum; class 2 shall receive extra compensation of $240 per annum, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered, in their discretion, to designate the members of the force assigned to such special service who shall be in class 1 and the remaining members of the force assigned to special service shall be in class 2: *Provided, however,* That members of the force designated by the Commissioners to class 1 shall, whenever possible, be members of the force in class 2, and have had at least 2 years' experience in class 2, but all vacancies in class 1 shall be filled from members of the force designated to class 2."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as repealing or amending section 3 of the act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1901, as amended.

SEC. 3. No member of the force designated to class 1, or class 2, according to the provisions of this act, shall be demoted without a trial before the trial board.

SEC. 4. A member of the Metropolitan Police force assigned to duty in plain clothes must have previously performed duty for 3 years in uniform.

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.

CHALMETTE NATIONAL MONUMENT, LOUISIANA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5368) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5368) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, 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 House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "buildings within ten miles" and insert: "buildings, not to exceed an area of two hundred and fifty acres in addition to the present area of thirty-two acres,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

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

ROSE MCCONNELL LONG,
KEY PITTMAN,
ROBERT D. CAREY,
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. 5368) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes, submit the following statement of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendments:

The Senate amendment no. (3), page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "buildings within 10 miles" and insert "buildings, not to exceed an area of 98 acres in addition to the present area of 32 acres", placed a maximum restriction upon the number of acres that could be bought or acquired smaller than thought advisable to the proper utilization of the moneys authorized to be appropriated and also for the proper development of the monument. The House amendment increases the number of acres from 98 to 250 acres, without increasing the amount of money appropriated. The House recedes with an amendment substituting for the Senate language the following:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "buildings within 10 miles" and insert "buildings, not to exceed an area of 250 acres in addition to the present area of 32 acres."

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a bill which covered an area of 32 acres. The Senate increased this acreage to 98 acres. The conferees agreed and we recommended that the amount be not more than 250 acres. That is all there is to this matter.

Mr. SNELL. There is an amendment here which appropriates $275,000?

Mr. DEROUEN. That is an authorization, yes; which is usual and customary.

Mr. SNELL. I know that; but it was not in the House bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. No; but the managers on the part of the House receded and accepted the amendment, and why not?

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that was not agreed to?

Mr. DEROUEN. That is agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. So there is something important in this bill because it carries an appropriation of $275,000?

Mr. DEROUEN. It authorizes $275,000; but do not forget that the State has already contributed over $300,000.

Mr. SNELL. To buy additional land down there to improve a park?

Mr. DEROUEN. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. It is purely for local purposes. I just want those things to be brought out before the Members of the House to show how liberal you on that side are in expending the people's money. I know I cannot stop this, and I am not going to object; but I want the matter to be brought out fully so that it will not be passed over without notice.

Mr. DEROUEN. 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPILATION OF LIST OF LABOR-SAVING DEVICES

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 49, requesting the Secretary of Labor to compile a list of the labor-saving devices, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have some explanation of this resolution? From where did it come?

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, this is a House resolution which requests no appropriation. It just requests the Labor Commissioner to prepare some data and report it back to Congress.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me if he had to compile a list of all the labor-saving devices of this country it would cost some money.

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman that $4,000,000 has been allocated to the W. P. A. for certain work, but not particularly for this purpose.

Mr. SNELL. Then it is going to cost some money?

Mr. PALMISANO. They are doing the work now.

Mr. SNELL. Why is it necessary to have a resolution of the Congress, then?

Mr. PALMISANO. The Labor Commissioner has been making a survey. This would give to the Congress the information and the Department would keep the data intact for future reference.

Mr. SNELL. Would not that information be available to the Congress, if it is compiled by a Government agency, without the passing of this resolution?

Mr. PALMISANO. Perhaps so, yes; but in this instance certain information is requested which otherwise they would not compile.

Mr. SNELL. From what committee does this come?

Mr. PALMISANO. From the Labor Committee, and I may say it has been reported unanimously by that committee. The chairman of the Labor Committee asked the Speaker to recognize me this morning in connection with this matter.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me this is a pretty far-reaching resolution, and we ought to have time for more thorough consideration of the matter.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, for the present, I must object.

TO AMEND SECTION 723 (A) OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1932

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12324) to amend section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this bill has been unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman should explain briefly what this bill is about.

Mr. BUCK. I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to overcome a ruling made by the counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue on March 9, 1936, which reversed the previous 7 years' conduct of the Bureau of Internal Revenue with reference to the stamp tax on stock transfers.

By the Revenue Act of 1926 no documentary stamp tax is to be imposed on deliveries or transfers to a broker for sale or by a broker to a customer for whom and on whose order the broker purchases the securities. This new ruling, which reversed the practice of 7 years, under which a nominee of the broker could transfer the stock and pay one tax, holds that the stamped memorandum of sale executed at the time of the sale does not cover the transfer from the selling broker or his client to the name of the nominee of the purchasing broker and therefore requires two stamp taxes.

The point involved is this: A partnership brokerage firm takes stock in the name of one of its partners. He may only own a one-hundredth interest in the firm, but he is the transferee and only one tax is paid. When an incorporated brokerage firm takes such stock it is necessary for them to name someone as their nominee because shares standing in the name of a corporate broker are not accepted as good delivery. This arises because of divergent corporation laws of the various States and the difficulty of ascertaining corporate capacity and authority of its officers to act. The effect of the new ruling will be to require two stamp taxes to be paid where corporate brokers act. The Treasury has recognized the inequality of this ruling but claim they are unable to change it by regulation. They have approved the bill and have stated that it will not affect the revenue of the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 723 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended (U. S. C. 1934, Supp. 1, title 26, sec. 902 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 723. (a) Subdivision 3 of schedule A of title VIII of the Revenue Act of 1926 is amended to read as follows:

"'3. Capital Stock (and Similar Interests), Sales or Transfers: On all sales, or agreements to sell, or memoranda of sales or deliveries of, or transfers of legal title to any of the shares or certificates mentioned or described in subdivision 2, or to rights to subscribe for or to receive such shares or certificates, whether made upon or shown by the books of the corporation or other organization, or by any assignment in blank, or by any delivery, or by any paper or agreement or memorandum or other evidence of transfer or sale (whether entitling the holder in any manner to the benefit of such share, certificate, interest, or rights, or not), on each $100 of par or face value or fraction thereof of the certificates of such corporation or other organization (or of the shares where no certificates were issued) 4 cents until July 1, 1937, and 2 cents thereafter, and where such shares or certificates are without par or face value, the tax shall be 4 cents until July 1, 1937, and 2 cents thereafter, on the transfer or sale or agreement to sell on each share (corporate share, or investment trust or other organization share as the case may be): *Provided*, That in case the selling price, if any, is $20 or more per share the above rate shall be 5 cents instead of 4 cents until July 1, 1937: *Provided further*, That it is not intended by this chapter to impose a tax upon an agreement evidencing a deposit of certificates as collateral security for money loaned thereon, which certificates are not actually sold, nor upon the delivery or transfer for such purpose of certificates so deposited nor upon the return of stock loaned: *Provided further*, That the tax shall not be imposed upon deliveries or transfers to a broker or his registered nominee for sale, nor upon deliveries or transfers by a broker or his registered nominee to a customer for whom and upon whose order the broker has purchased same, nor upon deliveries or transfers by a purchasing broker to his registered nominee, but such deliveries or transfers shall be accompanied by a certificate setting forth the facts: *Provided further*, That the tax shall not be imposed upon deliveries or transfers from a fiduciary to a nominee of such fiduciary, or from one nominee of such fiduciary to another, if such shares or certificates continue to be held by such nominee for the same purpose for which they would be held if retained by such fiduciary, or from the nominee to such fiduciary, but such deliveries or transfers shall be accompanied by a certificate setting forth the facts: *Provided further*, That in case of sale where the evidence of transfer is shown only by the books of the corporation or other organization the stamp shall be placed upon such books; and where the change of ownership is by transfer of the certificate the stamp shall be placed upon the certificate; and in cases of an agreement to sell or where the transfer is by delivery of the certificate assigned in blank there shall be made and delivered by the seller to the buyer a bill or memorandum of such sale, to which the stamp shall be affixed; and every bill or memorandum of sale or agreement to sell before mentioned shall show the date thereof, the name of the seller, the amount of the sale, and the matter or thing to which it refers: *Provided further*, That as used in this section the term "registered nominee" shall mean any person registered with the collector of internal revenue in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.'"

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 21, strike out the word "chapter" and insert the word "title."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "nominee", insert the words "if the shares or certificates so delivered or transferred are to be held by such nominee for the same purpose as if held by the broker."

Page 4, line 6, after the word "refers", insert "any person liable to pay the tax as herein provided, or anyone who acts in the matter as agent or broker for such person, who makes any such sale, or who in pursuance of any such sale delivers any certificate or evidence of the sale of any stock, share, interest, or right, or bill or memorandum thereof, as herein required, without having the proper stamps affixed thereto, with intent to evade the foregoing provisions, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall pay a fine of not exceeding $1,000, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

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.

TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM OF THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an address I made before the National Association of Credit Men.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by me before the National Association of Credit Men, at Richmond, Va., June 9, 1936:

I am deeply grateful for the honor that has been paid me in asking that I occupy time on your program. To me it is a heartening sign when leaders in business and industry are willing to pause in their deliberations of matters economic and hear the observations of those of us who are engaged in the very interesting matter of trying to look after the legislative needs of the country. There is a saying among us lawyers that "a smart client makes a smart lawyer."

I have long been of the opinion that the national legislative body and its labors are good, bad, or indifferent in perfect ratio to the intelligent interest taken by our constituencies and their willingness to put the national welfare above personal benefit.

Perhaps at no time in the history of our Government has the national legislative body been under such terrific pressure from individuals and groups. Opinions and views have clashed upon many subjects. Ofttimes the legislative way has been obscured by the clouds of uncertainty and indecision. Many times we would have welcomed the deliberate, unselfish viewpoint of you men of affairs. I am confident that the average Member of Congress is always grateful for a letter from a constituent, expressing his views upon a piece of legislation which shows that he understands the subject; that he has considered it from its various angles; and that he is definitely of the opinion that a certain course of conduct is for the best interest of society. I am also quite equally certain that no amount of high-powered pressure, no number of long telegrams, or visits of imposing delegations have any deciding influence on legislative action where it is so obviously shown that such effort is purely the cumulative action of individuals who are demanding a certain course of conduct merely because someone has asked them to do so.

I do not wish, however, to consume all of my time on your program by dealing in generalities. I would like, if you will permit me, for a few moments to direct your attention as businessmen to one of the aspects of our present economic and social chaos which, in my judgment, is too often overlooked or minimized in its importance. I refer to the somewhat prosaic subject of our foreign trade relations. To my way of thinking, we cannot expect any economic solidarity until we have solved the problem of finding a market for the goods, wares, and merchandise of our American industries and for the products of our farms and mines.

Therefore, I am very glad to have an opportunity to speak before a group of businessmen such as is represented by the National Association of Credit Men regarding the trade-agreements program of the Roosevelt administration. The conditions which brought about this program are not dissimilar to the problems of credit men when business conditions become acute. Credit men realize that an expansion of trade is the surest way of easing such conditions. The administration at Washington feels the same way about the international credit situation and is attempting to find a remedy through trade expansion.

Businessmen well understand that foreign trade is like traffic in a two-way street; they know that when such traffic is interrupted in one direction, it too frequently interferes with expeditious movement in the opposite direction. Credit men know that business consists of purchases as well as sales. The interest of creditors and debtors deserves some consideration in the international field as well as in the domestic phase of business. It has frequently been asserted that the United States has shifted from a debtor to a creditor position. It behooves us as creditors to make it possible for our debtors to pay us. While I do not intend to go into the complications and interrelationships of international finance and commerce, I wish to make it clear that the administration of a properly correlated foreign policy must take these matters into consideration.

The sponsors of the trade-agreements program at Washington are acting upon the principle that the component parts of foreign trade are imports and exports and that the interruption to this two-way traffic during the last 4 or 5 years has been unwarrantedly interfered with by governments at home and abroad. The administration is undertaking to modify that situation by means of trade agreements through which this Government lowers trade barriers in order to obtain better markets in foreign countries for our surplus products. The international credit situation has already been improved by trade agreements.

OBJECTIVES OF THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

First, I wish to say a word as to the objectives and procedure of this program. I can explain the objectives to you in no better way than to quote some passages from a speech by the Secretary of State, the beloved Cordell Hull, before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on April 30 of this year. On that occasion he said in part:

"The foreign-trade program of this Government is based fundamentally upon what to us is an indisputable assumption; namely, that our domestic recovery can be neither complete nor durable unless our surplus-creating branches of production succeed in regaining at least a substantial portion of their lost foreign markets.

"Our production of cotton, lard, tobacco, fruits, copper, petroleum products, automobiles, machinery, electrical and office appliances, and a host of other specialties is geared to a scale of operation the output of which exceeds domestic consumption by 10 to 50 percent.

"In his message to Congress recommending the passage of the Trade Agreements Act, the President urged the need of restoring foreign markets in order that our surplus-producing industries may be 'spared in part, at least, the heartbreaking readjustments that must be necessary if the shrinkage of American foreign commerce remains permanent.'

"In generalizing the duty reductions negotiated in the individual trade agreements we have sought to place on an equal footing those nations which in turn extend equality of treatment to our commerce and to refuse such equality to those nations which refuse equality to us. Thus all phases of our policy are on a reciprocal basis."

Now, as to the method of attaining these objectives. On June 12, 1934, the President signed the bill commonly known as the Trade Agreements Act, which granted to him the authority to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements with foreign nations for the purpose of expanding our foreign trade. The President in this amendment is limited to a 50-percent reduction in the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. A great majority of the American people will agree that the rates in most instances would still be sufficiently high after the maximum reduction of 50 percent. Few of the reductions thus far made, however, represent the maximum allowed by the law. Incidentally this limitation in reduction is parallel with the limitations of increases and decreases in duty under the flexible provision of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930. Likewise the provisions for hearings under the Trade Agreements Act are similar to the provisions for hearings under these tariff acts. A further similarity between the 1934 legislation and the flexible provisions of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930 is the equality of treatment of all countries. The changes in tariff rates, either upward or downward, apply to all countries alike. Under the flexible provisions, however, the great majority of rate changes represented increases. These increases did not single out individual countries, but applied to all nations. Since in a reciprocal-trade agreement both countries must agree to the changes in rates, it is readily seen that there is no place for increase in tariffs. As noted above in the objectives as stated by the Secretary of State, the purpose of the reciprocal act is to increase trade and not to restrict it further.

FALLACY OF IMPORTS DISPLACING WORKERS

There are a number of fallacies relative to the tariff which have been perpetuated for the past 100 to 150 years. One of these fallacies is that imports in general displace American products, dollar for dollar, and therefore rob American workers of their jobs. If one takes time to look into the situation, that fallacy is readily dissipated. In the first place, there are many imports into the United States on which thousands of workers directly depend for their livelihood. To mention a few, the imports of rubber, tin, raw silk, and coffee take not a single job from laborers, but actually give employment to American workers. These are four outstanding imports of the United States which bring into existence certain industries and give employment to labor. It is obvious that every individual employed in the rubber industry, with its many ramifications, the essential canning industry, utilizing tin, the great silk-manufacturing and coffee-roasting industries, are absolutely dependent upon imports for their very existence.

Most of the opponents of the reciprocal tariff program would possibly admit that these imports give employment rather than take it away from American workers. Every importation creates employment. The amount given by other imports into the United States is a matter of degree. Furthermore, for every dollar's worth of such imports brought into this country giving employment to American labor, another dollar's worth must be produced and exported. Instead of such imports robbing Americans of their jobs, they give additional jobs to American workers.

It is futile for opponents of trade agreements or high tariff exponents to attempt to calculate the loss of jobs caused by imports. Even in manufactured products as much employment is given in the purchase, sale, transportation, and handling of imported articles as in those produced domestically. Furthermore, as consumers, workers are naturally interested in obtaining their purchases at lower prices. If through imports the worker is able to buy with his 25-cent piece an imported electric light bulb for 10 cents and have 15 cents left over for other purchases, rather than pay the full 25 cents for the light bulb and have to go without other articles, his standard of living is increased. It so happens that a comparatively small cost of an electric-light bulb is represented by labor. Those who have selfish axes to grind usually beg this question by saying that we are all producers and all consumers. That, I submit, does not justify unreasonable tariff protection which may rob a worker of the product which he needs as a consumer.

HIGH-WAGE, HIGH-TARIFF FALLACY

There is still another wage fallacy related to the tariff problem. For many years it has been the contention of the high protectionists that high tariffs bring high wages. Every time a tariff measure is before the Congress, this outworn argument is paraded be-

fore the American public. It is readily granted that the American scale of wages is generally higher than that of foreign countries. A simple comparison of money wages in the United States and foreign countries appears to be a clear and convincing way of showing those not capable of further analyzing the problem of foreign trade that there is a necessity for tariffs in order to protect workers. Not being able to understand all the implications of foreign trade, it seems to follow from this comparison that cheap foreign goods must be excluded or our scale of wages will be forced down to the foreign level, to the detriment of the working class.

Incidentally, in the Canadian debates relative to the reciprocal agreement recently concluded with that country, the wage argument was used against certain cheap labor in the United States. The opponents of the trade agreement in Canada maintained that they needed a high tariff in Canada because they could not compete with lower labor costs in the United States. Some producers in France maintain that they need high tariffs to protect them from the high wages in the United States. This two-edged sword is now being used against us. The fallacy of the high-wage, high-tariff argument is, of course, the assumption that high wages mean high production costs. This, of course, is not true, as is readily seen by the experience of the automobile industry in the United States, which, on an average, pays higher wages than almost any other industry. The automobile producers are not afraid of the pauper labor of Europe or the coolie labor of the Orient. The simple explanation of high wages and low costs is that such labor is more efficient; that is, it has greater productivity than such labor in foreign countries. American money wages have always been higher than those of Europe and other foreign countries. This was true before we had a high protective-tariff system.

If there were much validity to the high-wage, high-tariff argument, the United States could not export the many lines of products which it is now sending abroad. The American worker is more productive than his foreign competitor in the industry in which he can compete in foreign markets. It is well known that many of the important export industries of the United States pay the highest average wage rates. If all the facts were available, it would be found that, generally speaking, industries which depend upon protection pay the lowest wages. The existence of tariff protection itself indicates the lack of ability to compete.

John Dickinson, as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in commenting upon the importance of export trade to labor at the hearings on the reciprocal-tariff bill before the Ways and Means Committee, stated:

"The justification which has always been put forward for the so-called policy of protection is that it supplies employment for the American workingman; if that is its justification, was there an instance in which protection was more urgently demanded than for the American workmen who have been and are being thrown out of employment by the closing of foreign markets to our American trade?

"I submit that it is a short-sighted conception of protection to American industry which regards it as requiring the exclusion of foreign goods which are needed to pay for the American products of our American workmen who produce goods for sale abroad.

"American labor is employed in making those exports, and if we cannot sell them abroad, in return for foreign goods, the American labor employed in making them is thrown out of work without necessarily creating any opportunity for reemployment in making in this country the type of foreign goods which are excluded."

In tariff debates it is frequently represented that nearly 50,000,000 workers in the United States are dependent upon tariff protection. It is asserted that, since tariff protection is the American system, that all those gainfully employed are dependent upon it. This is an extreme assertion. Some provisional studies have been made which indicate that the tariff benefits no more than one-seventh of the country's working people, or from five to seven million workers, while it raises the cost of living to the great majority of the population. It is obvious that of the 10,000,000 farmers in the United States, a comparatively few receive actual benefit from the protective tariff, since so many agricultural products are on an export basis. Laborers and farmers are skillfully misled by the high-tariff advocates, who have been in position to say to labor, "If you do not stand for tariff protection, you will lose your job." This method of forcing workers to act against their true interests is little short of the system of indentured labor sometimes practiced by the less-enlightened countries.

In connection with the wage argument, I should like once more to quote the Secretary of State when he said in a radio broadcast on March 23, 1935:

"What do the supporters of an excessive and prohibitive tariff have to say in favor of such excesses? One of the most-used arguments is that such tariffs protect American workers against the pauper labor of Europe and Asia and the American people generally from a low standard of living. But does it? I may first remark that all agree to the maintenance of reasonable or moderate tariffs that will not allow excessive or unreasonable importations of competitive products. A study made of 36 typical industries which are on an export basis or not aided by the tariff and 36 industries whose products are highly protected shows that in 1929 the average remuneration of wage earners in the highly protected industries was $595 less than that of the worker in the industries which received no tariff benefits. The average annual income in the unprotected industries was $1,704, while that in the highly protected industries was $1,109."

The experience of 1931 and 1932 should be sufficient to demolish finally the fallacy that high tariffs protect the American wage earner. It is well known that, following the Tariff Act of 1930, which came into force the middle of that year, unemployment became cumulatively worse in 1931 and 1932 under the highest protection of our history. We hope that a deathblow has been struck the fallacious notion that high tariffs will solve all problems of unemployment. We have had sufficient experimentation along that line.

Increase in trade as the result of a moderate and reasonable tariff policy, such as that which this administration is following, is the greatest guarantee of increased employment and stability for wage earners. It is an interesting fact that during the last decade there has been a close parallel between the importation of manufactured goods and factory employment. When employment was lowest in the early part of 1933, imports also reached the depression level. As factory employment has increased, imports have increased and vice versa.

TRADE AGREEMENTS AND AGRICULTURE

Much criticism has been lodged against the trade-agreements program by organizations and individuals claiming to represent agriculture. The present administration has, of course, undertaken a number of measures for the assistance of the great number of agricultural workers of this country. One of the principal ways in which this administration has been endeavoring to help agriculture is through the expansion of foreign markets. Despite the tremendous difficulties inherent in any attempt to reduce trade barriers in the present world situation, and in spite also of the strenuous efforts of those with selfish axes to grind to distort the record, real progress has been made, although it has been necessary to move cautiously and with great care. Had the administration been willing to sell agriculture or other interests "down the river", as has been claimed, much greater progress might have been made.

In this connection I wish to reiterate what the President wisely said in his message to Congress in March 1934, when he recommended passage of the Trade Agreements Act. He then said, in part: "I would emphasize that quick results are not to be expected. The successful building up of trade without injury to American producers depends upon a cautious and gradual evolution of plans." That is the line which has since been followed. The President well realized that reversing the world trend and moving toward a more liberal trade policy could not be done overnight.

Now, let me remind you more specifically of what has been done. There have been concluded agreements with 14 countries, 10 of which are now in effect. In every one of these agreements special efforts have been made to reopen outlets for farm products; we realize full well that prosperity for agriculture means also greater prosperity for manufacturing and other industries, with greater employment for the people who live in our cities. To the 14 countries signing agreements thus far our exports of agricultural products alone fell from more than $307,000,000 in 1929 to approximately one hundred and four millions in 1933. Concessions have been obtained on agricultural items, accounting in the aggregate for some two-thirds of this trade—61 percent in 1929; 70 percent in 1933. Including both major and minor items, over 130 agricultural products, according to customs classifications, have been covered.

RESULTS OF AGREEMENTS

Though it is too early to make any final appraisal of the effects of the program in dollars and cents, the results thus far are highly encouraging. For example, shipments of agricultural products to Cuba increased 174 percent during the first year of the agreement. Although the Canadian agreement has been in effect only since January, there have already been distinct increases in exports of both agricultural and industrial items across our northern border. During the first quarter of 1936, as compared with a corresponding period for 1935, exports of the following items show substantial increases: Pork products, grapefruit, oranges, apples, dried and canned fruits, rice, fresh vegetables, eggs, and nuts. Several of these items are important to the economy of Virginia.

To other countries with which agreements have been signed, there have likewise been increases in trade in which agriculture has shared. In those months of 1935 during which the respective agreements were in effect, our total exports to each country were greater than in the corresponding period of the preceding year—by 31 percent in the case of Belgium, 18 percent for Haiti, and 20 percent for Sweden.

WHAT ABOUT AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS AND TRADE AGREEMENTS?

In order to obtain these advantages for our export trade, both agricultural and industrial, it is true that we have had to reduce duties on some products below the prohibitive levels of the Hawley-Smoot Act. Because a few agricultural items have been included in these reductions, those who would seize at any straw to turn sentiment in the farming regions against the program are trying to make the farmers of this country believe that an administration which has honestly sought to help, and has achieved results as indicated by farmers' income and farm prices, is an enemy and not their friend. These election-year friends of farmers are flooding the country with false propaganda pointing to the increases in agricultural imports during the past 2 years and seeking to create the impression that these imports have been deliberately brought about by the policies of the administration, and that agricultural imports of whatever nature are a menace to agriculture.

Now, such propaganda may fool a few farmers, but the great majority of them will not be so easily misled. They know that the great drought of 1934 made inroads into our supplies of feedstuffs and into our livestock herds, which made temporary increases of imports, particularly of feeds, absolutely imperative. They know, moreover, that the effects of the drought have persisted beyond the first year, particularly as regards livestock supplies. They know that in normal times nearly two-thirds of our agricultural imports are noncompetitive, and the bulk of the remainder is brought in over tariffs to supplement domestic production, as, for example, in the case of such items as sugar and flaxseed. They know that imports even of the competitive types of farm products, following the drought, were sufficient to replace only a small fraction of the drought losses; that they were not greater than in the predepression period; and that most of them are now receding to normal levels.

For example, a recent bulletin by the American Farm Bureau Federation stated:

"Butter imports declined 98 percent from April to October, 1935.

"Canned beef imports declined 40 percent from April to October, 1935.

"Hay imports virtually disappeared last fall when October imports amounted to only 3 percent of the April total.

"Corn imports in December 1935 were only one-fourth what they were in August.

"Oats imports virtually ceased.

"Barley imports virtually ceased.

"Wheat imports for human consumption totaled 13½ million bushels in the last 6 months of 1935, and all of this wheat paid a tariff of 42 cents per bushel."

What farmers may not know but should know is that the trade agreements program could not possibly have had any appreciable effect upon imports in 1934 and 1935, for the simple reason that most of the agreements did not come into effect until this year and for the further reason that very few reductions were made in agricultural duties. The only important exception was sugar, and sugar imports were limited by quota. The unvarnished truth is that the increased imports were almost entirely of products subject to the old Hawley-Smoot rates, and that they came in for the perfectly obvious reason that they were needed to supplement the domestic shortages which would not have occurred if we had not been afflicted with the worst drought in our entire history. To attribute the increases in imports to the trade-agreements program is entirely misleading and is to ignore the plain facts of the case.

The farmers of our country have long had almost complete possession of the domestic market for those agricultural products which could be grown in sufficient quantities and without too great a cost, and they are going to continue to have it. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that if we undertook to produce every dollar's worth of imported agricultural products which can be grown in this country at increased cost, or to produce substitutes for them, we would still have a vast acreage—possibly 45,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres—producing for export. Either we must find outlets for these exports or produce less. It will be a small price to pay if, in return for tariff concessions on our part which include some few carefully considered reductions of hitherto prohibitive duties on farm products—safeguarded where necessary by quantitative limitations—we can restore a substantial part of the trade lost during the depression.

CONCESSIONS OF PRIMARY INTEREST TO VIRGINIA

Now, I wish to bring this matter of trade agreements down to a local issue. Of course, the administration at Washington views the program from a national standpoint. That is absolutely necessary, but I am glad to say that in this national picture my State has received a number of advantages in foreign markets that it would otherwise not have received. The two or three largest export items from the State of Virginia are agricultural. Every Virginian knows of the importance of apple production to the State. This importance is dramatized every year in the blossom festival at Winchester. The exportation of a comparatively large part of the production is, of course, less dramatic, but is, nevertheless, of vital importance to the growers of Virginia. The value of exports of apples from Virginia in 1929 amounted to more than $10,000,000. At the depth of the depression, the value of exports was reduced by about one-third. There has been some recovery, but important foreign countries with which agreements have not been undertaken still greatly restrict our exports.

Concessions of direct benefit to American apple growers have been obtained in every one of the 14 reciprocal-trade agreements which have been thus far concluded.

All of the countries, with one exception—Nicaragua—have given concessions on fresh apples. These concessions include seasonal reductions in duty, increases in quota allotments, binding against any change in present treatment, and in some instances as much as a 50-percent reduction in duty. On dried apples, concessions have been obtained in 10 agreements: Cuba, Belgium, Sweden, Canada, Switzerland, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and France. On canned fruits, including canned apples and apple sauce, concessions have been obtained in 10 agreements: Cuba, Brazil, Belgium, Haiti, Canada, Netherlands, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala.

The importance of foreign markets for American apples is evident when it is realized that during 1935 fresh apples ranked in value nineteenth among our exports and second only to canned fruits in our exports of foodstuffs. Exports of fresh apples were valued at $17,000,000 in 1935, as compared with $21,000,000 for the previous 5-year average. Furthermore, the apple-growing industry is not localized but is of some importance in every State in the Union. In fact, in 1929 the $159,000,000 apple crop was distributed to the extent of at least $100,000 in every State except five. These five were Florida, Louisiana, Nevada, North Dakota, and Wyoming. Although the largest production centers were in Washington, with $33,000,000, and in New York and Virginia, with $15,000,000 each, 28 other States reported apple crops valued at more than $1,000,000 in 1929.

While not all of the apple-growing States produce fruit for export, prices in the domestic apple market react very quickly to any inability of exporters to ship apples abroad. A very large proportion of this commodity is marketed and sold to the consumer as fresh fruit. However, in 1933 both the canning and drying industries reported apple products valued at more than $4,000,000. Last year $3,000,000 worth of dried apples and nearly $1,000,000 worth of canned apples and apple sauce were exported. The popularity of American fresh, dried, and canned fruits in foreign countries is increasing rapidly and every effort is being made to enlarge the opportunities for the marketing of these products abroad.

Tobacco is by far the largest item of export from the State of Virginia. This product has been important to the State from early colonial days. For a period tobacco is reported as having been used as the medium of exchange. The exports in 1929, as reported by the Department of Commerce, amounted to nearly $60,000,000. This was reduced by 54 percent in 1932. There has been some improvement in export markets during the past year or so. There is, however, much to be done in the way of lessening trade restrictions for a full recovery of our foreign markets for tobacco. Some progress has been made through agreements thus far concluded. The recent agreement concluded with France, which comes into effect on June 15, provides for a minimum increase in the purchases of tobacco by France in 1936 of about 10 percent over the purchases of 1935, or from 18,977,000 to 20,500,000 pounds. Several other concessions have been obtained in the agreements thus far concluded.

Cigarettes, an important product to Richmond, constituted the third largest item of export from Virginia. Some minor concessions have been obtained on cigarettes, but most foreign countries find that these are an important source of revenue and refuse to reduce the assessments placed on them.

There are other items, such as cotton and manufactures, lumber and wood manufactures, formerly of some significance in the exports of Virginia, which have been benefited in a number of the agreements. When the program is finally completed I can say with some confidence that every product of importance in the export trade of Virginia will have received some advantage, both directly and indirectly. The indirect benefits of this program to the State of Virginia should not be ignored.

Every important industry in every section of the country is interrelated to every other section in some way, and what is done for the advantage of one is reflected in the well-being of the other. I am sure that the members of this association, when they analyze fully the trade-agreements program, will agree with me that it is a forward-looking step toward rehabilitating world trade.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an address I made before the Democratic convention of the State of Virginia, including some small extracts.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC ADDRESS

Mr WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address by me before the Virginia Democratic convention, at Norfolk, Va., June 16, 1936:

I wish to acknowledge very sincerely my deep appreciation of the high honor conferred upon me in giving me the commission to bring you the message upon this occasion which shall officially sound the battle cry of a united, a militant, and a determined Virginia democracy. As I look out upon this inspiring scene—as I make note of your enthusiasm, your unity of purpose, and your determination—my heart is cheered with the knowledge that in our own beloved Virginia the cause of democracy, the faith of our fathers, is in good keeping. In the language of the Book of Books, "How pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Whatever may be or may have been our individual opinions as to methods, ways, means, and measures, certainly true it is today that we can meet upon one common ground, and that is with a heart full of pride that under the wise leadership of our great President the dark clouds of despondency and hopelessness are receding, and the sun is rising upon a new day in our land.

I wish, at the outset, to pay my respects and to extend my cordial felicitations to our State leadership. The people of Virginia have for many decades looked to the Democratic Party for the administration of State affairs. A long succession of distinguished chief executives, than whom none has been more courageous, conscientious, and patriotic than our present distinguished Governor, have given to the people of Virginia an administration of State affairs that was honest, sincere, economically sound, and in keeping with our splendid heritage. I wish

to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to our State legislative bodies, individually and collectively, to their distinguished presiding officers, and to the many other State and local officials, who, by their sincerity of purpose and devotion to the ideals of good government, have helped to make and maintain Virginia at that high point of governmental efficiency which has caused it to be held up as a model to her sister States.

In the administration of national affairs, Virginia is, of course, duly proud of her two splendid representatives in the United States Senate. I refer, of course, to Virginia's first citizen, the senior Senator, CARTER GLASS, and the distinguished, able, and courageous junior Senator, HARRY F. BYRD.

I continually thank Providence that I live in a State and represent a great district which does not require its representatives to be demagogues. If I understand the temperament of our people correctly, they wish their representatives in government to be intelligent, honest, courageous, and sincere. They do not require them to be perfect or superhuman. They can and will easily forgive human frailties, but they will not countenance dishonesty or demagoguery or cowardice. In these trying times, when it has been so imperative that in legislative matters there must be haste and a great deal of experimentation, there has been no human formula or yardstick by which any one man or set of men could say with definiteness and certainty that this course of conduct and this alone is wise. It has been the salvation of our country that there has been a difference of opinion on vital questions. It is so with the American people; it is so with the citizens of our own State. And so I say to you, my fellow Democrats, that if there have been occasions in these past few years when you have observed differences of opinion within the ranks of the Democratic Party, and its leaders, in the State and in the Nation, it is a virtue to be commended and not a vice to be condemned. It is an evidence of the freedom of thought and action which you have given your representatives, and by virtue of which they have been able, in my opinion, to reflect credit and honor upon their State and Nation.

I wish to pay tribute to the courage, the industry, and the sincerity of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I hope I may say to you with pardonable pride and without a display of unseemly boastfulness that the Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives occupies a place in the estimation of their colleagues which is worthy of the great State they represent.

THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

I hope it is within the limit of legitimate debate to comment upon the national convention at Cleveland and the attitude toward the administration taken by the speakers and the platform. My distinguished personal friend, the able Senator from Oregon, Mr. STEIWER, keynoted, much to the apparent delight and edification of the delegates assembled. Being a keynoter myself, I have a fellow feeling for the Senator. Our positions, however, fortunately for me, were quite different.

The distinguished Senator was forced to condemn policies and measures which had been enacted into law with his approval, support, and his vote as a Senator. He vigorously attacked regimentation in Government, and yet he voted for the N. R. A. He condemned the administration's treatment of agriculture and the so-called doctrine of scarcity, and yet he voted for the New Deal farm bill, the A. A. A. He condemned our fiscal policies and charged that we had led the Government to the brink of drastic inflation, and yet as a Senator he voted for the Wheeler 16-to-1 silver amendment and for the Thomas amendment, which conferred upon the President the power to inflate the currency by issuing $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks, a power which the President has never used.

He condemned the Government in business, and yet he voted for the Tennessee Valley Authority law. He condemned the wasteful spending and the unbalanced Budget, and yet he voted twice to override the President's veto on economy legislation. He complained very bitterly about the passage of unconstitutional laws. The Senator is one of the ablest lawyers in the Senate, and yet he voted for three of these laws that were declared unconstitutional.

I recite these facts to show that there will be in the attitude and the utterances of those who now head the Republican Party a decided change of spirit toward the New Deal since their ascension to leadership.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Without going into any long discussion of the platform adopted at Cleveland, permit me to say that while it is heavily charged with denunciations, condemnations, and criticisms, I think a very careful analysis of the platform will show that it is almost an endorsement of the fundamental principles involved in the President's recovery program. As I recall it, there were only two instances where the platform specifically pledged the party to a repeal of New Deal measures. One was the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act and the other the authority which Congress gave the President to fix the gold content of the dollar.

It is true that the Republican platform has a farm plank and a plank on social security, budget balancing, etc., and while there undoubtedly is some difference in the approach to the problem, yet really fundamentally there is little difference.

The platform presents some curious inconsistencies. For instance, it calls for ample expenditures for public relief to be administered through State agencies; for benefit payments to farmers equal to those being paid by the New Deal plus higher tariff rates which would be invoked in his behalf; lower taxes; and, on top of all of that, a balanced Budget. Now, if you can figure that out, please let me know the formula. That is not the only inconsistency. The platform promises to open up the foreign markets for the benefit of American agriculture and industry, to collect the war debts, and to take the lead in stabilizing currency, and yet they go on record as favoring a repeal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, the imposition of higher tariffs, and an extreme isolationist attitude toward the rest of the world. It is elementary that the only way that our markets can be opened up for American agriculture and industry and the only earthly way foreign nations will ever be able to pay the war debts or any portion of them will be by reestablishing an easy flow of trade between the nations. The reciprocal trade agreement program of the administration has made splendid strides in that direction.

THE REPUBLICAN NOMINEE

As was apparent from the opening of the convention, the nomination went to Governor Landon. The Governor theretofore had been most sympathetic with the major objectives of the New Deal, as I shall presently show. Let us look now a little, if you please, at "the record."

KANSAS

Governor Landon has acquired considerable fame as the chief executive of his splendid State, especially relating to his much-talked-of "balanced budget." I certainly have no desire to dim in the least the luster of his glory in that regard. I think we can with profit, however, examine the facts.

Fiscally, the State government of Kansas has fared comparatively well during the recent depression. With the exception of 1930 and 1933 income exceeded outgo. This situation, however, represents no particular achievement because the State government itself is fiscally a relatively unimportant factor in the performance of governmental functions in the State. The cost of State and local governments averages at present approximately $135,000,000. Of this total the general fund of the State accounts for only $7,500,000. The fact that a $7,500,000 budget was balanced has little bearing upon the fiscal situation in the State. It should be noted that to balance the $7,500,000 budget the State at present relies for 45 percent of its revenue upon taxes on property, a tax base which is also the major source of revenue for the local units of government. Furthermore, to keep the budget balanced, the State was obliged to impose a personal and corporate tax in 1933 from which an additional $1,600,000 was derived annually.

The tapping of this source of revenue was still inadequate to keep the budget balanced, and for that reason it was necessary to reduce expenditures. These reductions were accomplished by cuts of as much as 30 percent in the salaries of State officers and employees (including supreme court judges).

In view of the relative unimportance of the State government in meeting the cost of government, the bulk of the burden falls upon the cities, towns, and counties. These were called upon during the depression to pay for 98 percent of the school bill and to meet most of the State's responsibility for unemployment relief, in spite of the fact that the property tax, which is their major source of revenue, showed sharp reductions in productivity.

In spite of its comparatively good financial condition the State of Kansas had prior to 1935 consistently refrained from making any appropriations for unemployment relief.

The $225,000 relief expenditures credited to Kansas in the early months of 1933 were highway expenditures and not relief expenditures and were matched by $2,592,935 R. F. C. funds. Finally, in February 1935, the State appropriated $775,000 to last for 28 months "for supervision and administration of public-welfare relief, social security, and unemployment." During the 3 years 1933, 1934, and 1935 the total contribution of the State government to relief represented less than one-half of 1 percent of all relief expenditures from public funds.

To compensate for the inactivity of the State, the localities contributed a total of $14,325,622 for relief purposes during the same 3 years. To make these contributions, Kansas localities were obliged to tap all sources of revenue. This is apparent from the fact that almost 30 percent of all local funds raised for relief purposes were obtained from the sales of bonds, while part of the remainder entailed the diversion of funds originally dedicated to other purposes. Substantial sums were obtained through levies on already overburdened property.

The steadily deteriorating financial condition of the localities forced reductions in essential expenditures. Thus, between 1932 and 1934 current school expenditures decreased from $29,760,000 to $22,125,000, or approximately 26 percent. To avoid wholesale bankruptcies, counties are now clamoring for a sales tax. Such a bill has already been prepared by the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, an organization traditionally opposed to sales taxes.

CONCLUSIONS

Kansas could keep its budget in balance during the depression because—

(1) The general-fund budget is a comparatively unimportant factor in the Kansas governmental bill; it provides only 6 percent of all governmental funds (that is the funds supplied by State and local governments combined).

(2) The State enacted a personal and corporate income tax in 1933 and retained all revenue for itself.

(3) It cut salaries as much as 30 percent.

(4) It paid less than 2 percent of the cost of public schools.

(5) It supplied only one-half of 1 percent of the cost of relief.
(6) It forced the local governments into borrowing, into increasing burden on property, and cutting such essential costs as those for public schools.
(7) It has created a demand for a sales tax to "keep counties from bankruptcy."
(8) It received enormous sums in Federal assistance.

THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

When we met 4 years ago America socially, economically, and spiritually was in the depths of despair and despondency. I shall not take the time now to again paint the picture. You remember it all too well; nor shall I undertake to place the blame. The simple facts are, however, that under an administration of national affairs wholly within the power and control of the Republican Party, we had toppled from a high pinnacle of prosperity and economic solidarity to the very brink of national and individual bankruptcy. The American people will not soon forget that tragic fact. That record is written deep in their hearts and graven upon their souls. The political opponents and severe critics of the President will have a hard time explaining to the American people how it is that if Republican policies and leadership, as represented by the then and now leaders of the Republican Party, could now be expected to rejuvenate America, why, then, did it not prevent its collapse? No amount of specious argument, no beating of the breasts, no attempts to scare and frighten the American people, no amount of mythical issues will obliterate from our minds and consciousness the fact that under 12 successive and uninterrupted years of Republican administration, day by day and in every way, we sank lower and lower in the economic scale, until on March 4, 1933, we had reached the bottom. Armies of unemployed pounded the highways; the sound of the auctioneer's voice resounded in home and on farm; bankruptcy courts were overcrowded; banks closed their doors; portions of our citizenship armed themselves and marched upon county seats to prevent foreclosures of their properties. Fear, distrust, hopelessness, and despair, the four horsemen of disaster, rode abroad in our land. I say to you, my friends, that the record is there. It speaks for itself. It cannot be denied.

"The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

But I do not wish to rest my case on trying to point out the shortcomings or failures of our political opponents; but in the language of a great American statesman, "Let's look at the record." After all, it is not what I say or what my political adversaries say, but it is the record that counts. I am reminded of a young mother who once asked her husband: "What makes you think our boy is going to be a politician?" The young father replied: "He says more things that sound well and mean nothing than any other human being I ever saw." Anyone can make a speech extolling the virtues of an individual or a party, or calling down from high Heaven the wrath of Deity. But today I have a very much more agreeable duty to perform, and that is to bring you, in the necessarily brief space of time, the record of accomplishment of the present administration. Our opponents and critics are in a most unfortunate situation. They have nothing to offer and must content themselves with carping criticism and obstructive tactics. We ask judgment on the record—on both records, if you please.

WHAT OF A DICTATORSHIP?

We have heard much talk of late, and shall doubtless hear more in the months to come, of a "dictatorship." A new slogan that seems to have been coined by the Republican keynoter at Cleveland was "Down with the New Deal Caesar." Of course, he did not take very much time in explaining how he justified the great number of times that he had followed the leadership of that New Deal Caesar.

Antiadministration spellbinders rise to their greatest heights of oratory and melodramatics when, with wild gesticulations, they strike out against the specter of a tyrannical dictator; the loss of our so-called liberties; the collapse of free and democratic institutions. They picture to us a land under the iron heel of this tyrant who holds us in political bondage. Sounds pretty bad, doestn't it? Well, do you really know what it is? It's ghost stories, conjured up to frighten little children. Fortunately, the American people are not so easily duped. The real liberties of the American people—that is, if you mean the liberties of all of the people—were never quite so safe as now. Of course, complete frankness compels me to admit that a few American citizens have lost at least for a season some of their physical liberties. Unfortunately, it was found necessary in recent years to take a few high-ranking officials, who had not properly appreciated the public trust and confidence in them reposed, and deprive them of their liberty.

It is also true that some so-called liberties have been taken from a few groups of individuals. Let us name them: That company of conscienceless stock manipulators who wish to continue free to ply their trade upon the investors of America; certain monopolistic combinations and groups of persons who wanted to exploit the American public. There have been a few groups, who, parading under the cloak of their love of liberty and constitutional government, desired in reality to have the power to control government and manipulate it for their own benefit. Some of their freedom of action in this regard has been circumscribed. There were also a few other groups of so-called business organizations reaping large profits from the exploitation of labor and of women and children in industry. They likewise have lost some of their so-called liberties.

But, my friends, the fundamental heritage of freedom, liberty of action, equality of opportunity, freedom of speech, of public assembly, of religious worship, the right to representation in free government—these and many other heritages of which we boast are safe and sound and have in nowise been curtailed or circumscribed.

But they say the present Chief Executive has usurped the powers of the legislative branch of the Government and has become a dictator. Let us look at the record: In the emergency it was necessary to confer large discretionary powers upon the President in order that there might be expeditious treatment of the problems which so vitally affected our people. In no instance that can be pointed out has this right of power been abused by the Chief Executive or has he ever in any sense of the word undertaken to force his will or his individual ideas upon the legislative branch of the Government. It has often followed his leadership, it is true, but it is likewise true that it has many times made its own decisions. But this frantic talk about the loss of our liberties, a dictatorship, and usurpation by the Chief Executive is not new. Listen to this blast, if you please, and tremble in your boots for the safety of our Nation:

"We saw the executive power grasp in one hand the sword and the purse of the Nation, and in the other the legislative and judicial authority, and hold them in a relentless grip to the complete annihilation of our constitutional rights.

"We saw trade disordered, Government finances ruined, an enormous debt piled incalculably high, intolerable taxes. We saw the superb Constitution, under which our country has grown great and respected, torn to shreds."

Now, these are bold words. It is surely an ominous warning. You can hear the rattle of the trappings of the tyrant; feel the brush of his withering breath upon your brow; the weight of his mailed hand upon your bending form; and hear, if you please, the reverberations on the crumbling foundations of our institutions of government as they fall about our ears. It surely is a pretty bad situation. Where did this blast come from? It sounds like some antiadministration keynoter, doesn't it? Surely, the warning is opportune and must have been uttered about the hated New Deal. Well, if you are interested to know about this very colorful statement, I can tell you that it is history repeating itself. The article was an editorial in the Salem (Ill.) Advocate, under date of November 13, 1863, in the middle of the first term of Mr. Lincoln. He was trying to save the Union, and that is what his political enemies said of him.

AN ADMINISTRATION BY HUMANS

In the first place, permit me to cheerfully make a concession or a confession, perhaps. The Democratic Party is made up of human beings; its great leader, thank God, is decidedly human.

Ah, my friends, it has seemed to me that there was something providential in sending us this man at this hour. The first time, perhaps, in the history of our land where there sat in the White House a great leader whose heart and sustaining hand reached out to the helpless, the despondent, the weak; who not only had sympathy for the needs of his people, but the courage to translate that sympathy into action. The clatter and clang of the trappings of form and ceremony or the imposing presence of power and affluence have not been sufficient to sway him from his purpose to minister to the needs of his people.

All human institutions are subject to frailties, errors, and failures. In order to commend the present administration to your favorable consideration, I do not feel required to demonstrate its absolute perfection and infallibility. I freely confess shortcomings, disappointments, and even failures. We were confronted with an unprecedented problem. History did not furnish its parallel. Ancient maxims of constitutionalism and government were empty and meaningless in the face of the real practical problem that lay on the doorstep of the President when he took office in March 1933.

Millions of American citizens, through no fault of their own, were destitute. They had to be fed and housed. Talk of States' rights and a balanced Budget did not seem to go very far toward easing that eating hunger that gnawed at their vitals; State and local governments had practically failed and were financially unable to meet the problem. The Federal Government had to do the job. The financial institutions of the country faced ruin. The Federal Government had to step into the breach. Business and commerce in every avenue had to turn to the Federal Government for sustenance and deliverance. The President and his party have met these problems face to face and applied the remedy that seemed to be indicated. Again, in the language of Holy Writ, "That which the hand findeth to do—do that with a will." Today millions of Americans send up to the mercy seat a prayer of thanksgiving that there was called to the White House in this hour of trial a man who had the courage and the vision and the humanity of purpose to meet the issue. The results speak for themselves. Failures there have been, but there have been so many victories, so many triumphs. There is so much of the good and so much of the commendable that the American people, with their traditional generosity, will in November give credit where credit is due and acknowledge, in a handsome way, the beneficent and wise leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

ALL CITIZENS JOINED IN ELECTING ROOSEVELT

Let me not overlook acknowledging the splendid support given the President in 1932 by many persons who never before had affiliated with our party. The size and extent of his marvelous victory were made possible by the enthusiastic support of literally thousands of citizens who put their desire for progressive government above party ties.

We invite again your cooperation and aid. The effects of the tragic situation which has confronted us and from which we are emerging fell alike on all of us regardless of sectional or political differences. The administration has sought to reconstruct and rebuild along lines that would benefit all alike. In a continuation of this forward movement we welcome the aid of every American citizen.

THE WOMEN

To the women of America and Virginia we bring salutations and hearty felicitations.

Certainly, over and above the din of bitter partisan denunciation and criticism, you have been able to discern the great warm heart and consecrated purpose of our leader, who has dared to concern himself and his administration with the well-being of women, children, youth, and the needy. For once there has been an administration of government that, in its anxiety to build up and reconstruct business and commerce, has not forgotten the fundamental truth that the strength of the Nation is its homes.

This reconstruction program has reached out and brought succor and aid to the homes of our citizens in the cities and on the farms. American womanhood will not forget Roosevelt the humanitarian.

PLATFORM

Now about our platform: That seems to be the thing that is troubling our political enemies the most. It is really very touching to see the Liberty League and the Republican Party so much concerned about us Democrats. The truth of the thing is that these gentlemen are not so much concerned because we have failed to live up to our platform, but the thing that terrifies the Liberty League and that has caused the Republican Party to try to undergo a rebirth is the fact that we have lived up to the essential and fundamental ingredients of our platform of 1932. That's what hurts—"Let's look at the record."

After all, however, let us face the realities of the situation. The platform, numbering only about 1,500 words—clear, concise, and specific—was drawn up in the middle of the summer of 1932, 8 months before the President took the oath of office. A lot happened in the meantime—don't forget that. But the remarkable and astounding part of it is that our platform makers were so nearly able to appraise and approximate conditions accurately. They missed it in one notable particular, and that was the extent of the damage done by the depression and the cost of repair. But now we have a platform, and let's see about it. There are 26 affirmative planks in this much-discussed platform. Eliminating such planks as oppose the repudiation of foreign debts, the employment of American citizens on the Panama Canal, and seven planks condemning the policies of the previous administration, et cetera, we have for practical purposes 18 affirmative planks in the platform. These have been substantially carried out or are in the process of being carried out with one exception—the plank which promised a reduction of governmental expenditures of 25 percent.

THE BUDGET

In that respect I call you to witness the fact that one of the first acts of the President was to present for the consideration of Congress the so-called economy legislation which sought to reduce public expenditures by making drastic reductions all along the line. This effort on the part of the administration was met by a storm of protest, and such reductions as were made were largely reinstated and oftentimes with aid of Republican votes in Congress.

But I ask you in all sincerity and honesty who in June 1932 could have predicted the severity of the blow or the necessity for expenditures that would be required before we could pull out of this disaster? Of course, we have spent a lot of money, and it is imperative that these expenditures be reduced as speedily as possible and that will be done. But there is still much to be done, and only a spirit of cooperation on the part of business and industry and a firm and determined stand by Congress will enable us to get back on an even financial basis. I say to you without any hesitation that if in March 1933 and the months that followed this Government had undertaken to hold down its public expenditures merely to the amount of its receipts from taxation or its income there was no power on the face of this earth that would have prevented internal social and economic disorders that would have shaken our Government from center to circumference.

RAGGED INDIVIDUALISM

This is not the first time we have had an unbalanced Budget. But again let us look at the record. Let us go back to the classic era of ragged individualism. We find that under Mr. Hoover the total expenditures increased from $3,994,152,487 in the first year of his administration to $5,142,953,677 in the last year of his administration, and the public debt rose from $16,000,000,000 to $22,000,000,000. The per-capita expenditure for the operation of the Federal Government during that period increased from 32.42 to 40.91 during that administration. What do we have now? The public debt has increased 9 or 10 billion dollars, made necessary because of this emergency. It is passing strange that we did not hear these loud lamentations and calamity howlings when the public debt mounted to $22,000,000,000, a very large portion of which, be it remembered, had gone into the pockets of war profiteers; but the wrath of high Heaven is called down upon our heads when the Government is called upon to spend a few billion dollars to feed and clothe people to save their homes and their business and to prevent a collapse of their financial institutions; to save the youth of the land, and to provide a measure of security for the aged and dependent. I stand for a balanced Budget of ordinary expenditures at the earliest possible moment, and shall exert every possible effort to that end, but we may not and need not be under the illusion that this administration or any other administration can this year or next year balance its Budget, if you include expenditures that will be necessary because of the relief load.

Again let us look at the platform and the record:

RELIEF OF HUMAN NEEDS

In the Democratic platform we find the following provision:

"We advocate the extension of Federal credit to the States to provide unemployment relief wherever the diminishing resources of the States make it impossible for them to provide for the needy; expansion of the Federal program of necessary and useful construction affected with a public interest, such as adequate flood control and waterways."

Let us recall again that this provision in the Democratic platform was written in June 1932, 8 or 9 months before the President took office. However, we have lived up to the spirit of that commitment.

In 1933 when the present administration came into power, it was confronted with a need of an immediate relief program which was without parallel in the history of our country and which might easily have caused serious economic and social disorders. State governments were divided into three classes: First, those States which were absolutely financially unable to meet their relief problems; second, that group of States which, though financially able to pay their own way, did not make such arrangements and preferred to look to the Federal Government; third, those States wherein are located the heavy metropolitan centers or industrial districts where the relief load, due to unemployment, was so stupendous that they could not and should not have been expected to have borne the whole burden. When he addressed the Human Needs Conference held in Washington in 1933, the President made this statement:

"If the State has done everything it reasonably should do, then obviously the Federal Government must step in, because, while it isn't written in the Constitution, it is the inherent duty of the Federal Government to keep its citizens from starvation."

And a month later, he said in a radio message from the White House: "The Government must not let anyone starve this winter."

Therefore, a realistic problem was presented to the administration. I maintain that it has been handled in a splendid manner, considering its perplexities and difficulties. Again I reiterate that perhaps there have been errors of judgment. Very likely plans have not worked out as intended in some instances; but with experience as its guide, the manner and method of handling relief has been as satisfactory as could reasonably have been expected under the circumstances. There were a great variety of circumstances that had to be considered. In the first place, it should be borne in mind that relief rolls were made up by local communities. If persons were on such rolls who were not entitled to be there, then certainly the blame for that cannot be laid at the door of the Federal Government. In the second place, this great army of unemployed and destitute contained all classes and elements of our citizenship. There were the men physically able to work either in the skilled or unskilled trades or labor. There was the increasingly large army of young men from the ages of 16 to 22 or 23, who, for one reason or another, could not continue in school or college and could not find employment. There was then a large and very difficult group to handle composed of the so-called white-collar workers—merchants, lawyers, insurance men, clerical workers, teachers, engineers, architects, etc. Added to this was yet another group, the so-called artists' group—professional musicians, dancers, singers, painters, sculptors, etc.

Considerable ridicule has been leveled at the projects designed to take care of these people. Bear in mind, however, that they were American citizens and that the depression had deprived them of their livelihood. They were entitled to consideration at the hands of our Government. Added to that, was something like 400,000 women and a staggering number of domestic servants. Then came the large list of unemployables who were on the relief rolls—persons who because of age or infirmities were not able to work, but who were destitute and had to be cared for. I go into this detail to show you that when it came to formulating and fashioning a program to care for these problems so varied and so complex and with no precedent to go by, the administration had a very real challenge to meet.

A few months ago when we came to consider the relief appropriations for 1937 we called before the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, Mr. Harry Hopkins, the Emergency Relief Director. For several days he and his aides were ready to answer questions before our committee. On this committee were three of the most able and astute members of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. They were armed with all manner of data and did not conceal their purpose to develop any defects or shortcomings in the administration of relief. The hearings on this one item alone, which included all manner of reports and statistical data, numbered 490 printed pages. At the conclusion, I can say

without any hesitation that while there may have been some difference of opinion as to measures and methods, in not one single instance was anything developed or shown that in any way reflected upon the sincerity and the honesty of the effort to handle this very perplexing and difficult problem. It has been charged that politics has figured in this relief. There may be places where this is true, and if it is, it is entirely because of local influences and has certainly been contrary to the wishes and over the protests of the administration.

You will recall that we started out in 1933 with the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which inaugurated the civil-works program. Under this program, which lasted until April 1934, 255,000 miles of road were built or repaired, 60,000 public buildings were repaired or rebuilt, 1,000 airports built or completed, and many other worth-while white-collar projects completed. The total cost of the civil-works program was $938,000,000, of which $738,000,000 was expended for wages. The Works Progress Administration was established in May 1935. It had for its purpose the furnishing of employment to employable persons on relief. You will recall that at that time the President decided that employables must be looked after by the respective communities. Under this program over 3,000,000 unemployed persons on relief rolls have been given work, and the following projects have been carried forward:

Workers: 3,039,000 unemployed put to work.

Flood control and other conservation: 2,989 projects under construction.

Schools: 5,266 schools built or repaired.

Public buildings (excluding schools): 4,242 structures erected or repaired.

Farm-to-market roads: Projects valued at $159,000,000 under construction. These will help to lift 13,000,000 farmers out of the mud.

Airports: 328 fields and airway markers built or improved. This builds toward a great national air transport system.

Water and sewer systems: 6,256 plants built or repaired.

Parks and playgrounds: 4,892 parks and playgrounds constructed or improved.

Utilities (electric): 130 systems installed or repaired.

In Virginia, W. P. A. had certified State grants totaling $6,318,000 to prosecute some 1,500 projects. By the end of 1935, W. P. A. and other Federal-aid programs had absorbed 45,167 workers out of a total of 61,000 men and women certified for relief.

A variety of projects had been undertaken, including highways, roads, streets, public buildings, conservation, public utilities, such as sewer and water systems, professional, technical, and clerical projects, etc. Two hundred and nine projects to employ women were in operation on December 31, employing some 9,000 women from the relief rolls.

To meet the crisis among the youth of the land, two programs have been in operation: Over a million young men have been taken from the relief rolls and put into the C. C. C. camps, where they have been improved in health and have been able to contribute to their dependents. The National Youth Movement has also made a notable contribution to this problem: 605,200 young people receiving N. Y. A. wages for many kinds of work useful both to them and to the communities in which they live; 6,600 graduate students earning an average of $25 and $30 a month to help pay their way through graduate school; 125,000 college students earning a maximum average of $15 a month to help meet the expenses of a college education; 263,600 high-school students earning up to $6 a month to pay for carfares, lunches, textbooks, and other essentials; 210,000 young men and women employed on approximately 6,800 N. Y. A. work projects; and 4,500 young women in attendance at 68 camps for unemployed women.

BOONDOGGLING

There have been very pointed and persistent criticisms of the so-called boondoggling projects. Much of the information published is without foundation and fact. Many of the instances are elaborated upon without reciting all of the facts. From time to time there have been something in the neighborhood of 300 of these so-called boondoggling projects that have been criticized in the press or in public addresses. I wish to make a brief comment upon that: In the first place, let it be remembered that these projects were undertaken with the cooperation of the States or the communities and in nearly every instance the project was selected and submitted to the Federal Government by the particular community involved, and the sponsors bore part of the costs.

But if we should say for the sake of argument that an error of judgment was made in every one of these 300 projects, which is by no means true, they constitute one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the so-called Federal-aid projects and affect fewer than 200,000 persons. The total cost of the same is correspondingly infinitesimal.

Let us pick out, however, one or two of the notable instances where there has been so much criticism. Time does not permit any extensive discussion of this phase of the program. Of course, all of us remember the very famous $25,000 dog house built in Memphis, Tenn. This project has been held up to ridicule and scorn by the press and by the Republican spellbinders. Now, what are the facts? For the past several years Memphis has been scourged with recurrent cases of mad dogs. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the terror of such a situation. The United States Public Health Service has been concerned about the condition. The mayor of Memphis pointed out in a telegram that in the last 3 years alone the city health service had given 827 Pasteur treatments, mostly to children who had been bitten by mad dogs, and that during that period 1,500 people had been bitten by dogs affected by rabies; that 362 dogs had been involved; and that at least 6 persons had suffered horrible deaths from this malady. The city of Memphis presented the so-called dog house as a worthwhile project for its community and the cost was $25,000, $6,000 of which was borne by the city; and it furnished employment for people on the relief rolls and provided a ways and means of ridding this splendid community of a terrible menace. So much for the dog house.

Let us look at another one that has been the subject of so much ridicule. The Republic National Committee, in a list of projects which it criticized, gave this meager information: "At Waltham, Mass., drainage of a piggery on Winter Street cost the Federal Government $9,478." Of course, that meager information would cause any citizen to look with scorn upon this project. What are the facts? On Winter Street in Waltham, Mass., there was a piggery, or pig wallow. In fact, there is a piggery. The drainage from this said piggery emptied into a stream which feeds the water supply of the adjoining city of Cambridge. Danger of contamination was so great that the Massachusetts State Board of Health ordered the piggery drained; and again in this instance the community presented this project to the Federal Government on a cooperative basis. The piggery has been drained. Destitute American citizens on relief were given work, and the water supply of the splendid city of Cambridge has been made safe. So much for the piggery.

I have in my files several hundred instances such as I have detailed to you, but time does not permit any more extensive discussion of that. The fact remains that the Democratic administration has in good faith, in my judgment, effectively met the relief problem. We are withdrawing from it just as fast as possible, and a continuation of improved business conditions and a cooperation of industry will enable us to get out of this business of relief, we hope, at a very early date.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION

I think all of us can agree that business and industry, as well as the individual citizen, should be given the greatest amount of personal freedom and be encouraged to use individual initiative. Unquestionably, the Government should not ruthlessly and wantonly step in and undertake to regulate the business and affairs of its citizens. But while this is true fundamentally, yet again we have been faced with a very practical situation.

Let us take, for instance, the great coal industry. After the collapse of N. R. A., the administration was besieged by this great industry to come to its assistance. The so-caled Guffey coal bill was presented as a remedy. Of course, at once it invoked heated discussion and a wide difference of opinion. Realizing the need of this remedial legislation, the President asked Congress to pass the bill, and that if there were a doubt about the constitutionality, the doubt be resolved in favor of the legislation. For that, he was soundly criticized. The bill was passed; it saved the coal industry. It was declared unconstitutional by a divided court, and it occurs to me that the splendid reasoning of the minority opinion of the Court is abundant justification for Congress having been willing to take this action in the face of such an extreme need.

Now, what has happened further? The coal industry is faced with a tragic situation. Congress is again asked to come to the aid of this industry. A few days ago, in fact, on June 10, I received a letter from a distinguished citizen of my district, whose name I do not feel at liberty to use. However, he represents the intellectually conservative type of our citizenship. His letter impressed me so greatly that I take the liberty of herewith quoting a portion of it as a convincing statement on the subject:

"Unalterably opposed as I have been, and still am, in general to Government in business, intimate contact with the coal industry for more than 20 years has forced me to the conclusion that coal has now acquired a place in the economic life of the Nation where the welfare of owners and their employees, and the protection from ruthless waste of a valuable natural resource necessitate governmental regulation of some kind. In such regulation, as I see the picture, is the only hope for the survival of the majority of coal operators.

"For quite a while I tenaciously held to the hope that through trade associations, such as Appalachian Coals, Inc., the industry might reasonably regulate itself, but I have followed earnestly these efforts to the point where I am forced to admit that with such a multiplicity of operators, widely scattered, with varying conditions, effective cooperative action will never be secured such as will eliminate unfair trade practices and abuses and continual price wars with their devastating losses.

"Hence I am writing to invoke your careful consideration of these facts and to express the hope that you may see your way clear to support the new Guffey law which, if enacted and made effective, will at least give relief for some years and perhaps until a more permanent solution of the problem is found."

So we see that in spite of theories and abstract fundamentals to which we might subscribe, here is a great industry pleading for help. Not only are the stockholders involved, mind you, but the workman and his security, as well as the consuming public.

So I think I may reiterate, there has been no precedent, no definite yardstick, which might measure and guide our course in these years that have just passed.

FURTHER WITH REFERENCE TO THE PLATFORM

Let us again look at the instances wherein the Democratic administration has proceeded to carry out its platform promises of 1932:

TRANSPORTATION

The Motor Carrier Act of 1935 provides that the power to regulate transportation of passengers or property by motor carriers engaged in interstate commerce is vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission, provides regulations for the supervision of busses and trucks, and provides penalties for failure to comply.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Establishes a system of retirement annuities for railroad workers who reach the age of 65 years, and for any under that age who have had 30 years' service with the rail carriers and who either make application for retirement or are retired because of physical or mental disability.

THE NEUTRALITY ACT

Makes it unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States or its possessions to any port of belligerent states, or to any neutral port for transshipment to, or for the use of, a belligerent country, etc.

THE BANKING ACT OF 1935

Under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the banking laws have been strengthened and improved in many notable instances.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Under the provisions of this act water-power rights have been preserved, electric utility rates reduced, and a great plant of inestimable value in time of war maintained.

UTILITY REGULATION OF HOLDING COMPANIES

The Wheeler-Rayburn Act regulating public-utility holding companies—a long-needed reform for protection of utility stockholders, as well as consumers; a bill fought through only in the most impudent and highly financed lobby in congressional annals.

REGULATION OF SECURITIES

Through the medium of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Democratic Party has redeemed the forward-looking pledge in its platform to clean up the ugly mess existing in the stock exchanges and in private manipulation of securities. For the first time in a decade, the American investor may feel free to go into the market and make purchases of securities with some feeling of protection.

In other outstanding instances we have carried out our campaign promises, namely: Repeal of the eighteenth amendment; modification of the Volstead Act; independence of the Philippines; cooperation in the reduction of armaments; guarantee of bank deposits; protection of the natural resources, and others.

Let's look again at the record.

AGRICULTURE

In our platform we said:

"We favor the restoration of agriculture, the Nation's basic industry; better financing of farm mortgages through recognized farm-bank agencies at low rates of interest on an amortization plan, giving preference to credits for the redemption of farms and homes sold under foreclosure.

"Extension and development of farm cooperative movement and effective control of crop surpluses so that our farmers may have the full benefit of the domestic market.

"The enactment of every constitutional measure that will aid the farmers to receive for their basic farm commodities prices in excess of cost."

Now, what about the performance? A little more than 3 years ago, at the end of 12 years of Republican control of the Federal Government, the farmers of the United States were in utter despair. They had seen the collapse of repeated half-hearted Republican experiments to aid agriculture; they had witnessed the unblushing failure of the Republican Party to carry out its platform promises; they had seen prices for farm products fall so low that the farmers could not sell their crops and livestock for what it had cost to produce them. Huge surpluses had piled up; export demand had declined almost to the vanishing point; mortgages were plastered on millions of farms.

Indeed, in March of 1933, the first month of the present administration, prices for all groups of farm commodities had sunk to the lowest level since 1910. According to the reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, it is probably safe to say that prices of farm products in March of 1933 were the lowest for farm products as a group since prior to the Civil War, with the single exception of the year 1896.

The total cash income received by farmers for the whole United States for the year 1932 was $4,377,000,000.

The disasters that had overtaken the farmer continued, and after 1929 agriculture, with 25 percent of the Nation's population, saw its returns shrink to 7 percent of the national income. Business in the agricultural regions was paralyzed by the loss of this farm buying power. Factories manufacturing goods for farmers and businesses distributing goods to them could not sell. The collapse of agricultural purchasing power accounted for the unemployment of at least four and one-half million men at the worst of the depression. An epidemic of business and bank failures crept eastward from the West. Finally the whole financial structure of the country fell to the ground. And that was the full flower of Republican irresponsibility in high places.

Then, in November of 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected and at once set to work to do something practical for the farmers. He called together in Washington a little group of earnest men, experienced leaders of organized agriculture in the United States. These men were not theorists or dreamers; they were not "brain trusters." They had led in every stage of the postwar battle for agricultural equality; they had gone through successive efforts to end the inequalities that were drawing the life blood from the American farmers.

These men saw that while farmers had maintained their full production practically at the 1929 level, their prices had been driven down to 60 percent below 1929 prices; manufacturing industries, on the other hand, had held their prices up on an average level not far below that of 1929 by cutting the volume of their production nearly 60 percent below the 1929 volume. These men knew that 6½ million farmers could not expect to compete with corporate organizations for a living share of the Nation's income, and they asked the Federal Government to supply the instrument through which the farmers could effectively cooperate. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed substantially along the line of their recommendation. So you see the farmers themselves, for all practical purposes, were the authors of this act.

Farmers operated under this act for 2 years and a half until the United States Supreme Court on January 6, 1936, by a 6-to-3 decision, declared that agricultural production is a right reserved to the States and therefore beyond Federal control. The production-control provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act were in effect declared invalid.

But the adjustment program had already helped to bring a marvelous change in the condition of farmers. In March of 1935, 2 years after President Roosevelt had entered the White House, the price of wheat had risen from 34.5 to 85.5 cents a bushel; corn from 20.6 to 82.7 cents a bushel; oats from 13.07 to 54.1 cents a bushel; hogs from $3.22 to $8.10 a hundredweight; beef cattle from $3.42 to $6.55 a hundred; tobacco from 6.01 to 10.1 cents a pound, and cotton had gone up from 5.04 to 11.5 cents a pound. While it is true that the average price of tobacco of all types was 10.1 cents a pound as of March 15, 1935, this figure does not, in fact, show the large increase in tobacco prices since March 15, 1933. The actual improvement is shown by the average price for the 1934–35 marketing season, which was 21.4 cents a pound, and for the 1935–36 marketing season it was 18.5 cents a pound. April 15, 1936, wheat was selling for 86.3 cents, corn for 57.2 cents; hogs for $9.38 a hundred; cotton for 11.2 cents a pound, and rice for 86 cents a bushel.

In other words, the buying power per unit for farm products advanced from 55 percent of parity in March 1933 to 85 percent in April of 1936.

And the total farm cash income for the year 1935 had increased from $4,377,000,000 in 1932 to $6,900,000,000 in 1935.

Such, in brief, is the story of the improvement in the position of the farmers of the Nation under the present administration.

Let us now turn for a moment to what the Roosevelt administration has done for the farmers in Virginia. Farm cash income in the State of Virginia rose from $61,874,000 in 1932 to $78,356,000 in 1933; to $101,671,000 in 1934; and the preliminary estimate for 1935 was $116,378,000. For 1933 these figures include $871,000 in rental and benefit payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and Government purchases of pigs and sows in the 1933 emergency marketing program. For 1934 they include $4,259,000 in rental and benefit payments either disbursed or due under contracts.

Since early colonial days, tobacco has been the leading cash crop of Virginia. It also has figured prominently among agricultural commodities, taking the United States as a whole. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act program, the income from tobacco rose steadily from 1932 when the total cash farm income from this commodity for the entire United States was $107,776,000. In 1933 the cash income jumped to $183,677,000, including rental and benefit payments, and in 1934 the total cash income was $254,000,000, counting rental and benefit payments.

The extent to which Virginia farmers' economic situation has improved since 1932 is indicated by comparing the 1932 and 1934 volume of production of certain Virginia commodities and the cash income therefrom. In 1932 a tobacco crop of 55,595,000 pounds brought producers a cash income of $4,744,000. Two years later the crop of 92,970,000 pounds yielded a cash return at the market of $22,357,000. If the rental and benefit payment portion of the cooperating farmers' price be added to this, Virginia tobacco growers received a total cash return of $24,165,000 for their 1934 crop, an amount 409 percent larger than they received in 1932.

The price of sun-cured tobacco increased from 4.2 cents a pound in 1932 to more than 10 cents a pound in 1935, while the price of fire-cured tobacco rose from 6.2 cents a pound in 1932 to nearly 11 cents a pound in 1935.

Cotton growers in Virginia produced 34,000 bales of cotton in 1932, which, together with 15,000 tons of seed therefrom, yielded a cash return of $1,206,000. The crop of 39,000 bales and 17,000 tons of seed in 1934 brought $2,869,000 in cash at the market, and $3,159,000 when rental and benefits are included.

Peanut growers in this State raised 155,150,000 pounds of peanuts in 1932 and received $2,085,000 for their crop. In 1934 they

produced a crop smaller by some 8,000,000 pounds and yet received a cash return of $4,617,000.

Over this same 2-year period, from 1932 to 1934, the total cash return to corn growers increased from $660,000 to $2,260,000; that of wheat producers from $1,380,000 to $4,668,000; and that of apple growers from $4,065,000 to $6,379,000.

In 1934 Virginia farmers received nearly $2,000,000 more for their cattle and calves and more than $1,000,000 for their hogs than they received in 1933.

Over the 4-year period from 1932 to 1935, inclusive, the average farm price of cotton lint increased from 6.42 cents to 11.30 cents a pound; cottonseed from $10.91 to $32.30 per ton; wheat from 58 to 87 cents a bushel; corn from 52 to 75 cents a bushel; hogs from $4.20 to $8.50 per hundredweight; cattle from $4.15 to $6 per hundredweight; lambs from $5 to $7.20 per hundredweight; and wool from 10 to 24 cents a pound.

For the 1935 tobacco crop Virginia farmers received around $17,860,000 plus $2,435,659 in rental and benefit payments, making a total cash income of $20,295,659 for the year. Contrast this with the 1932 returns, which amounted to only $4,744,000. The average farm price of tobacco in Virginia increased from 8.9 cents a pound in 1932 to 18.7 cents a pound in 1935.

As of March 31, 1936, rental and benefit payments disbursed among cooperating producers in Virginia from the beginning of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in 1933 to March 31, 1936, totaled $7,140,434. This sum does not represent the total that Virginia farmers will receive ultimately. Congress has provided for payment of benefits under contracts in existence at the time of the invalidation of the A. A. A., and these payments will materially increase the present figure.

Of the sum paid up to March 31, 1936, tobacco producers received $2,435,659; corn-hog farmers, $1,917,064; wheat farmers, $1,461,142; cotton growers, $780,280; peanut growers, $546,287.

It cannot be denied that the decision of the United States Supreme Court on January 6, virtually invalidating the Agricultural Adjustment Act, was a severe blow. But President Roosevelt and his aides in the administration immediately set about to construct a new plan that would meet the objections of the Court. I cannot better describe the events following that decision than by quoting the words of Mr. H. R. Tolley, Acting Administrator of the Adjustment Act, in a recent radio address. Mr. Tolley said in part:

"It was only a little more than 4 months ago that the production-control programs, then in full swing, were stopped by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hoosac Mills case. Fifty-four days later, in response to widespread demands from farmers, Congress had enacted and the President had signed the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, providing for a program centered around the idea of soil conservation. And now, only 70 days from the time the bill was signed and placed in effect, several million farmers are busy working out the new program. That is a record of which, I believe, the farmers of the United States may be proud.

"The present A. A. A. conservation program recognizes that a farmer who grows less of soil-depleting crops and more of soil-conserving crops may have to make an immediate cash sacrifice to do so. Hence the program provides for a graduated system of payments calculated to make it possible for him to balance his farming operations and grow the amounts of the various crops that are best for his individual farm. These are what we are calling class I payments. The program recognizes also that certain desirable soil-building practices are expensive to carry out. Therefore a series of payments has been devised to compensate farmers, at least in part, for this expense. These payments, known as the class II payments, also serve to reward the farmers who have had a desirable proportion of their land in soil-conserving crops in the past.

"As to the details of this program, you farmers scattered through the 48 States are coming daily in closer touch with them. The country has been divided into five regions, with a specially adapted program for each region; and within each region modifications have been made that are suited to the various States. Within the States the program is in the hands of the farmers themselves, working through State, county, and community committees and county agricultural conservation associations. All over the country these committees and associations are at work, acquainting farmers with the details of the program and helping them fill out work sheets for their farms."

REFINANCING FARM INDEBTEDNESS

One of the burdens of the American farmer was his indebtedness, for which he paid large interest rates. What have we done about it?

In the last 2½ years more farms have been refinanced by the Farm Credit Administration than in the 16 years previous to the land bank's history. Seven hundred and forty-eight thousand loans have been made, totaling $1,972,000,000. These banks have outstanding a million loans and at the lowest rate for farm mortgages that ever existed in the world. Appropriate short-time credit facilities have also been provided through the medium of Federal intermediate credit banks and their agencies. These banks extend short-term credit to farmers for the production and marketing of crops, livestock, etc. The American farmer for the first time in a decade looks forward to the morrow with hope and confidence—another evidence of faithful performance of campaign promises.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPREME COURT

Our Republican friends and their allies, the Liberty Leaguers, work themselves up into quite a lather over their apprehensions about the security of our Constitution and the dignity of the Supreme Court of the United States. Because some of the recovery measures were held unconstitutional they infer from that that the President is an enemy of constitutional government. Because he disagreed with a decision of the Supreme Court and more or less casually suggested that the time might come when the people would want to amend their Constitution by giving the Federal Government greater power in cases of emergency, they charge him with having made an attack upon the Constitution and the dignity and integrity of the Supreme Court. Of course, this is utterly ridiculous when you turn upon it the light of logic and facts.

Now what has happened? In a unanimous decision, N. R. A. was held unconstitutional. None will deny that most of its objectives were sound and needed. In fact, in its brief lifetime it performed a useful service in the recovery program. Its principal objective was to spread employment by providing for shorter hours, to outlaw child labor, to prevent the exploitation of women in industry, and to prevent cutthroat competition and price cutting in business. The Supreme Court unanimously knocked it out, and that is the end of it. Then came the A. A. A. and the Guffey coal bill. Both laws had served a useful purpose. Agriculture was being rehabilitated. The coal industry had been saved, but by a divided court these acts were held unconstitutional. Do you remember what a storm of protest went up when the President suggested to Congress that it give a trial to the Guffey coal bill; that he had been advised it was constitutional, and that he would like to see the matter settled? Well be it remembered that four distinguished Justices of the Supreme Court said that it was constitutional, headed by no less authority than the distinguished Chief Justice, Charles Evans Hughes. Now, let us away with emotionalism and dramatics and get down to earth about the Constitution and the Supreme Court.

When did it get to be such a crime to suggest that the United States Constitution might be amended or should be amended? What is there in such a suggestion to justify the conclusion that the fundamental liberties of the people are being threatened? Let us remember history in this regard. The very Constitution itself is the child of unconstitutional action. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention were charged with the duty of amending the old Articles of Confederation, and those Articles of Confederation forbade any changes therein except such as were suggested or recommended by Congress and confirmed by the legislatures of 13 States. Yet, these delegates, with rare wisdom and splendid courage, realized the impotency of the old Articles of Confederation and proceeded to draft a new constitution. We honor them for their courage. All of the forefathers realized that the Constitution would have to be amended many times. Those who have so suddenly become great defenders of the Constitution and exponents of Jefferson would do well to recall these pertinent remarks of the sage of Monticello in 1816:

"Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them, like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment.

"I knew that age well; I belonged to it and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but without the experience of the present; and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading; and this they would say themselves were they to rise from the dead.

"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their ancestors. It is this preposterous idea which has lately deluged Europe in blood. Let us follow no such examples, nor weakly believe that one generation is not as capable as another of taking care of itself and of ordering its own affairs.

"Each generation is as independent of the one preceding as that was of all which had gone before. It has, then, like them, a right to choose for itself the form of government it believes most promotive of its own happiness, and it is for the peace and good of mankind that a solemn opportunity of doing this should be provided by the Constitution, so that it may be handed on, with periodical repairs from generation to generation to the end of time, if anything human can so long endure."

And let us remember also that the Constitution was not drawn up for the purpose of conferring liberty, freedom, and power upon individuals, but was really for the purpose of putting as many checks as possible upon State power. The original Constitution contained practically no protection for the so-called people's liberties and freedom. Almost without exception each of the guarantees of liberty and freedom, of which we boast today, was put into the Constitution by amendments. Its very strength is in its flexibility; and though it is ever constant in its purpose it is likewise ever changing in its application. For one, I am not afraid of what the American people will do with their Constitution; like Jefferson and Lincoln, I believe the American people will make

their Government what they wish it to be; and if that necessitates a change in the organic law, the change will be made in the established and orderly manner. To hear some of our friends talk about this matter you would think that the Constitution might be amended by Executive order.

But please remember this fact, my friends, that up to the present hour neither the President nor any responsible spokesman for his administration has ever advocated any change in the Constitution.

As to the Court, I believe I have as much respect and reverence for this august tribunal as any American citizen. Certainly, I have no patience with the suggestion or idea that there should be any law undertaking to circumscribe its jurisdiction or authority. On the other hand, I think I am not un-American or unpatriotic when I choose to disagree with some of its opinions, and, certainly, I cannot be held up to scorn or ridicule when I prefer to accept the philosophy of four minority members of the Court rather than that of the majority of five.

The Supreme Court of the United States is composed of human beings. It is an American institution, and we do not create institutions in America and hold them up as infallible, or place them on such a high pedestal that American citizens cannot honestly disagree with their course of action. Our own Supreme Court has always been open to criticism whenever any citizen felt inclined to do so. Listen to this a moment, if you please:

"If the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that tribunal."

Again, listen to this:

"The Supreme Court has got the doctrine of popular sovereignty down as thin as homeopathic soup that was made by boiling the shadow of a pigeon that had starved to death."

Now, I claim that this is pretty strong language. Was that some New Dealer showing his irreverence for the Supreme Court of our land? No; it was no less a great statesman than Abraham Lincoln. He even went a great deal further than that when, in referring to the decision in the Dred Scott case, he said:

"Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it is made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably."

Now, I do not mean to suggest that it is dignified or appropriate for American citizens to be jumping on the Supreme Court of the land or holding it up to ridicule, and I shall certainly not do so. The Democratic Party has not done so, but things that have happened of late have demonstrated very clearly and forcibly that the American people are going to have to give thought to problems presented in these recent decisions. What do we find? In the Guffey decision the Court held that the relationship between employer and employee constituted a local transaction and was thus outside of the authority of Congress and the Federal Government. We had sought in the Guffey bill to deal with wages and hours of labor—a situation so necessary to preserve the coal industry. Again the Court comes in the New York case involving the women's minimum wage law and, in a 5-to-4 decision, rules that State legislatures are without authority to fix minimum wages of workers in a given industry.

Now, where are we? Apparently, neither the State nor the Federal Government under the Constitution, as it exists today, has the power to deal with the vital questions of child labor, wages, hours of labor, or conditions of the workers. Therefore, it may very well be that in a rapidly changing and greatly advancing social and economic order, the people will in their own good time, and in the established and orderly manner, examine the question and determine whether or not it will be for their interest, for the stabilization of the economic order, and for the protection of human life and liberty, to confer upon the Federal Government, or even upon the State governments for that matter, the power to deal with these matters. There has been no attack upon the United States Constitution, and not one single right or liberty of the American people has been jeopardized by the present administration.

RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Let us look further at a few campaign promises which have been redeemed. In our platform we favored "a competitive tariff for revenue with a fact-finding commission and reciprocal agreements", etc. This promise is being redeemed under the brilliant leadership of Secretary Hull. Trade agreements have been concluded with 14 countries and are now in operation in 10. The results have been most gratifying and encouraging. Under these reciprocal agreements, Virginia will be largely benefited, particularly the apple, tobacco, and cotton growers of the State, as well as many manufacturing industries. Recently, in addressing the National Association of Credit Men, I presented this phase of the administration program very fully and I shall not here repeat.

LABOR

We had a plank in our platform for the spread of employment, reduction in hours of labor, etc. Substantial progress has been made under this administration, notwithstanding the legislative upsets in making more secure the lot of the laboring man. Under no administration in a decade has he had better opportunities or more considerate treatment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Substantial progress has been made under the present administration for the conservative and orderly yet logical strengthening of our defense forces on the land, in the air, and on the high seas.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Let us not overlook the social-security program of the administration. For the first time in our history the Federal Government has recognized the obligation which it owes to the needy aged, dependent children, mothers, crippled children, the indigent disabled, and the blind.

Appropriate laws have been passed, appropriations made, and the machinery set up for a vast cooperative enterprise which has for its purpose the fulfillment of this obligation to our citizens. We have made an auspicious beginning. Here again we have vindicated a promise we made when in our platform we said: "We advocate unemployment and old-age insurance under State laws."

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

In enlarging and expanding the powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation we have placed at the disposal of legitimate business the credit of the Nation to be used in a vast reconstruction and stabilizing effort.

H. O. L. C. AND THE FEDERAL HOUSING CORPORATION

Nine hundred and ninety-two thousand five hundred and thirty-one homes have been saved by loans made by the H. O. L. C., aggregating three and one-half billion dollars, and the loans are being repaid 90 percent on time. Second mortgages and short-term mortgages are replaced by the Federal Housing Administration. Millions of dollars of frozen credit in banks and building-and-loan associations have been loosened and millions of American homes saved through the beneficent administration of these activities.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, if time would permit, I could detain you for hours in enumerating the beneficent actions of this Government under its present leadership and could, I think, demonstrate to you how upon all fronts we have moved forward and upward. I reiterate that it has not been a perfect performance but it has been a forward movement from which the American people will not retreat.

Is it not passing strange that in the various public utterances of our political adversaries, in the keynote addresses, etc., that the President and his party are never given credit for a single achievement or praise for any action? Nothing that we have done has been wise or helpful. However, our opponents do not take you into their confidence and tell you which of these beneficent actions, remedies, or laws they would repeal, or what would be put in its place. They seem to be content with carping criticism.

EVIDENCES OF RECOVERY

But why all of this oratory? There never was a truer saying than the old adage of our grandmother, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof." You do not have to take my word for the beneficial effects of this administration. Just look about you. Pick up the daily financial sheet of any responsible publication and you will find the story: Increased bank deposits; increased exports; decreasing imports; fewer business failures; less bankruptcies; larger dividends; business and trade expansion; increasing real-estate values; optimism; hope; brightening skies; regained confidence. That is the story we find on every hand. Today there is a song of hope and triumph in our hearts.

Strange as it may seem, some of the severest critics of the present order are those who have benefited most. Let me give you a typical instance: In the House of Representatives we have a most likable and distinguished colleague who is a member of the Republican Party and who has been relentless in his criticism of the administration. He is a banker and a businessman of large proportions. Almost daily he proclaims upon the floor of the House that the Democratic Party is ruining the country. Incidentally he is president of a big manufacturing industry which is located in a community which was named after his family. Notwithstanding his apprehensions, it has been discovered that a short time ago there went out from his industry to his customers the following letter:

"DEAR CUSTOMER: Time marches on; 1935 has passed into history. Woolrich (the name of his industry) enjoyed one of the best years in its 105 years of existence."

BANK FAILURES

Permit me to give you, in closing, what is to my mind an unanswerable evidence of the safety and soundness of the present order.

I think you will agree that any instability of our economic order of governmental fiscal policies would be quickly reflected in our banking institutions. They, after all, are the safest and surest barometers of public confidence and soundness of government. "Let's look at the record."

Three and a half years under Harding brought 91 national-bank failures.

Four and a half years under Coolidge brought 533 failures.

Four years under Mr. Hoover, 1,035 failures.

During 1933, 435 suspensions occurred before or during the bank holiday, and only 3 during the remainder of the year.

During 1934–35, five banks closed, and all deposits up to $5,000 were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

ON GUARANTEE OF BANK DEPOSITS

One of the most helpful measures of the New Deal has been the law placed upon the statute books guaranteeing bank deposits. It is practically impossible now to hear anyone who will challenge the benefit and stabilizing influence of this act.

It is interesting to recall Governor Landon's attitude on this law. I quote herewith a few paragraphs from an address of Governor Landon that his representative read to the American Bankers Association at Chicago September 6, 1933, and published in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle. The full address may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 15, 1936, at page 9353.

First let us see what the Governor thinks on economies and finance generally:

"The future of the American people lies to a considerable extent in the hands of the men in this room insofar as you represent the State banking system. There is no question in my mind but that the guaranty of bank deposits is a greater blow to the ultimate welfare of the American people than the wildest inflation of the currency could possibly be. Certainly no currency inflation could be more completely destructive and devastating to a people than it was in Germany, but the German people and the German resources are still there. After the holocaust of an incredible inflation, such as no one believes President Roosevelt even contemplates, was over, the German people had a bank structure to turn to as a keystone of the arch of such economic stability as they have been able to rebuild.

"In my judgment the guaranty of bank deposits, if carried out in this country to its logical conclusion, will completely destroy the entire banking system of the Nation. That destruction must inevitably be accompanied or followed by the most extreme inflation of the currency. When the final day of reckoning comes there will be no financial structure whatsoever to which to turn or on which to rely as a fulcrum for whatever lever statesmen may devise to begin the great task of reconstruction."

Of course, we are grateful that the dire calamity which the Governor prophesied has not come to pass.

Listen, if you please, to this observation and wonder how it will impress some of the more orthodox and conservative followers of the Governor:

"For the first one-third of our national history this country was largely dominated by agriculturalists. For the second one-third it was largely dominated by industrialists—great builders and developers of railroads. For the last one-third, to a large extent, by financiers. You, and all independent bankers in this country, are going to pay, and pay dearly, for the unwise banking practices that have permitted the Insulls and others free rein. The innocent will suffer with the guilty. These manipulators of great wealth, elevated to places of responsibility in our great financial institutions, have sponsored huge bond issues in our industrial and utility fields; plucked out their paper profits of excessive bonds or stocks, and financed the entire load by subsequent sales of securities to the public. The overloading by the greedy and unscrupulous lords of financial juggling has been too heavy for honest business to carry, dividends have stopped, and our banking system is facing loss of confidence because in too many cases bankers were involved in the profit-taking manipulations."

Again the Governor speaks on guarantee of deposits:

"Let us examine some of the arguments that have been used in favor of the bank-guaranty plan contained in the Glass bill. It has been said that it will force the banks to cooperate more closely to prevent unsound banking. I think CARTER GLASS himself has used that argument. Is he ignorant of the fact that that argument was used in Kansas a quarter of a century ago? Is he unaware of the fact that events proved conclusively in Kansas that the argument is not worth wasting breath on?"

So much for the Governor's ideas on finance. Now let us see, from his precampaign utterances, what he thought of the New Deal:

GOVERNOR LANDON ON EXPERIMENTATION

"We have solved the secrets of power and machinery, but we have not yet found how to control and manage the industrial civilization which we have created. The only way we can find the solution is the age-old way of trial and error and experience." (Sept. 3, 1934.)

GOVERNOR LANDON ON EMPLOYMENT

"I am confident that the President and the W. P. A. are doing all in their power to get the people to work." (Nov. 13, 1935.)

GOVERNOR LANDON ON LOCAL SELF-RULE

"Dictatorships have been established all over the world. I do not view the granting of additional powers to President-elect Roosevelt as belonging in this class. I do not believe it would endanger our democracy." (Feb. 11, 1933.)

GOVERNOR LANDON ON EXECUTIVE POWER

"We have never felt it any confession of weakness in a democracy to repose in our President the greatest power of any governmental head in the world in time of war." (Feb. 11, 1933.)

GOVERNOR LANDON ON BUDGET BALANCING

"Kansas must meet its work-relief problems without placing its taxpayers in debt." (Oct. 23, 1933.)

"It would be good business, in my opinion, for Kansas to borrow every dollar it can get under the P. W. A. that could possibly be spent on highway work by July 1935." (May 21, 1934.)

GOVERNOR LANDON ON DEPRESSION

"I desire to acknowledge in a tangible way the appreciation of the people of my State for the courage with which President Roosevelt has attacked the depression." (Baltimore Evening Sun, quoting a speech Landon made in March 1933.)

GOVERNOR LANDON ON PLEDGES

"I plan to enlist with President Roosevelt for duration of the war against depression." (March 1933.)

Now, let us hear from the Governor on the relief program of the administration:

SOUNDEST, MOST CONSTRUCTIVE

"I have felt that this civil-works program is one of the soundest, most constructive policies of your administration, and I cannot urge too strongly its continuance." (Jan. 17, 1934.)

"I am confident the President and the W. P. A. are doing all in their power to get the people to work." (Nov. 13, 1935.)

GOOD FOR KANSAS

"It would be good business, in my opinion, for Kansas to borrow every dollar it can get under the P. W. A. that could possibly be spent on highway work by July 1935." (May 31, 1934.)

EFFICIENT

"There were no payless days for work-relief applicants." (Apr. 9, 1934.)

FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

He wired Hopkins to "make provision for relief on the basis of not only the physical needs of families but also for the educational requirements of the next generation." (July 17, 1933.)

EFFICIENT

"Kansas was fortunate in having nearly 32,000 men and women on civil-works pay rolls the first week the civil-works program was put into operation." (Apr. 9, 1934.)

WANTS MORE

"We are in dire need of substantial increase in May grant for general relief purposes for the State, as April grant was insufficient." (Apr. 24, 1934.)

So said the Governor, my friends, before his candidacy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I must conclude. I have sought to bring you accurate information and to present convincing argument on the record.

That record speaks for itself. Like Tennyson's brook, I might go on and on if I sought to detain you long enough to recount all of the beneficences of this administration; but I must close.

The case is with you. I ask you to judge it upon its merits and upon our record. I have an abiding faith and confidence that when the verdict is in the people of America will in 1936, as they did in 1932, show, with a degree of unanimity seldom witnessed in American political affairs, that they appreciate the consecrated efforts and that they have an abiding faith and confidence in the patriotic purpose of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

PILGRIMAGE OF GOLD STAR MOTHERS OF AMERICA TO STAUNTON, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to extend an invitation to the Members of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend, on behalf of the city of Staunton, Va., a most cordial invitation to my colleagues in the House to visit Staunton during the pilgrimage of the Gold Star Mothers of America from June 18 to 21, inclusive, to the birthplace of our great wartime President, Woodrow Wilson. Staunton is the largest city in the Shenandoah Valley, and its history dates back to early colonial days, when it was the county seat of a vast domain known as West Augusta, which extended to the Mississippi River and included the area known as the Northwest Territory. The brilliant and distinguished Governor of the great State of Indiana, Hon. Paul V. McNutt, has highly honored us by agreeing to make the principal address to the Gold Star Mothers in Staunton on the afternoon of June 20. Governor McNutt already enjoys a national reputation, and I predict further honors for him in the coming years. We would like for you to come to Staunton to hear Governor McNutt on Saturday, to see the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson, to visit the spot where Lewis, of West Augusta, dressed in deerskin breeches and a coonskin cap, proposed independence for the Colonies months before Patrick Henry declared that life was not so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. And on your way to Staunton you will have an opportunity to pass through the beautiful Shenandoah Park, which on July 3 will be officially dedicated by the President of the United States as a national recreational area. [Applause.]

ENROLLMENT OF H. R. 12624

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 60) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 60

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of H. R. 12624, to amend the matter

agreed to by both Houses in connection with Senate amendment no. 14, as follows:

Insert in such matter, after the figures "1936", the following: "including payment of salaries and expenses heretofore incurred in preparing to carry out the provisions of such act."

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

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOL TEACHERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman offer the resolution as a matter of the privileges of the House?

Mr. KELLER. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, has directed a letter to each and every school teacher in the District of Columbia seeking certain information, of which the following is an exact copy:

"As chairman of the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill, to obviate a hearing and save you the time and inconvenience of coming before us in person, I request that you kindly give us the following information, filled in by you in the blank spaces provided therefor, and signing same, and return promptly in the enclosed addressed envelope, requiring no postage, namely:

"Please state—

"Your present position?_____ School?_____ Salary?_____

"Do you believe in any of the doctrines of communism?_____ If so, which_____. Do you approve of communism being given any favor or support in the schools?_____.

"Do you believe there is a God?_____. Do you believe in some form of religion?_____.

"Are you a subscriber to the Social Frontier?_____. Were you asked to subscribe?_____. If so, state by whom_____.

"Are you a member of the N. E. A.?_____. Since when?_____. Who suggested joining?_____.

"Have you a copy of Conclusions and Recommendations?_____. Have you read same?_____.

"Have you a copy of Counts' Dare the School Build a New Social Order?_____. Have you read same?_____. Do you approve of same?_____. Do you approve of Dr. George S. Counts' writings?_____. Do you approve of Dr. Charles A. Beard's writings?_____. Have you been to Russia?_____. Did you attend school there?_____.

"Have you read Boy and Girl Tramps of America, by Thomas Minehan?_____. Do you approve it?_____. Are you in favor of high school girls reading it?_____. Would you read it aloud?_____.

"Have you read Made in Russia?_____. Do you approve of it?_____.

"Do you approve of Scholastic as a school magazine for high-school students?_____. Do you know why the school committee's recommendation to eliminate it from the Washington public schools has been held up?_____. If so, why?_____.

"Very truly yours,

"THOMAS L. BLANTON.

"My answers above are correct _____; position_____, address_____."

Whereas this was done as chairman of the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill; and

Whereas the letter was sent in a franked envelope as official business; and

Whereas a franked envelope requiring no postage was inserted in the letter for the purpose of the teacher's reply; and

Whereas the use of the language "to obviate a hearing and to save you the time and inconvenience of coming before us in person, I request that you kindly give us the following information", would lead the recipient to believe that a failure to answer the questionnaire would result in the issuance of a subpena hauling the teacher before the subcommittee handling the District appropriation bill; and

Whereas this constitutes a thinly veiled threat that a subpena might be issued; and

Whereas the subcommittee does not have authority to force the attendance of anybody at a hearing; and

Whereas there has been no congressional action giving this subcommittee that power; and

Whereas the action of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, in directing this letter to the teachers in the aforementioned manner might lead some to believe that the subcommittee and the House of Representatives were joining with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, in demanding this information in this threatening manner; and

Whereas the spread of this belief might tend to greatly lessen the dignity of the House of Representatives and violate the integrity of this House by assuming an authority which had not been delegated to him: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House deplores the action of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, which was not authorized by the House of Representatives nor by any competent agency thereof, and that his action shall not be construed as being an act authorized by the House of Representatives nor any competent agency thereof.

During the reading of the foregoing resolution the following occurred:

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty Members present, not a quorum.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

[Roll No. 124]

Andrews	Deen	Hook	Robsion, Ky.
Ayers	Dies	Kee	Rogers, Okla.
Berlin	Ditter	Kleberg	Ryan
Bolton	Doutrich	Lanham	Sadowski
Brennan	Drewry	Larrabee	Sanders, La.
Brewster	Duffey, Ohio	Lee, Okla.	Sandlin
Brooks	Dunn, Miss.	McClellan	Sauthoff
Buckley, N. Y.	Eagle	McFarlane	Schneider, Wis.
Bulwinkle	Englebright	McSwain	Schuetz
Cannon, Wis.	Ferguson	Maloney	Scrugham
Cary	Fernandez	Martin, Mass.	Sears
Chapman	Fiesinger	Maverick	Secrest
Claiborne	Fish	Michener	Stewart
Clark, N. C.	Frey	Monaghan	Sumners, Tex.
Cole, Md.	Gasque	Montague	Tolan
Collins	Gassaway	Montet	Weaver
Connery	Gray, Pa.	Nelson	Wilson, La.
Corning	Greenway	Nichols	Wood
Culkin	Hamlin	Oliver	Zioncheck
Darden	Higgins, Conn.	Parks	
Darrow	Hoeppel	Reed, N. Y.	
Dear	Hollister	Richards	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. While I think the resolution clearly shows upon its face that it is not a privileged resolution, and is subject to a point of order, I do not want to make the point of order, because I want the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER], to be heard upon the matter, and I want to be heard myself, because I want the House to know what the facts are, and then to vote on the matter. I want a vote of the House on it. I shall not make the point of order.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not a resolution involving the privileges of the House. Upon its face it shows that Mr. BLANTON had no authority to bind any Member of this House, and certainly had none in law, directly or indirectly, to bind his committee. As to whether or not he did what is right is not a question for this House to pass on as a special privilege. It is a matter in which he exercised his own judgment, and certainly he could not bind the House and no Member of the House could be bound by it. It is, therefore, in no sense of the word a resolution involving the privileges of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I would much prefer that the House vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that the subject matter in the resolution is not sufficient to constitute a matter involving the privileges of the House. The Chair has had opportunity to examine this question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard upon the point of order?

The SPEAKER. No. The Chair is ready to rule. During the roll call the Chair had an opportunity to examine carefully the subject matter of the resolution, and also the rules of the House. The Chair is somewhat familiar with

the precedents involved in matters of this sort. The question of privilege under rule IX under which this resolution is offered provides that questions of privilege shall be—

First, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings.

The matter set up in the resolution constitutes an allegation of certain conduct on the part of an individual Member of the House, who, it seems, wrote certain letters to school teachers or other persons in the District of Columbia. Whether or not the subject matter of the letter was proper or not, whether it was a matter of propriety or not, whether it was a matter of good judgment or not, is not one that involves under this rule the question of the privileges of the House and its proceedings, in the opinion of the Chair. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, since this ridiculous resolution has been read into the RECORD and will go in the press, and every fair-minded man in the House knows that votes for it here would be negligible and it could not be passed, I think it is only fair that the House should give me 5 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, of course, one objection can prevent it, so I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit the last four clauses of the resolution just read, which was filed here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER], without any notice whatever to me, at a time when I was in a Senate conference, working for this House, and did get an agreement with the Senate conferees on an important appropriation bill, will be used by "red" newspapers as a reflection upon me, although, as a matter of fact, it cannot hurt me or my good name in any way. I had no notice that this resolution was to be offered, and I was called out of that conference with Senate managers after the resolution had been sent to the Clerk's desk for consideration.

While under a strict interpretation of the rules I realize full well that because the resolution does not reflect upon me, and will not hurt me, it does not constitute privilege, but I feel that I should raise the question to show what a great injustice was done me by it being presented. I submit that, as a matter of personal privilege, I should have a right to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated that in his opinion the subject matter stated in the resolution was not of such nature as reflected upon the gentleman from Texas.

The Chair is of the opinion that the matter stated by the gentleman from Texas does not constitute a question of personal privilege. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad the Chair has ruled that way, and I hope the "red" newspapers will correctly report it, and abide by it. [Laughter and applause.]

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to ask whether or not under the unanimous consent that heretofore has been granted all Members of the House to extend their own remarks, it would embrace my review of this question in my remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Under the privilege granted the gentleman has the right to extend his own remarks.

Mr. BLANTON. I want the Members to read what I put into the RECORD tonight. [Laughter and applause.]

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY THROUGHOUT BROWARD COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12458) authorizing a preliminary examination of the intracoastal waterway throughout Broward County, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this any connection with the famous Florida canal?

Mr. WILCOX. None whatever.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question. As I understand, this is a survey that can be done by the Army engineers in their regular duties?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct.

Mr. SNELL. And it does not call for any extra expenditure on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. WILCOX. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, one or two other similar resolutions have been called up by unanimous consent in the House during the past few days. My understanding is that the same authority can be granted to the Board of Engineers by a simple resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I am wondering why Members do not submit their resolutions to that committee and get a resolution from the committee?

Mr. WILCOX. I think the gentleman is in error on that. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors can authorize a resurvey which has been previously authorized by the Congress; but it is my understanding that as to an original survey there must be an authorization by Congress for the Board of Army Engineers to make it an initial proposition.

Mr. MAPES. Does the gentleman say that the law does not permit the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to authorize a resurvey?

Mr. WILCOX. No, no. The law does permit a resurvey, and it does permit the Rivers and Harbors Committee, by simple resolution, to authorize surveys within the purview of the original act. For instance, this intracoastal waterway was adopted by the Congress. Any survey in connection with the original proposal for the establishment of the waterway could be done by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, but this is a proposal to survey a certain section of that waterway for the purpose of determining flood-control measures that may be installed to prevent the overflow of salt water on farm lands in the adjacent territory.

Mr. MAPES. Has the gentleman submitted his resolution to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes; and that committee found it was outside of their jurisdiction. The matter was referred to the Committee on Flood Control, which has favorably reported it upon the recommendation of the Secretary of War.

Mr. MAPES. This resolution has been reported by the Committee on Flood Control?

Mr. WILCOX. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this one of the Regular Army flood-control survey projects?

Mr. WILCOX. No. This proposes a survey of a short territory to determine whether or not flood-control measures could be installed along this waterway, to prevent overflows.

Mr. RICH. When was this brought out in the Flood Control Committee? I have attended practically every session of the committee, and I do not recall that bill. We did pass the regular flood-control bills that were authorized by the Army engineers.

Mr. WILCOX. This was reported by the Committee on Flood Control (Rept. No. 2739) May 22.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object for the present.

Mr. WILCOX. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. RICH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

LIEV EIRIKSSON PAINTING IN STATUARY HALL

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, and include therein addresses made on the occasion of the official presentation and acceptance of the Liev Eiriksson painting in Statuary Hall on March 23.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses made on the occasion of the official presentation and

acceptance of the Liev Eiriksson painting in Statuary Hall on March 23:

PRAYER BY JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, CHAPLAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Almighty God, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations, before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hast formed the earth and the world—even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. Thou art not only our Heavenly Father but Thou art our Heavenly Father upon earth. We rejoice in Thy providences which have been above all and over all and we believe will be blessed forevermore. We are grateful for the rich and abiding contributions which have been made to our country by other lands. Hear us, gracious Father, as we breathe a prayer of gratitude for those courageous sons and daughters which have come from the arteries of the brave Norsemen, conspicuous among whom is he whose memory we celebrate today. We praise Thee for his chivalry of soul, for his vision, and for his daring and intrepid spirit which led him to the unknown shores of this part of the old world. We praise Thee for the generations of those which continue to make rich our country in peace, righteousness, and industry. God, abide with the King and the royal family of their homeland. Bless our own country and ever remain with our own President. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

INTRODUCTION BY WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE, NORWEGIAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, ladies, and gentlemen, 11 years ago, on the occasion of the Norwegian American Centennial in 1925, the Congress of the United States authorized a special commemorative medal which carried the words: "By authority of the Congress of the United States of America", and, further, a picture of a viking ship and of Liev Eiriksson and the letters "A. D. 1000."

This was accepted on both side of the ocean, I believe, as the definite, official recognition by the United States of Liev Eiriksson as the first discoverer of the American Continent.

This event gave a tremendous impetus to the Liev Eiriksson movement. It has been growing steadily since, until last year the Congress and the President of the United States decided that October 9, 1935, should be officially observed all over the United States as Liev Eiriksson Day, the Stars and Stripes flying that day from all public buildings in the United States.

Today, thanks to the efforts primarily of my friend Dr. Bjercke, and also other Norwegian friends of America, a copy of the famous painting Liev Eiriksson Discovers America is going to be presented to the Congress.

It has been my privilege during the last year to submit this matter to Members of Congress and to receive the assurance that this painting would be gladly accepted and included in that collections of historic paintings which illustrate the manifest destiny of this great Nation.

To all Norwegians, to all Americans of Norwegian ancestry, to those hundreds of thousands in Norway and here listening in this morning, this is an occasion of great significance. To me it is an honor and a privilege to stand before you today as the representative of the Government and the people of Norway.

If the essence of true diplomacy is to emphasize what reveals and unites, if it is to create mutual understanding and good will between men and between nations, here, indeed, is a task eminently congenial and appropriate.

I am sure that no vain desire of mere priority enters into this eagerness to commemorate and to gain universal recognition for Liev's discovery. No one could more than the Norwegians, with their traditions of high adventure and seamanship, admire and whole-heartedly recognize the epoch-making venture which 500 years later was responsible for the opening up and the permanent settlement of the American Continent.

The real incentive behind the Liev Eiriksson movement undoubtedly has been, and is, first the love of historic truth, and, secondly, the deep affection which the several million Americans of Norwegian ancestry feel for this country and its people. No wonder that theirs should be a proud satisfaction that this historic contact between Norway and America stretches back almost a thousand years.

In the heroic figure of Liev they sense, and we in Norway sense, a symbol of that relationship. A relationship which in modern times has found nourishment and inspiration in the democratic ideas and institutions, the ideals of freedom and of peace, which both Nations have in common.

There is something fine and inspiring in the fact that no question of size or bigness plays any part in this fundamental understanding and friendship between one nation of 130,000,000 people and one of 3,000,000. Here are two great nations in the true sense of the word, joining hands across the sea, realizing that not only do they have the same colors in their flags but also the same ideals in their hearts.

Just as I was leaving for the Capitol this morning I received a cable from Dr. Halvdan Koht, the eminent professor of history at the University of Oslo and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Norway. He asks me to convey his hearty personal greetings to everyone present here this morning. Dr. Koht emphasizes in his message how our common history, and a common spirit of enterprise, bind together the Norwegian and American people in close understanding and sympathy.

I have the honor and the pleasure to introduce to you Dr. Alf Bjercke, of Oslo, who did not only originate the idea of this gift but who has also carried it to such a happy conclusion. Dr. Bjercke has come here from Norway to present this picture on behalf of those Norwegian friends of America of whom he is one. Dr. Alf Bjercke.

ADDRESS BY DR. ALF BJERCKE

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the Senate and of the House of Representative, ladies, and gentlemen, I should like to begin by saying that we Norwegians are immensely grateful to the American people for the friendliness with which we have been met by this great Nation. In the first instance the Norwegian pioneers who came over here during the first period of emigration owe a debt of thanks to the Nation, and later all good Norwegians during several generations who succeeded them and who by hard and honest work made themselves deserving of the confidence shown them by this great Nation in receiving them amongst its people as its own. They are all glad and proud—as we in the native country also are—when the highest representative of this great Nation gives the following testimonial to the Norwegian contribution to American progress:

"We recognize fully the great contribution which they (the Norwegians) have made to the progress of this country, in a cultural as well as in a commercial and industrial way." These were the words of President Roosevelt about 2 years ago.

In addition to this recognition of the Norwegian-born men and women's good work as American citizens, the American people in general are more and more realizing that the Norwegians' feelings for this continent are, so to speak, rooted in tradition. I refer here to all the memorials and other marks of appreciation which are dedicated to the name of Liev Eiriksson, America's discoverer. All Norwegian-bred American citizens and all Norwegians in the mother country received with great pleasure the information that the Congress last year instituted the 9th of October as Liev Eiriksson's Day. And we entertain the hope that the day will continue to be devoted to his memory.

It is with gratitude to the Congress for its friendly act and for all other American honor to the first white man who set foot on the American shore, together with 34 other Norsemen, that we today present Congress with this painting of Liev Eiriksson's expedition to America. It is a gift from Norwegian friends of America and amongst the subscribers you will find our Parliament's Speaker, Mr. C. J. Hambro, who recently visited the States, as President of the International League of Norsemen. Also the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Halvdan Koht, from whom you just received a greeting through the Minister, Mr. Mowinckel, former Prime Minister. And among the contributors is our eminent Minister to the States, Mr. Morgenstierne, who has subscribed as an indication of personal devotion and love for this country, to which he is Norway's official representative. You will also find Capt. Magnus Andersen's name there, the old viking, who crossed the ocean from Norway to the world exhibition in Chicago in 1893 in an open viking ship copied from the original Gokstad ship in the museum near Oslo—besides several Norwegian friends of America.

I venture to assert that there are few moments in history so dramatic as when our Norwegian ancestors landed for the first time on the American shore up there on the coast of Labrador. They were looking for experiences and adventures and they found them, just as Nansen and Amundsen did later. Liev Eiriksson and his men, they did not search the gold like the Spaniards who came to the islands after them and to the southern parts of the American continent. They did not find gold, but they found adventure. They discovered for the first time the soil which later has given bread and power to the world's mightiest Nation—the United States of today. We have hitherto, according to the historical sources which have been known, regarded this voyage of discovery as one made only by adventurers, but the subsequent investigation has shown that behind the manly courage and behind the toil was regularity of plan and desire to find new land for further colonization.

I should at this point like to say a few words about Liev Eiriksson. He was the son of Eirik Raude, who discovered Greenland in 980 and subsequently colonized it. Liev bought a boat from a man called Bjarne Herjulvsson. Bjarne had sailed from Iceland to Greenland, but drifted westward into the sea; a fog came on and he lost his course. When the fog cleared and they set their course again, they saw land which they understood was not Greenland, because it was not wooded. Bjarne was therefore the first Norseman who saw the American shore, but he did not land there. And Liev Eiriksson bought his ship in order to explore this land which Bjarne had only seen. Liev's expedition was not an accidental discovery of new land, like Bjarne's, but Liev is one of the important men of that age, there is a glamour about his young, strong personality which calls to mind one of his contemporaries, the Norwegian hero King, Olav Trygvason. Liev disembarked where they saw land first, and named it "Helluland", part of what is now called Baffinsland—afterward he came to Markland (Woodland), the coast of Labrador, and continued southward. They came to a land where it was good to be, with salmon in the sea and fine soil. There was no frost in wintertime as there was in their own country, and the grass was always green. They explored the land thoroughly and found among other things, grapes, which caused Liev to call the land "Wineland." From the time reports and observations regarding the sun's position, according to the latest investigations, we can now in all probability establish that Wineland was situated about 50° to 40°, or even further south.

As I have said there was a plan for the expeditions to the country which they temptingly called Wineland, and the enterprises continued down through the Middle Ages, even if nothing more

came of them than an attempt at colonization with 160 people and three ships led by Torfin Karlsevne.

Torfin's son Snorre was the first white native American, being born about 1020 in America.

We are glad and proud that the Nation has officially accepted this painting to be placed here in the Capitol of the United States, and that those who live in this country today where Liev Eiriksson was the first to set foot have not forgotten the country's first discoverer, but honor his memory by giving the painting a place in the very heart of the Nation, at its seat of power. And we hope that all the thousands of visitors who will see this painting in the coming years will pause awhile before it and receive a strong impression of this bold, stalwart Viking, as Christian Krogh, the famous Norwegian painter, in 1893 pictured Liev Eiriksson standing at the tiller pointing to the new country—the New World. We hope that this picture will inspire the American men and women to get to know the descendants of this explorer who first discovered the country for the white man. And we should be very glad, indeed, if this picture could play a part in inducing you Americans also to go on expeditions eastward to see the country Liev Eiriksson came from, and even if you do not meet him or his vikings over there, and it is perhaps just as well, I can promise you all the same that the country lies where it lay 936 years ago, just as safe and beautiful.

Sirs, with these words I have the honor on behalf of Norwegian friends of America to present the painting Liev Eiriksson Discovers America to the Congress.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ALBEN W. BARKLEY ACCEPTING THE PAINTING LIEV EIRIKSSON DISCOVERS AMERICA, PRESENTED BY THE PEOPLE OF NORWAY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 23, 1936, IN STATUARY HALL, CAPITOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Your Excellency, Dr. Morgenstierne, Dr. Bjercke, ladies, and gentlemen: I very deeply appreciate the honor which has been conferred upon me as a representative of the Senate of the United States in accepting this beautiful painting of a historic discovery.

If time permitted, it would afford me the greatest of pleasure to allow my fancy to dwell upon the remarkable history of the Scandinavian people as a whole and of Norway in particular. I should like to trace the growth of this great people, its migrations and settlement in the northern countries, now known as Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, its kinship and connection with the great Indo-European race of men, and its influence upon the civilization of the world; but obviously I cannot, on this occasion, indulge my fancy to such an extent.

The history of the races of mankind, to me, is a fascinating story. I love to dwell upon the migrations and settlements of tribes and of races in the various portions of the world, and try to imagine the moving causes which impelled them forward to the permanent settlements which became their final allotment of the earth's surface.

In all this migration, in all these movements, in all these great developments of what we call the world's civilization, no race of men has played a more heroic part than the people now known as Scandinavians.

In the beginning, they were a ferocious and warlike people. They sent their ships of war and plunder into nearly all parts of the civilized world. They conquered the Roman Empire and made of the cultured Romans conquered slaves. They invaded and took possession of Italy, of Spain, of parts of France, of England, of Germany, and of Russia.

They conquered Normandy and brought to that part of France a new culture and a new vigor. They conquered England and sat upon her throne for many years.

They established the Russian Empire and dominated it for nearly two centuries.

They discovered Iceland and established there the world's first republic more than a thousand years ago, the anniversary of whose establishment was celebrated in 1930 and was attended by an American delegate in the person of our Senator PETER NORBECK, of South Dakota, who is now in this audience.

This great race of people—and I speak now particularly of the Norwegian branch of the Scandinavian race—discovered and civilized Greenland. They were the first to send their ships of commerce across the waste waters of the North Atlantic. From the region of their first discovery and exploration they sent their ships and their men and women to the northern coasts of America, though it was not then known by such a name. The history of these discoveries must, of course, leave something to the imagination, but it is fairly definitely known that these Norwegian adventurers came down the eastern coast of this continent as far as Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Markland or Vineland, which is the region adjacent to Cape Cod, and that they probably sailed as far south as Long Island in New York State.

The leaders in this vanguard of American discovery were Eric the Red and Liev Eiriksson. Tradition tells us that these men were forced to leave Norway because of homicides which they had committed. If this is true, we are reminded that they lived in an age where brute force played an overwhelming part in the relationships of men; but if it be true that their departure from Norway was the result of these personal encounters, then the civilization of America, which they assisted in promoting, may be counted as an atonement for such misdeeds as may have been attributed to them.

The story of Liev Eiriksson, who is the subject of this beautiful painting which is today unveiled, is a romantic story. It is a story of love, adventure, and of hardship. It is a story of privation. It is a story that ranks him and his life inseparably with the strength and vigor of the Scandinavian world.

We need not seek to penetrate the night which enveloped what is now northern America from the advent of Eiriksson to the later discovery of Christopher Columbus. It is sufficient that the descendants of Liev Eiriksson have made an indispensable contribution to the civilization of the United States.

It is a singular coincidence that this great race of people who at the beginning were so savage in their attacks upon other nations and other people have become the most peace loving and peaceful among the nations of the world. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark not only live in peace among themselves, but at peace with all the world. During the world's greatest struggle from 1914 to 1918, these people dedicated to the arts of civilization and to the pursuit of happiness, not only remained aloof from the conflict, but made great contributions toward the ultimate outcome of peace.

These great people have contributed to the jurisprudence of our civilized era a conception of law and of order and orderly development which takes its place alongside that of England.

In our own country they have made indispensable contributions to the arts and sciences, to religion and education, to the development of industry, and to the high conception of public service which characterizes the regions in which they are predominating citizens.

As I look upon this beautiful painting I am reminded of Washington crossing the Delaware, but it was no Delaware River that Liev Eiriksson navigated to discover northern America. It was an ocean theretofore uncharted, which held within its bosom every element of nautical danger. The wonder to us is that he was ever able to reach the goal or to return to the country from which he had departed.

Dr. Bjercke, let me, as the commissioned representative of the Senate, on this historic occasion express to you the gratitude of our people for this gracious gift to them from the people of your country. This painting will hang in the Capitol of this great Nation as a perpetual reminder of the enduring friendship which exists between your country and ours, and may I express the hope that you will convey to your people in Norway and indirectly to all the people of Scandinavia our deep appreciation of the fine spirit which has actuated them in sending you to this Capitol to present to us this historic painting of a great historic accomplishment consummated more than 1,000 years ago.

May I express the fervent hope that the great contributions to civilization which your people have made and are making may enlarge the vision of mankind and the opportunities for the enjoyment of a fuller life, and may I also express the fervent hope that the cordial relationship which has always existed between your people and ours may continue so long as men appreciate the heroic and substantial part that both countries and both peoples are playing in the development and the enjoyment of a better world?

HOMESTEADS FOR ACTUAL FARM FAMILIES

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein excerpts from the report of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Public Lands, of which I was chairman, on H. R. 8286, a bill to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families, introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Public Lands, of which I was chairman, on the bill (H. R. 8286) to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families:

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

MAY 19, 1936

The subcommittee of the Committee on the Public Lands appointed for the purpose of studying the provisions of H. R. 8286, a bill to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families, introduced by Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, makes its report, as follows:

The question of the necessity for legislation of this nature has been considered of first importance.

In an effort to determine this question, we have made a careful study of national homestead policies; the trend of farm ownership, farm-mortgage debt, and tenant farming; and the effect of these forces upon the national economic and social structure.

In the detailed report which follows this summary may be found tables and data, compiled by various Government agencies, substantiating statements made herein. Data has also been obtained from regular Government statistics and reports which are not reproduced herein but which are readily available.

SUMMARY

In this study we have divided farmers into three groups: Owner-operators free of mortgage debt, owner-operators with mortgage debt, and tenant farmers.

During the 40-year period for which complete census figures are available—1890 to 1930—the group of owner-operators free of mortgage debt steadily declined. Today they represent less than one-third of the total number of farmers. The number of farms operated by tenants increased rapidly. Farm mortgages grew by

leaps and bounds—from a total of slightly over three and one-quarter billion dollars in 1910 to nine and one-quarter billion dollars in 1930.

We find that no legislation of a basic nature relating to the national land policies has been enacted since the adoption of the homestead law of 1862. At that time there was a total of over 1,000,000,000 acres of land in the public domain, a major portion of which was suitable for farm purposes.

So long as free farm lands were available to the public, farm families operating their own homesteads free of debt composed the predominating group of the Nation's farmers.

The farm mortgage was a minor feature of the farm structure.

Such tenantry as existed was of a voluntary nature.

Years ago, however, all the desirable farm lands passed into private ownership, and the homestead law of 1862 has become inoperative. Since that time farm mortgages and tenant rentals have occupied places of increasing importance in the Nation's economy; while the plight of the tenant farmer and the owner-operator with mortgaged farm has created a serious social problem different from any heretofore confronting our people.

ANALYSIS OF THE FARMER'S INCOME

A reason for this rapid decline in the number of owner-operated farms free of mortgage debt and a corresponding increase in the number of tenant farms is readily found through an analysis of the income of the Nation's farmer.

The last complete census giving necessary data for this purpose was that of 1930.

In 1930 farm prices and farm production were both above normal, and exchange values as between agriculture and industry were not far below normal, so that the figures for 1930 may be relied upon as fairly representative. (See table at close of detailed report.)

During that year (1930) the average net income of the average farm operator throughout the Nation, above operating expenses, was $26.50 per month. (In 1934 it was only $18.42 per month.)

The average net cash income of the average farm operator in the three respective groups was as follows:

Net cash income per month:

Owner-operator free of mortgage debt	$36.66
Owner-operator with mortgage debt	15.00
Tenant farmer	21.00

(Figures given here are for the average throughout the entire Nation. Net cash income of each group for each State is estimated in a table appearing in the detailed report.)

LIMITED INCOME PROHIBITS PAYMENT OF OBLIGATIONS

Out of his income of $36.66 per month, the owner-operator free of mortgage debt was supposed to supply management and supervision for his farm (which had an average value of $9,103); support and clothe his family; provide household necessities; pay doctors' and medicine bills; educate his children; pay church dues and other religious and social obligations; take care of telephone, electric, and other similar accounts; furnish and maintain automobiles, radio, sewing machines, etc.; and meet all other obligations of the normal American family.

Expenditures, however, are often in excess of this exceedingly limited income. Especially is this true with credit and merchandise both plentiful, with fine farm lands available as collateral, and with loan agents anxious to make commissions.

Once the farmer steps beyond the bounds of his income, whether deliberately or through the force of circumstances, the result is generally another farm mortgage.

After the average owner-operator has mortgaged his farm he finds that in addition to all the other operating expenses he is also forced to meet interest and retirement payments on the mortgage in order to prevent foreclosure. In 1930, after paying these additional expenses, his net cash income dwindled from $36.66 per month to an average of $15 per month (the average farm mortgage in 1930 amounted to approximately $3,500). With this sum it is obviously impossible for the farmer to meet his living expenses, which are just as great as they were before he mortgaged his farm.

As a result he becomes delinquent in payments on the farm mortgage. The mortgage is foreclosed, and his farm is placed in the group of tenant-operated farms.

Convincing evidence of this fact is found in tables presented in the detailed report following this summary, which tables were prepared by the Farm Credit Administration. They show that more Federal land-bank loans are foreclosed each year than are paid. On January 1, 1935, over one-third of the outstanding loans were delinquent.

AMERICA'S NEW CASTE SYSTEM

Struggling against these tremendous odds the American farmer is being driven into a condition of tenantry.

Even now 3,000,000 farm families are settling down to a social state of serfdom heretofore foreign to our great country.

Almost 2,000,000 more, with their farm homes heavily mortgaged, struggle on under the burden of debt, hoping that a kind Providence will save them from a like fate.

Less than 2,000,000 families of the Nation's once proud group of independent home-owning farmers remain, and their ranks are thinning every year. The independent home owner is rapidly vanishing.

BANKRUPTCY COURTS AND FREE SOIL—THE NATION'S CITY OF REFUGE

In framing our Government, the founders recognized the necessity for an avenue of escape from the oppressions of debt, and provided for the enactment of Federal bankruptcy laws.

The bankruptcy system was planned as a city of refuge to safeguard every citizen of the Nation in his inalienable right of the pursuit of happiness. However, this system was buttressed and supplemented by what appeared at the time to be an unlimited supply of free soil, available to all. Free homesteads constituted a vital portion of the city of refuge.

After freeing himself of the burden of debt through bankruptcy proceedings, a citizen could move into new lands where he could acquire a homestead and maintain his family, secure from threat of tenantry or serfdom.

Today, with no more free homesteads available, the Federal bankruptcy laws have lost their sustaining ally, free soil. They continue to be effective weapons against the oppressions of debt, but they no longer offer hope to the unfortunate citizen who has become a victim of tenantry and serfdom—those other monsters, equally as hideous, which have, since the dawn of civilization, destroyed human rights and blighted human progress wherever they have prevailed. From these conditions our Government now provides no city of refuge—no avenue of escape—for the average citizen of the Nation.

Since the homestead law of 1862 became ineffective there is no national law safeguarding the American farmer in his inalienable right of the pursuit of happiness in freedom and independence.

AGRICULTURE DRIFTS—A PREY OF INDUSTRY

For 40 years agriculture in the United States has been gradually drifting into the clutch of practices which have prevailed in commerce and industry for centuries, and which, when permitted to go unchecked, have invariably destroyed the independent farm home, and reduced agriculture to a condition of serfdom.

Under a correct order of things this condition would not prevail.

Agriculture is the foundation of our economic structure, and the stability of agriculture is dependent upon self-supporting families composed of free and equal citizens.

Therefore, the Nation's commercial and industrial activities should center around a sound national agrarian policy; while its social structure should rest upon the sturdy shoulders of a free yeomanry.

GOVERNMENT AID ESSENTIAL

It is gravely doubtful whether this problem will ever right itself without the aid of the Federal Government.

Experience, throughout the ages, has demonstrated that without such aid the farm group when once reduced to serfdom never regain that equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

CONCLUSIONS

It is evident that the present trend of agriculture is toward a system of tenantry and serfdom that is destructive of the liberty and freedom of the individual citizen and foreign to the doctrine of equality of citizenship.

This condition is brought about largely by economic practices beyond the farmer's control and is very undesirable, both economically and socially, tending to destroy essential elements of our Christian civilization.

It is, therefore, a duty of Congress to enact legislation to check this tendency and to promote the economic independence of agriculture and the social welfare of those engaged in agriculture equally with all other groups. H. R. 8286, a bill to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families, proposes a national land policy designed to meet these specific ends. It involves a basic principle of government that is essential to the life of our free institutions.

We, therefore, consider it a matter of vital importance.

To aid the committee in its further consideration of this legislation we present our report and findings, supported by important tables and other data, together with an explanation of the bill.

DETAILED REPORT

REVIEW OF NATIONAL LAND POLICY

The homestead law under which the major portion of the Nation's public domain was settled was enacted in 1862, after having been a subject of national debate and discussion over a long period of years.

Its primary purpose was to provide an opportunity for needy families to own a home and live in freedom and independence. It was intended by its author to provide a haven of safety for every citizen who was willing to labor with his hands and earn an honest living by the sweat of his brow.

Under its provisions over 1 billion acres of public domain were made available to the people of the Nation, and there was promoted an amount of emigration the like of which the history of the world affords no other example.

The beginning of the twentieth century found practically all desirable farm lands taken up by homesteaders.

With no free lands suitable for farm purposes left, the homestead law of 1862 could no longer be the means of furnishing free land for free laborers.

Complete title to these lands had passed out of the Government. It was the homesteader's to use as he saw fit, to mortgage, to give away, or to sell. However, when the title to this homestead passed out of his possession he could not now apply to the General Land Office for a new homestead. The supply had become exhausted.

In the Thirteen Original States the lands were never under the jurisdiction of the General Land Office, but were controlled by the States themselves. Although the major portion of these lands had passed into private possession long before the enactment of the homestead law of 1862, still the operation of that law in opening vast areas to free homesteaders materially affected land practices and values in these States.

During the intervening years from the enactment of the homestead law of 1862 to 1890, when the first comprehensive farm census was taken, there was free land for everyone who was willing to take possession of it. Therefore, such tenantry as existed was certainly of a voluntary nature.

During this period, too, the problem of the farm mortgage was not insurmountable, for when the costs of a mortgage became excessive or beyond the ability of the farmer to pay he always had the recourse of giving up his farm and moving west to new and unencumbered land.

Laborers engaged in industrial pursuits were not forced to accept terms of employment which they considered unjust or unfair. They were not absolutely dependent upon their employer for a living. The Government was always ready to furnish them with a free farm where they could live in freedom and independence.

Whenever the burden of debt became destructive of the liberty of any citizen he could always turn to the Government for relief through the bankruptcy laws, and for a new opportunity through the homestead law.

The Nation's free soil was the people's greatest natural refuge from injustice and oppression.

THE PRESENT TREND OF AGRICULTURE

Soon after the beginning of the twentieth century free farm lands suitable for the support of a family disappeared. The homestead law became inoperative.

Since that time agriculture has been drifting, without the aid of national legislation or the guidance of a definite national policy.

In order to determine the direction of the drift of agriculture, we have made a study of the census figures for the entire 40-year period from 1890 to 1930. This analysis of the Nation's farm population and of the fiscal affairs of the Nation's farmer discloses certain pronounced and continuing tendencies.

Although farm operators are ordinarily placed in two groups—the owner and the tenant—we find that the farm mortgage, which played so small a part in the early history of agriculture in this Nation, has grown to be such a tremendous factor that it is necessary to give it equal attention with the other elements of the farm picture.

We have, therefore, found it essential to class farm operators into three groups in order to correctly analyze their present condition:

1. The farm operator who owns his farm free of mortgage debt.
2. The farm operator who owns his farm but has a mortgage on it.
3. The farm operator who does not own his farm, and is known as the tenant farmer.

Then there is a small group of farmers known as managers, who occupy only a small part of the complete field of operation. Certainly it is not necessary to take them into account in order to get a true picture of the real condition of the average American farmer.

Throughout the entire 40-year period 1890 to 1930, there was a constant decrease in the percentage of owner-operators free of mortgage debt.

At the same time there was a constant and steady increase in the percentage both of owner-operators with farm mortgages and of tenant farmers. The table below clearly demonstrates these facts.

Number of farms in the United States, by tenure and by mortgage status of owners, 1890, 1900, 1910, 1920, 1925, and 1930

[Compiled from reports on the Census of Agriculture]

Description	1890	1900	1910	1920	1925	1930
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*
Total	4,564,641	5,739,657	6,361,502	6,448,343	6,371,640	6,288,648
Full owners and part owners	[1] 3,142,746	3,638,403	3,948,722	3,925,090	3,868,332	3,568,394
Free of mortgage debt	2,228,806	2,419,180	2,588,596	2,074,325	[2]	1,845,997
Mortgaged	874,215	1,093,164	1,312,034	1,461,306	[3] 1,395,026	1,497,766
Unknown	39,725	126,059	48,092	389,459	[2]	224,631
Full owners				3,366,510	3,313,490	2,911,644
Free of mortgage debt				1,844,470	[2]	1,569,178
Mortgaged				1,217,234	[3] 1,128,207	1,157,848
Unknown				304,806	[2]	184,618
Part owners				558,580	554,842	656,750
Free of mortgage debt				229,855	[2]	276,819
Mortgaged				244,072	266,819	339,918
Unknown				84,653	[2]	40,013
Managers		59,213	58,104	68,449	40,700	55,889
Owners and managers	3,269,726	3,660,072	4,006,826	3,993,539	3,909,032	3,624,283
Joint owners and tenants		53,299				
Tenants	1,294,913	2,026,286	2,354,676	2,454,804	2,462,608	2,664,365

PERCENTAGE OF ALL FARMS

Description	1890	1900	1910	1920	1925	1930
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Full owners and part owners	[1] 68.8	63.4	62.1	60.9	60.7	56.7
Free of mortgage debt	48.8	42.2	40.7	32.2		29.4
Mortgaged	19.2	19.0	20.6	22.7	21.9	23.8
Unknown	.8	2.2	.8	6.0		3.5
Full owners				52.2	52.0	46.3
Free of mortgage debt				28.6		25.0
Mortgaged				18.9	17.7	18.4
Unknown				4.7		2.9
Part owners				8.7	8.7	10.4
Free of mortgage debt				3.6		4.4
Mortgaged				3.8	4.2	5.4
Unknown				1.3		.6
Managers		1.0	.9	1.1	.6	.9
Owners and managers	71.6	63.8	63.0	61.9	61.4	57.6
Joint owners and tenants		.9				
Tenants	28.4	35.3	37.0	38.1	38.6	42.4

[1] Owned farm homes.
[2] Not reported.
[3] Number reporting amount of mortgage debt on farm land and buildings anywhere in the United States.

FREE AND SELF-SUPPORTING FARM FAMILY DISAPPEARING

It is evident from the above table, which shows both the number of farms in each group and the percentage of the total each group represents, for the 10-year periods from 1890 to 1930, that the owner-operator free of debt is disappearing from the farm picture.

In 1890 there were 2,228,806 owner-operators free of debt out of the total number of four and one-half million farm families. This represented almost one-half of the total farms.

In 1930 the total number of owner-operators free of debt had decreased to 1,845,997, while the total number of farms had increased to over six and one-quarter million.

In 40 years the owner-operators free of mortgage debt decreased from 48.8 percent of the total to 29.4 percent of the total.

During this same period the owner-operators with farm mortgage increased from 874,215, or 19.2 percent of the total, to 1,497,766, or 23.8 percent of the total.

Likewise the tenant farmers steadily increased, rising from 1,294,913, or 28.4 percent of the total, in 1890 to 2,664,365, or 42.4 percent of the total, in 1930.

(At the close of this report can be found detailed tables for the years 1890, 1910, 1920, and 1930. These tables, prepared by the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce, show number of

farms, land in farms, and value of farms, by tenure of farm operator and by mortgage status for full owners and part owners, by divisions and States.)

By combining the two groups—owner-operators with mortgage debt and tenants—into one group and comparing the combined group with the group of owner-operators free of mortgage debt a much clearer and more impressive picture of the entire farm group for the whole Nation is presented.

In 1890 the owner-operator free of debt represented 48.8 percent of the total number of farms, while the owner-operator with mortgage debt and the tenant farmer combined represented only 47.6 percent of the total.

Forty years later, in 1930, the owner-operator free of mortgage debt represented only 29.4 percent, or less than one-third of the total, while the owner-operator mortgaged and the tenant farmer combined represented 66.2 percent, or two-thirds of the total.

The tables given below show number of farms in these groups and the percentage of the total they represent for the entire Nation and for each State of the Union for the years 1890, 1910, 1920, and 1930.

Total land area, farm acreage, and the number of farms and owned farm homes—Specified tenure and mortgage classes, by States: Census of 1890

	Total land area (acres)	Total area in farms (acres)	Total number of farms	Farm homes occupied by owners free from debt		Farms of tenants and occupied farm homes of owners mortgaged		Farm homes occupied by owners, debt not reported, and all other farms, except tenant farms	
				Number [1]	Percent of all farms	Number	Percent of all farms	Number	Percent of all farms
United States	1,903,337,600	623,218,619	4,564,641	2,228,806	48.8	2,169,128		166,707	
Alabama	32,818,560	19,853,000	157,772	68,596	43.5	79,751		9,425	
Arizona	72,857,600	1,297,033	1,426	1,602		231		−407	
Arkansas	33,616,000	14,891,356	124,760	75,127	60.2	43,331		6,302	
California	99,776,000	21,427,293	52,894	27,701	52.4	22,742		2,451	
Colorado	66,341,120	4,598,941	16,389	11,098		5,638		−347	
Connecticut	3,084,800	2,253,432	26,350	14,750	56.0	9,698		1,902	
Delaware	1,257,600	1,055,692	9,381	3,223	34.4	5,745		413	
District of Columbia	37,120	11,745	382	232		150			
Florida	35,111,040	3,674,486	34,228	23,030	67.3	8,788		2,410	
Georgia	37,584,000	25,200,435	171,071	70,841	41.4	94,072		6,158	
Idaho	53,346,560	1,302,256	6,603	5,619		1,401		−417	
Illinois	35,841,280	30,498,277	240,681	100,158	41.6	139,927		596	
Indiana	22,966,400	20,362,516	198,167	95,656	48.3	97,610		4,901	
Iowa	35,575,040	30,491,541	201,903	66,949	33.2	133,099		1,855	
Kansas	52,335,360	30,214,456	166,617	52,065	31.2	111,923		2,629	
Kentucky	25,715,840	21,412,229	179,264	117,405	65.5	49,703		12,156	
Louisiana	29,061,760	9,544,219	69,294	33,560	48.4	32,153		3,581	
Maine	19,132,800	6,179,925	62,013	44,372	71.6	15,951		1,690	
Maryland	6,362,240	4,952,390	40,798	17,768	43.6	20,262		2,768	
Massachusetts	5,144,960	2,998,282	34,374	20,314	59.1	12,095		1,965	
Michigan	36,787,200	14,785,636	172,344	73,415	42.6	95,666		3,263	
Minnesota	51,719,120	18,663,645	116,851	52,416	44.9	60,461		3,974	
Mississippi	29,671,680	17,572,547	144,318	55,652	38.6	80,903		7,763	
Missouri	43,985,280	30,780,290	238,043	108,100	45.4	125,706		4,237	
Montana	93,568,640	1,964,197	5,603	4,340	77.5	1,071		192	
Nebraska	49,157,120	21,593,444	113,608	39,855	35.1	71,242		2,511	
Nevada	70,285,440	1,661,416	1,277	1,023		308		−54	
New Hampshire	5,779,840	3,459,018	29,151	19,992	68.6	7,894		1,265	
New Jersey	4,808,960	2,662,009	30,828	10,897	35.3	18,818		1,113	
New Mexico	78,401,920	787,882	4,458	8,032		449		−4,023	
New York	30,498,560	21,961,562	226,223	96,595	42.7	122,172		7,456	
North Carolina	31,193,600	22,651,896	178,359	100,820	56.5	66,062		11,477	
North Dakota	44,917,120	7,660,333	27,611	12,855	46.6	14,102		654	
Ohio	26,073,600	23,352,408	251,430	130,817	52.0	110,708		9,905	
Oklahoma [2]	44,424,960	1,606,423	8,826	9,903		65		−1,142	
Oregon	61,188,480	6,909,888	25,530	16,774	65.7	8,319		437	
Pennsylvania	28,692,480	18,364,370	211,557	112,004	52.9	91,631		7,922	
Rhode Island	682,880	469,281	5,500	3,276	59.6	1,801		423	
South Carolina	19,516,800	13,184,652	115,008	41,531	36.1	67,191		6,286	
South Dakota	49,195,520	11,396,460	50,158	19,273	38.4	27,802		3,083	
Tennessee	26,679,680	20,161,583	174,412	102,784	58.9	57,199		14,429	
Texas	167,934,720	51,406,937	228,126	118,164	51.8	102,679		7,283	
Utah	52,597,760	1,323,705	10,517	9,795		1,119		−397	
Vermont	5,839,360	4,395,646	32,573	14,759	45.3	16,520		1,294	
Virginia	25,767,680	19,104,951	127,600	79,310	62.2	36,877		11,413	
Washington	42,775,040	4,179,190	18,056	13,948		6,623		−2,515	
West Virginia	15,374,080	10,321,326	72,773	47,816	65.7	20,047		4,910	
Wisconsin	35,363,840	16,787,988	146,409	72,316	49.4	70,949		3,144	
Wyoming	62,460,160	1,830,432	3,125	2,278	72.9	474		373	

[1] Farm homes occupied by their owners. In the reports of the 1890 census, all owned farm homes without mortgage report were distributed between the two groups, "mortgaged" and "free from mortgage." For purposes of comparison, the number of these farm homes which was assigned to each group has been recomputed and subtracted, leaving the figures for 1890 approximately as reported.

[2] Figures include Oklahoma Territory alone, no data being available for Indian Territory.

Total land area, farm acreage, and number of farms of specified classes, by States

CENSUS OF 1910

	Total land area (acres)	Area in farms (acres)	Total number of farms	Farms operated by owners free from debt		Farms of owners mortgaged and of all tenants		Farms of managers, and owners mortgage status not reported	
				Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
United States	1,903,289,600	878,798,325	6,361,502	2,588,596	40.7	3,666,710	57.6	106,196	1.7
Alabama	32,818,560	20,732,312	262,901	74,504	28.3	185,783	70.7	2,614	1.0
Arizona	72,838,400	1,246,613	9,227	7,038	76.3	1,904	20.6	285	3.1
Arkansas	33,616,000	17,416,075	214,678	82,321	38.3	129,640	60.4	2,717	1.3
California	99,617,280	27,931,444	88,197	39,368	44.6	44,897	50.9	3,932	4.5
Colorado	66,341,120	13,532,113	46,170	26,822	58.1	18,026	39.0	1,322	2.9
Connecticut	3,084,800	2,185,788	26,815	13,080	48.8	12,590	47.0	1,145	4.3
Delaware	1,257,600	1,038,866	10,836	3,817	35.2	6,799	62.7	220	2.0
District of Columbia	38,400	6,063	217	93	42.9	105	48.4	19	8.8
Florida	35,111,040	5,253,538	50,016	29,614	59.2	18,502	37.0	1,900	3.8
Georgia	37,584,000	26,953,413	291,027	78,004	26.8	209,237	71.9	3,786	1.3
Idaho	53,346,560	5,283,604	30,807	17,933	58.2	12,198	39.6	676	2.2
Illinois	35,867,520	32,522,937	251,872	87,713	34.4	160,171	63.6	4,988	2.0

Total land area, farm acreage, and number of farms of specified classes, by States—Continued

CENSUS OF 1910—continued

	Total land area (acres)	Area in farms (acres)	Total number of farms	Farms operated by owners free from debt		Farms of owners mortgaged and of all tenants		Farms of managers, and owners mortgage status not reported	
				Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
Indiana	23,068,800	21,299,823	215,485	89,847	41.7	121,601	56.4	4,037	1.9
Iowa	35,575,040	33,930,688	217,044	63,234	29.1	150,160	69.2	3,650	1.7
Kansas	52,335,360	43,384,799	177,841	60,582	34.1	114,647	64.5	2,612	1.5
Kentucky	25,715,840	22,189,127	259,185	135,505	52.3	120,899	46.6	2,781	1.1
Louisiana	29,061,760	10,439,481	120,546	42,011	35.9	76,441	63.4	2,094	1.7
Maine	19,132,800	6,296,859	60,016	41,309	68.8	17,511	29.2	1,196	2.0
Maryland	6,362,240	5,057,140	48,923	21,084	43.1	26,543	54.3	1,296	2.6
Massachusetts	5,144,960	2,875,941	36,917	18,768	50.8	15,993	43.3	2,156	5.8
Michigan	36,787,200	18,940,614	206,960	88,705	42.9	115,320	55.7	2,935	1.4
Minnesota	51,749,120	27,675,823	156,137	65,038	41.7	88,956	57.0	2,143	1.4
Mississippi	29,671,680	18,557,533	274,382	60,543	22.1	211,184	77.0	2,655	1.0
Missouri	43,985,280	34,591,248	277,244	102,514	37.0	171,444	61.8	3,286	1.2
Montana	93,568,640	13,545,603	26,214	18,014	68.7	7,164	27.3	1,036	4.0
Nebraska	49,157,120	38,622,021	129,678	47,435	36.6	80,280	61.9	1,963	1.5
Nevada	70,285,440	2,714,757	2,689	1,805	67.1	694	25.8	190	7.1
New Hampshire	5,779,840	3,249,458	27,053	18,119	67.0	8,113	30.0	821	3.0
New Jersey	4,808,960	2,573,857	33,487	11,983	35.8	20,087	60.0	1,417	4.2
New Mexico	78,401,920	11,270,021	35,676	31,382	88.0	3,732	10.5	562	1.6
New York	30,498,560	22,030,367	215,597	93,118	43.2	117,183	54.4	5,296	2.5
North Carolina	31,193,600	22,439,129	253,725	117,028	46.1	133,929	52.8	2,768	1.1
North Dakota	44,917,120	28,426,650	74,360	30,651	41.2	42,391	57.0	1,318	1.8
Ohio	26,073,600	24,105,708	272,045	135,616	49.9	132,185	48.6	4,244	1.6
Oklahoma	44,424,960	28,859,353	190,192	46,889	24.7	140,173	73.7	3,130	1.6
Oregon	61,188,480	11,685,110	45,502	24,855	54.6	19,491	42.8	1,156	2.5
Pennsylvania	28,692,480	18,586,832	219,295	112,156	51.1	101,804	46.4	5,335	2.4
Rhode Island	682,880	443,308	5,292	2,811	53.1	2,134	40.3	347	6.6
South Carolina	19,516,800	13,512,028	176,434	47,535	26.9	126,241	71.6	2,658	1.5
South Dakota	49,195,520	26,016,892	77,644	35,101	45.2	40,922	52.7	1,621	2.1
Tennessee	26,679,680	20,041,657	246,012	118,285	48.1	125,067	50.8	2,660	1.1
Texas	167,934,720	112,435,067	417,770	128,082	30.7	283,583	67.9	6,105	1.5
Utah	52,597,760	3,397,699	21,676	15,131	69.8	6,212	28.7	333	1.5
Vermont	5,839,360	4,663,577	32,709	14,851	45.4	17,148	52.4	710	2.2
Virginia	25,767,680	19,495,636	184,018	111,474	60.6	69,911	38.0	2,633	1.4
Washington	42,775,040	11,712,235	56,192	30,979	55.1	23,752	42.3	1,461	2.6
West Virginia	15,374,080	10,026,442	96,085	66,093	68.4	29,360	30.4	1,232	1.3
Wisconsin	35,363,840	21,060,066	177,127	72,941	41.2	101,783	57.5	2,403	1.4
Wyoming	62,460,160	8,543,010	10,987	7,815	71.1	2,820	25.7	352	3.2

CENSUS OF 1920

United States	1,903,215,360	955,883,715	6,448,343	2,074,325	32.2	3,916,110	60.7	457,908	7.1
Alabama	32,818,560	19,576,856	256,099	64,498	25.2	176,123	68.8	15,478	6.0
Arizona	72,838,400	5,802,126	9,975	3,708	37.2	5,181	51.9	1,086	10.9
Arkansas	33,616,000	17,456,750	232,604	64,881	27.9	153,211	65.9	14,512	6.2
California	99,617,280	29,365,667	117,670	36,042	30.6	69,250	58.9	12,378	10.5
Colorado	66,341,120	24,462,014	59,934	20,965	35.0	34,894	58.2	4,075	6.8
Connecticut	3,084,800	1,898,980	22,655	9,597	42.4	10,839	47.8	2,219	9.8
Delaware	1,257,600	944,511	10,140	3,504	34.6	6,004	59.2	632	6.2
District of Columbia	38,400	5,668	204	53	26.0	114	55.9	37	18.1
Florida	35,111,040	6,046,691	54,005	25,010	46.3	21,791	40.3	7,204	13.3
Georgia	37,584,000	25,441,061	310,732	64,061	20.6	230,089	74.0	16,582	5.3
Idaho	53,346,560	8,375,873	42,106	11,872	28.2	26,761	63.6	3,473	8.2
Illinois	35,867,520	31,974,775	237,181	68,892	29.0	152,235	64.2	16,054	6.8
Indiana	23,068,800	21,063,332	205,126	73,233	35.7	117,061	57.1	14,832	7.2
Iowa	35,575,040	33,474,896	213,439	45,807	21.5	155,160	72.7	12,472	5.8
Kansas	52,335,360	45,425,179	165,286	40,979	24.8	110,765	67.0	13,542	8.2
Kentucky	25,715,840	21,612,772	270,626	116,613	43.1	130,945	48.4	23,068	8.5
Louisiana	29,061,760	10,019,822	135,463	36,010	26.6	89,164	65.8	10,289	7.6
Maine	19,132,800	5,425,968	48,227	30,665	63.6	15,027	31.2	2,535	5.3
Maryland	6,362,240	4,757,999	47,908	19,292	40.3	25,180	52.6	3,436	7.2
Massachusetts	5,144,960	2,494,477	32,001	14,055	43.9	14,919	46.6	3,027	9.5
Michigan	36,787,200	19,032,961	196,447	72,869	37.1	113,480	57.8	10,098	5.1
Minnesota	51,749,120	30,221,758	178,478	54,086	30.3	113,683	63.7	10,709	6.0
Mississippi	29,671,680	18,196,979	272,101	53,073	19.5	203,792	74.9	15,236	5.6
Missouri	43,985,280	34,774,679	263,004	82,099	31.2	161,265	61.3	19,640	7.5
Montana	93,523,840	35,070,656	57,677	16,365	28.4	36,404	63.1	4,908	8.5
Nebraska	49,157,120	42,225,475	124,417	26,065	21.8	88,621	71.2	8,731	7.0
Nevada	70,285,440	2,357,163	3,163	1,599	50.6	1,180	37.3	384	12.1
New Hampshire	5,779,840	2,603,806	20,523	11,992	58.4	6,762	32.9	1,769	8.6
New Jersey	4,808,960	2,282,535	29,702	10,000	33.7	16,911	56.9	2,791	9.4
New Mexico	78,401,920	24,409,633	29,844	16,650	55.8	9,912	33.2	3,282	11.0
New York	30,498,560	20,632,803	193,195	75,522	39.1	103,735	53.7	13,938	7.2
North Carolina	31,193,600	20,021,736	269,763	102,950	38.2	141,958	52.6	24,855	9.2
North Dakota	44,917,120	36,214,751	77,690	12,833	16.5	60,380	77.7	4,477	5.8
Ohio	26,073,600	23,515,888	256,695	110,004	42.9	126,428	49.3	20,263	7.9
Oklahoma	44,424,960	31,951,934	191,988	30,551	15.9	144,861	75.5	16,576	8.6
Oregon	61,188,480	13,542,318	50,206	18,077	36.0	27,270	54.3	4,859	9.7
Pennsylvania	28,692,480	17,657,513	202,250	93,804	46.4	92,760	45.9	15,686	7.8
Rhode Island	682,880	331,600	4,083	1,971	48.3	1,582	38.7	530	13.0
South Carolina	19,516,800	12,426,675	192,693	42,847	22.2	138,530	71.9	11,316	5.9
South Dakota	49,195,520	34,636,491	74,637	16,037	21.5	53,303	71.4	5,297	7.1
Tennessee	26,679,680	19,510,856	252,774	105,128	41.6	136,149	53.9	11,497	4.5
Texas	167,934,720	114,020,621	436,033	105,490	24.2	302,249	69.3	28,294	6.5
Utah	52,597,760	5,050,410	25,662	10,756	41.9	12,703	49.5	2,203	8.6
Vermont	5,839,360	4,235,811	29,075	12,132	41.7	15,611	53.7	1,332	4.6
Virginia	25,767,680	18,561,112	186,242	98,470	52.9	72,076	38.7	15,696	8.4
Washington	42,775,040	13,244,720	66,288	25,012	37.7	36,423	54.9	4,853	7.3
West Virginia	15,374,080	9,569,790	87,289	25,617	60.3	24,372	27.9	10,300	11.8
Wisconsin	35,363,840	22,148,223	189,295	57,773	30.5	121,516	64.2	10,006	5.3
Wyoming	62,430,720	11,809,351	15,748	6,816	43.3	7,481	47.5	1,451	9.2

Total land area, farm acreage, and number of farms of specified classes, by States—Continued

CENSUS OF 1930

	Total land area (acres)	Area in farms (acres)	Total number of farms	Farms operated by owners free from debt		Farms of owners mortgaged and of all tenants		Farms of managers, and owners mortgage status not reported	
				Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
United States	1,903,216,640	986,771,016	6,288,648	1,845,997	29.4	4,162,131	66.2	280,520	4.5
Alabama	32,818,560	17,554,635	257,395	47,406	18.4	202,837	78.9	7,152	2.8
Arizona	72,838,400	10,526,627	14,173	4,822	34.0	5,937	41.8	3,414	24.1
Arkansas	33,616,000	16,052,962	242,334	47,494	19.6	186,393	77.0	8,447	3.5
California	99,617,280	30,442,581	135,676	43,852	32.3	79,056	58.3	12,768	9.3
Colorado	66,341,120	28,876,171	59,956	15,741	26.2	40,708	67.9	3,507	5.8
Connecticut	3,084,800	1,502,279	17,195	7,024	40.9	9,066	52.7	1,105	6.4
Delaware	1,257,600	900,815	9,707	3,470	35.7	5,689	58.6	548	5.6
District of Columbia	39,680	3,071	104	35	33.7	44	42.3	25	24.0
Florida	35,111,040	5,026,617	58,966	25,535	43.3	26,457	44.9	6,974	11.8
Georgia	37,584,000	22,078,630	255,598	46,479	18.2	199,807	78.2	9,312	3.7
Idaho	53,346,560	9,346,908	41,674	11,466	27.5	27,977	67.1	2,231	5.3
Illinois	35,867,520	30,695,339	214,497	62,990	29.4	141,941	66.2	9,566	4.4
Indiana	23,068,800	19,688,675	181,570	61,731	34.0	111,483	61.4	8,356	4.5
Iowa	35,575,040	34,019,332	214,928	41,371	19.3	166,040	77.3	7,517	3.5
Kansas	52,335,360	46,975,647	166,042	41,728	25.1	119,405	71.9	4,909	3.0
Kentucky	25,715,840	19,927,286	246,499	103,780	42.1	126,601	51.4	16,118	6.6
Louisiana	29,061,760	9,355,437	161,445	30,339	18.8	125,231	77.6	5,875	3.7
Maine	19,132,800	4,639,938	39,006	22,535	57.8	13,688	35.1	2,783	7.1
Maryland	6,362,240	4,374,398	43,203	17,575	40.7	23,089	53.4	2,539	5.9
Massachusetts	5,144,960	2,005,461	25,598	9,961	38.9	13,601	53.1	2,036	7.9
Michigan	36,787,200	17,118,951	169,372	68,046	40.2	95,168	56.2	6,158	3.6
Minnesota	51,749,120	30,913,367	185,255	53,830	29.1	125,708	67.8	5,717	3.1
Mississippi	29,671,680	17,332,195	312,663	44,271	14.2	261,408	83.7	6,984	2.2
Missouri	43,985,280	33,743,019	255,940	80,056	31.3	169,260	66.1	6,624	2.6
Montana	93,523,840	44,659,152	47,495	14,498	30.6	30,620	64.5	2,377	5.0
Nebraska	49,157,120	44,708,565	129,458	24,893	19.2	99,981	77.2	4,584	3.5
Nevada	7,285,440	4,080,906	3,442	1,332	38.7	1,595	46.3	515	15.0
New Hampshire	5,779,840	1,960,061	14,906	7,704	51.7	5,721	38.4	1,481	9.9
New Jersey	4,808,960	1,758,027	25,378	9,316	36.7	14,611	57.6	1,451	5.7
New Mexico	78,401,920	30,822,034	31,404	15,655	49.9	12,057	38.4	3,692	11.8
New York	30,498,560	17,979,633	159,806	68,786	43.0	82,659	51.7	8,361	5.3
North Carolina	31,193,600	18,055,103	279,708	89,364	31.9	176,847	63.2	13,497	4.8
North Dakota	44,917,120	38,657,894	77,975	14,124	18.1	60,990	78.2	2,861	3.6
Ohio	26,073,600	21,514,059	219,296	94,179	42.9	113,692	51.9	11,425	5.2
Oklahoma	44,424,960	33,790,817	203,866	31,776	15.6	163,887	80.4	8,203	4.1
Oregon	61,188,480	16,548,678	55,153	19,754	35.8	32,860	59.6	2,539	4.6
Pennsylvania	28,692,480	15,309,485	172,419	85,616	49.7	75,602	43.9	11,201	6.5
Rhode Island	682,880	279,361	3,322	1,619	48.7	1,441	43.4	262	8.0
South Carolina	19,516,800	10,393,113	157,931	32,222	20.4	121,088	76.7	4,621	2.9
South Dakota	49,195,520	36,470,083	83,157	15,394	18.5	64,381	77.4	3,382	4.0
Tennessee	26,679,680	18,003,241	245,657	87,010	35.4	147,935	60.2	10,712	4.3
Texas	167,934,720	124,707,130	495,489	99,440	20.1	377,118	76.1	18,931	3.8
Utah	52,597,760	5,613,101	27,159	9,488	35.0	15,198	55.9	2,473	9.1
Vermont	5,839,360	3,896,097	24,898	9,945	40.0	14,043	56.4	910	3.6
Virginia	25,767,680	16,728,620	170,610	87,031	51.1	75,584	44.3	7,995	4.7
Washington	42,775,040	13,533,778	70,904	25,774	36.3	40,909	57.7	4,221	5.9
West Virginia	15,374,080	8,802,348	82,641	49,259	59.7	26,904	32.6	6,478	7.8
Wisconsin	35,363,840	21,874,155	181,676	55,509	30.5	119,801	65.9	6,457	3.6
Wyoming	62,430,720	23,525,234	16,011	4,772	29.9	10,013	62.5	1,226	7.6

FARM MORTGAGES AND TENANTRY INCREASE

It is evident from a study of the above tables that farm mortgages are being contracted at a more rapid pace than they are being paid off. (As further evidence of this fact we refer to table 19, p. 46, of Technical Bulletin No. 288, issued by the U. S. Department of Agriculture in February 1932.)

It is also evident that the number of farms shifting into the tenant class is increasing more rapidly than the number shifting into the owner-operated class.

The total land area of the United States is 1,903,337,600 acres, of which about 1,000,000,000 acres is in farms.

Of this amount only approximately 300,000,000 acres are operated by the owner and free of mortgage debt.

The remainder, over 700,000,000 acres, which represents over two-thirds of the total acreage, is either heavily mortgaged or operated by tenants, or both mortgaged and operated by tenants.

The outstanding mortgage debt on farm lands in the Nation is estimated for the respective years, as follows (H. Doc. No. 9, 73d Cong. 1st sess., p. 5):

1910	$3,320,470,000
1920	7,857,700,000
1930	9,241,390,000

Since 1930, statisticians calculate that at least $1,000,000,000 of the mortgage debt has been retired either through foreclosure or a scaling down of indebtedness.

In 1930 it is estimated that the farm-mortgage debt of over $9,000,000,000 was secured by mortgage over approximately 425,000,000 acres of farm land.

The value of the average farm of the Nation in 1930 was $9,103.

The average mortgage debt per owner-operated farm mortgaged throughout the Nation was approximately $3,561. The average size of the mortgage in the different States varied considerably—from an average amount of $1,163 in Mississippi to $9,626 in Iowa.

The average annual interest charges per owner-operated farm mortgaged throughout the Nation were $219.

The interest charges on all farm mortgages for the entire Nation amounted to over $500,000,000.

Other debts in addition to mortgage debts increased the farmer's total interest charges in 1930 to between $800,000,000 and $900,000,000. (See H. Doc. No. 9, 73d Cong., 1st sess., p. 20.)

The table below shows the average size and value of owner-operated farms mortgaged, the average amount of the mortgage, and the average interest charges on the mortgage for each State of the Union in 1930.

Mortgaged farms operated by full owners reporting amount of debt by divisions and States, 1930

Division or State	Average acreage per farm [1]	Average value per farm [1]	Average mortgage debt per farm [1]	Average charges per farm [2]
United States	147.3	$8,997	$3,561	$219
Geographic divisions:				
New England	110.4	7,073	2,565	155
Middle Atlantic	95.6	7,759	3,029	179
East North Central	99.8	8,394	3,773	221
West North Central	189.2	13,000	5,639	326
South Atlantic	111.0	5,598	1,965	129
East South Central	109.8	4,039	1,551	102
West South Central	241.3	7,788	2,634	180
Mountain	324.2	10,041	3,714	257
Pacific	117.8	15,388	4,909	330
New England:				
Maine	126.8	5,959	2,013	130
New Hampshire	123.7	4,998	1,805	100
Vermont	160.9	5,674	2,423	139
Massachusetts	65.6	8,554	3,089	190
Rhode Island	62.4	8,960	2,977	188
Connecticut	75.0	9,721	3,264	194
Middle Atlantic:				
New York	110.0	7,896	3,093	184
New Jersey	60.0	10,776	4,012	247
Pennsylvania	85.9	6,923	2,733	158

[1] Based on 1,145,737 farms reporting amount of debt.

[2] Interest, commissions, bonuses, and premiums for 1929, based on 1,107,664 farms reporting amount of debt and charges.

Mortgaged farms operated by full owners reporting amount of debt by divisions and States, 1930—Continued

Division or State	Average acreage per farm	Average value per farm	Average mortgage debt per farm	Average charges per farm
East North Central:				
Ohio	82.8	$7,314	$3,136	$195
Indiana	90.8	6,767	2,722	166
Illinois	122.3	14,112	6,182	358
Michigan	89.9	6,099	2,534	160
Wisconsin	112.3	9,169	4,600	253
West North Central:				
Minnesota	143.4	10,610	4,734	270
Iowa	146.2	19,853	9,626	533
Missouri	130.0	7,123	3,233	199
North Dakota	380.4	11,332	4,323	277
South Dakota	315.2	14,951	5,768	338
Nebraska	308.9	19,586	7,588	428
Kansas	226.3	12,604	4,460	267
South Atlantic:				
Delaware	81.4	6,429	2,554	155
Maryland	94.2	7,948	3,123	186
District of Columbia	10.4	22,529	5,250	309
Virginia	122.5	7,260	2,295	143
West Virginia	122.4	5,073	1,580	101
North Carolina	87.3	4,300	1,599	102
South Carolina	114.5	4,362	1,747	128
Georgia	142.4	4,065	1,620	114
Florida	93.3	9,465	2,561	193
East South Central:				
Kentucky	105.0	5,199	1,995	123
Tennessee	102.3	4,682	1,798	115
Alabama	112.2	3,181	1,264	92
Mississippi	118.8	3,125	1,163	80
West South Central:				
Arkansas	105.2	3,472	1,327	99
Louisiana	106.7	4,676	1,780	128
Oklahoma	173.6	7,525	2,529	162
Texas	370.0	10,759	3,522	238
Mountain:				
Montana	520.7	9,644	3,808	257
Idaho	176.0	9,715	3,802	260
Wyoming	629.0	$10,260	$3,435	$233
Colorado	310.0	10,040	3,857	259
New Mexico	487.4	9,039	2,767	201
Arizona	117.6	13,425	4,187	321
Utah	183.6	9,040	3,146	229
Nevada	715.3	21,056	8,208	574
Pacific:				
Washington	95.4	9,295	3,036	200
Oregon	200.4	10,239	3,526	226
California	97.0	20,510	6,405	437

Mortgaged farms operated by full owners reporting amount of debt by divisions and States, 1930—Continued

ANALYSIS OF FARM INCOME, 1930

The average farm in 1930 had a gross income of $1,503. Included, however, in this amount were farm products consumed by the farm family which were valued at $226.

This left a gross cash income of $1,277.

The total average operating expenses, including taxes and interest but excluding costs of liquidating farm-mortgage debts, were $889.

This left an average net cash income of $388 per family.

It is estimated that there are 1.22 family laborers to each farm, not including household laborers and members of the family not actually engaged in the operation of the farm. Therefore the cash income per family laborer was $318 annually, or $26.50 per month.

There are given below tables prepared by the Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, setting forth these facts, including the total amount of the different items which entered into the cost of operation. (We have also secured comparative figures for 1934, which are also given below:)

Income from farm production in the United States and its distribution, 1930 and 1934

Item	1930	1934	Percentage of gross income	
			1930	1934
	Million dollars	*Million dollars*		
Gross income from agricultural production	9,454	6,706	100.0	100.0
Value of farm products retained for home consumption	1,424	1,033	15.1	15.4
Gross cash income from agricultural production	8,030	5,673		
Total expenditures for farm operations	5,591	3,832		
Operators' current production expenditures	1,722	1,206	18.2	18.0
Depreciation on operators' buildings and equipment	892	789	9.4	11.8
Wages to hired labor	1,112	518	11.8	7.7
Interest payable on farm mortgages of operators (excluding dwellings)	362	298	3.8	4.4
Taxes payable on operators' farms	420	271	4.5	4.0
Rent to nonoperators	911	669	9.6	10.0
All other expenditures	172	81	1.8	1.2
Gross income available for operators' labor, capital, and management	3,863	2,874	40.9	42.9
Cash income available for operators' labor, capital, and management	2,439	1,841	25.8	27.5
	Number	*Number*		
Number of farms in the United States	[1] 6,288,648	[2] 6,812,350		
	Dollars	*Dollars*		
Gross income from agricultural production per farm	1,503	984		
Value of farm products retained for home consumption per farm	226	151		
Gross cash income from agricultural production per farm	1,277	833		
Expenditures for farm operations per farm	889	562		
Gross income available for operator's labor, capital, and management per farm	614	422		
Cash income available for operator's labor, capital, and management per farm	388	270		
	Number	*Number*		
Unpaid family laborer per farm (including operator)	1.22	1.22		
	Dollars	*Dollars*		
Income available per family laborer (unpaid)	503	346		
Cash income per family laborer (unpaid)	318	221		
Yearly wage rate per laborer without board	535	326		
Yearly wage rate per laborer with board	374	215		

[1] United States Census of Agriculture, Jan. 1, 1930.
[2] United States Census of Agriculture, Jan. 1, 1935.

Division of Statistical and Historical Research of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The average farmer who owned and operated his farm, free of mortgage debt, had a net cash income, above actual operating expenses, of $440 per farm laborer annually, or $36.66 per month.

The average farmer who owned and operated his farm and had a mortgage on it had a net cash income above actual operating expenses (including interest and sinking fund on the mortgage debt) of $179 per farm laborer annually, of $15 per month.

The average tenant farmer had a net cash income above actual operating expenses (including rentals) of $252 per farm laborer annually, or $21 per month.

There are inserted below tables showing the total income, total operating costs, and net cash income for each of these three groups for the entire Nation for 1930.

Owner-operator (total number, 1,845,997), free of mortgage debt

Total gross income, 1930		$1,503
Income in kind		226
Total cash income		1,277
Operating expenses	$435	
Wages	177	
Taxes	95	
Other expenditures	33	
Total expenditures in production of crop		740
Net cash income for 1.22 family laborers		$537
Net cash income per family laborer		$440
Percent of total cash income received as net, per laborer		34
Net cash income per month per laborer		$36.66

Owner-operator (total number, 1,497,766), with mortgage debt

Total gross income, 1930		$1,503
Income in kind		226
Total cash income		1,277
Operating expenses	$435	
Wages	177	
Taxes	95	
Interest on mortgage debt	219	
All other expenditures	33	
Sinking fund on debt	100	
Total expenditures in production of crop and on debt		1,059
Net cash income for 1.22 family laborers		$218
Net cash income per family laborer		$179
Percent of total cash income received as net, per laborer		14
Net cash income per month per laborer		$15

Tenant (total number, 2,664,365)

Total gross income, 1930		$1,503
Income in kind		226
Total cash income		1,277
Operating expenses	$389	
Wages	177	
Rent	342	
Taxes	29	
Other expenditures	33	
Total expenditures in production of crop		970
Net cash income for 1.22 family laborers		$307
Net cash income per family laborer		$252
Percent of total cash income received as net per laborer		20
Net cash income per month per laborer		$21

The owner-operator must either manage and supervise his farm holding, valued at $9,103, himself or pay for such management and supervision out of his net cash income.

The tenant farmer does not have a capital investment in farm holdings and is therefore relieved of many of the responsibilities of ownership.

The average owner-operator free of mortgage debt, with his income of $36.66 per month, must provide for other members of his family who have contributed materially in the operation of the farm, but whose services have been given no cash value in the above estimates; pay all cash expenses incidental to the operation of his household; clothe and educate his family; pay insurance premiums, church dues, doctor's and medicine bills, and provide for other personal and household requirements and necessities; purchase automobiles, radio, sewing machines, etc., and pay for their upkeep; and take care of other expenses of the average normal American family.

The average owner-operator with farm mortgage had a cash income of only $15 per month, yet he is subject to the same cash demands as are made upon the owner-operator free of mortgage debt. In addition there is the mortgage debt, hanging like the sword of Damocles, suspended eternally over his head—one false move, one major adversity, and down comes the sharp instrument with ruthless precision, severing the last tie by which he holds his equal place as an independent American citizen, and hurling his family into an inferior position of tenantry and serfdom.

The average tenant farmer had a cash income of $21 per month. He does not have the ownership of a farm. Neither does he have the worries of a mortgage. At the same time he has lost his position as an independent home owner and all the moral and social benefits to himself and his family that go with such ownership. His sense of responsibility as a unit of society grows dull, and the love of liberty, which can never be destroyed, is overcome by penury and want.

For him to attempt to climb back to economic independence over the rugged pathway of another farm mortgage is a herculean task accomplished only by the favored few. To the great majority such an adventure leads only to despair.

GROSS INCOME FOR EACH STATE, 1930

The net cash income figures given above are the averages for the entire Nation. However, incomes and operating costs vary considerably in the different States. There is presented below a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture showing gross income by States and the average per farm in each State for 1930.

Gross and cash income from farm production, total by States, and per farm, 1930

State	Gross income	Cash income	Number of farms	Income per farm	
				Gross	Cash
	1,000 dollars	*1,000 dollars*			
Maine	77,154	66,289	39,006	$1,978	$1,699
New Hampshire	27,548	23,442	14,906	1,848	1,573
Vermont	52,924	46,381	24,898	2,126	1,863
Massachusetts	80,337	72,934	25,598	3,138	2,849
Rhode Island	10,389	9,335	3,322	3,127	2,810
Connecticut	60,649	54,943	17,195	3,527	3,195
New York	389,523	347,600	159,806	2,437	2,175
New Jersey	105,528	98,353	25,378	4,158	3,876
Pennsylvania	312,152	261,887	172,419	1,810	1,519
Ohio	332,910	278,217	219,296	1,518	1,269
Indiana	280,822	238,082	181,570	1,547	1,311
Illinois	490,806	428,701	214,497	2,288	1,999
Michigan	236,084	199,656	169,372	1,394	1,179
Wisconsin	361,068	319,848	181,767	1,986	1,760
Minnesota	385,105	343,050	185,255	2,079	1,852
Iowa	627,597	572,485	214,928	2,920	2,664
Missouri	325,939	266,046	255,940	1,273	1,039
North Dakota	147,931	129,184	77,975	1,897	1,657
South Dakota	195,094	176,576	83,157	2,346	2,123
Nebraska	381,809	349,654	129,458	2,949	2,701
Kansas	347,232	311,424	166,042	2,091	1,876
Delaware	20,115	17,534	9,707	2,072	1,806
Maryland	76,983	63,454	43,203	1,782	1,469
Virginia	154,380	104,087	170,610	905	610
West Virginia	66,748	38,707	82,641	808	468
North Carolina	252,211	177,020	279,708	902	633
South Carolina	129,779	96,973	157,931	822	614
Georgia	211,926	155,873	255,598	829	610
Florida	139,025	127,344	58,966	2,358	2,160
Kentucky	172,684	118,040	246,499	701	479
Tennessee	168,704	108,918	245,657	687	443
Alabama	174,115	112,934	257,395	676	439
Mississippi	167,321	119,034	312,663	535	381
Arkansas	126,773	85,665	242,334	523	353
Louisiana	130,072	101,297	161,445	806	627
Oklahoma	189,697	150,139	203,866	930	736
Texas	577,142	478,462	495,489	1,165	966
Montana	93,387	83,633	47,495	1,966	1,761
Idaho	93,157	85,517	41,674	2,235	2,052
Wyoming	45,387	41,590	16,011	2,835	2,598
Colorado	153,417	143,303	59,956	2,559	2,390
New Mexico	42,724	37,861	31,404	1,360	1,206
Arizona	44,589	41,742	14,173	3,146	2,945
Utah	53,115	48,605	27,159	1,956	1,790
Nevada	13,417	12,307	3,442	3,898	3,576
Washington	169,912	154,350	70,904	2,396	2,177
Oregon	110,769	99,146	55,153	2,008	1,798
California	601,335	583,924	135,676	4,432	4,304
United States [1]	9,413,545	7,987,606	6,288,648	1,497	1,270
United States adjusted [2]	9,454,405	8,030,156	6,288,648	1,503	1,277

[1] Totals include $6,060,000 for sugar beets for "other States."

[2] After deducting for interstate sales of crops, principally seeds, and adding for "other poultry" and honey not estimated by States.

NET CASH INCOME OF FARMERS IN EACH STATE, 1930

We have endeavored to obtain definite figures showing operating costs for each State but have been advised that no such figures are available. However, assuming that operating costs, taxes, interest, and mortgage payments consume about the same proportions of the gross income in each State, a table has been prepared showing the estimated average net cash income per farm laborer annually and per month for each group in each State of the Union for the year 1930. It is presented below.

Gross cash income per farm and net cash income per family laborer, by States, 1930

Division or State	Gross cash income per farm	Average net cash income per family laborer							
		All farms		Owner-operated farms free of mortgage debt		Owner-operated farms with mortgage debt		Tenant-operated farms	
		Annual	Per month	Annual	Per month	Annual	Per month	Annual	Per month
United States	$1,277	$318	$27	$434	$36	$179	$15	$255	$21
New England:									
Maine	1,699	425	35	578	48	238	20	340	28
New Hampshire	1,573	393	33	535	45	220	18	315	26
Vermont	1,863	466	39	633	53	261	22	373	31
Massachusetts	2,849	712	59	969	81	399	33	570	48
Rhode Island	2,810	702	58	955	80	393	33	562	47
Connecticut	3,195	799	67	1,086	90	447	37	639	53
Middle Atlantic:									
New York	2,175	544	45	740	62	304	25	435	36
New Jersey	3,876	969	81	1,318	110	543	45	775	65
Pennsylvania	1,519	380	32	516	43	213	18	304	25
East North Central:									
Ohio	1,269	317	26	431	36	178	15	254	21
Indiana	1,311	328	27	446	37	184	15	262	22
Illinois	1,999	500	42	680	57	280	23	400	33
Michigan	1,179	295	25	401	33	165	14	236	20
Wisconsin	1,760	440	37	598	50	246	20	352	29
West North Central:									
Minnesota	1,852	463	39	630	52	259	22	370	31
Iowa	2,664	666	56	906	76	373	31	533	44
Missouri	1,039	260	22	353	29	145	12	208	17
North Dakota	1,657	414	34	563	47	232	19	331	28
South Dakota	2,123	531	44	722	60	297	25	425	35
Nebraska	2,701	675	56	918	76	378	32	540	45
Kansas	1,876	469	39	638	53	263	22	375	31
South Atlantic:									
Delaware	1,806	452	38	614	51	253	21	361	30
Maryland	1,469	367	31	499	42	206	17	294	24
Virginia	610	152	13	207	17	85	7	122	10
West Virginia	468	117	10	159	13	66	6	94	8
North Carolina	633	158	13	215	18	89	7	127	11
South Carolina	614	154	13	209	17	86	7	123	10
Georgia	610	152	13	207	17	85	7	122	10
Florida	2,160	540	45	734	61	302	25	432	36
East South Central:									
Kentucky	479	120	10	163	14	67	6	96	8
Tennessee	443	111	9	151	13	62	5	89	7
Alabama	439	110	9	149	12	61	5	88	7
Mississippi	381	95	8	130	11	53	4	76	6
West South Central:									
Arkansas	353	88	7	120	10	49	4	71	6
Louisiana	627	157	13	213	18	88	7	125	10
Oklahoma	736	184	15	250	21	103	9	147	12
Texas	966	242	20	328	27	135	11	193	16
Mountain:									
Montana	1,761	440	37	599	50	247	21	352	29
Idaho	2,052	513	43	698	58	287	24	410	34
Wyoming	2,598	650	54	883	74	364	30	520	43
Colorado	2,390	598	50	813	68	335	28	478	40
New Mexico	1,206	302	25	410	34	169	14	241	20
Arizona	2,945	736	61	1,001	83	412	34	589	49
Utah	1,790	448	37	609	51	251	21	358	30
Nevada	3,576	894	74	1,216	101	501	42	715	60
Pacific:									
Washington	2,177	544	45	740	62	305	25	435	36
Oregon	1,798	450	38	611	51	252	21	360	30
California	4,304	1,076	90	1,463	122	603	50	861	72

Prepared in the Division of Agriculture, Bureau of the Census, from basic figures furnished by Congressman PETERSON of Georgia.

It can be seen from this table that the estimated net cash income per farm laborer ranged from $4 per month for the average owner-operator with mortgage debt in Arkansas to $122 per month for the average owner-operator free of debt in California.

FEDERAL LAND BANK RECORDS

As convincing evidence of the disaster which befalls so many of the unfortunate families who struggle under the burden of a farm mortgage, we present a record of farm-mortgage loans made by Federal land banks, institutions created for the purpose of saving the farmer from tenantry and restoring him to a position of economic independence.

This record shows that the Federal land banks, on December 31, 1934, had 606,344 farm-mortgage loans outstanding, representing a total mortgage indebtedness of $1,896,414,669.40.

Of these loans, $204,480, or 33.7 percent of the total, were delinquent. The delinquent loans represented $628,454,079.17, or 33.2 percent of the total debt.

More Federal land bank loans are foreclosed annually than are paid. During 1935, 62 percent of all the loans closed out were settled through foreclosure. Only 38 percent were settled through payment. (Eleven thousand four hundred and fifty-two loans were foreclosed; only 7,012 loans were paid in full.)

Total interest charges during 1934 amounted to $64,905,715; $47,810,304 of this sum was delinquent on December 31, 1934.

We give below data prepared by the Farm Credit Administration giving status of Federal land bank loans for each year since the creation of that institution. (It will be noted that the data given is not complete for each year. We attempted to obtain this complete data but were advised by the Farm Credit Administration that it is not available at their office.)

Number and amount of loans closed from 1917 through 1935 by the Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner

Year	Federal land banks		Land Bank Commissioner		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1917	18,154	$39,112,115			18,154	$39,112,115
1918	49,808	118,129,836			49,808	118,129,836
1919	45,436	144,987,180			45,436	144,987,180
1920	17,997	66,984,534			17,997	66,984,534
1921	27,153	91,029,976			27,153	91,029,976
1922	74,055	224,301,400			74,055	224,301,400
1923	60,100	192,083,015			60,100	192,083,015
1924	47,227	165,509,845			47,227	165,509,845
1925	39,905	127,355,451			39,905	127,355,451
1926	36,893	131,317,715			36,893	131,317,715
1927	39,268	140,384,200			39,268	140,384,200
1928	26,988	102,236,400			26,988	102,236,400
1929	17,132	64,252,500			17,132	64,252,500
1930	12,572	47,971,000			12,572	47,971,000
1931	10,898	42,015,300			10,898	42,015,300
1932	7,208	27,569,800			7,208	27,569,800
1933	38,568	151,634,111	44,039	$70,812,112	82,607	222,446,223
1934	190,147	730,367,140	306,354	553,136,316	496,501	1,283,503,456
1935	58,968	248,671,200	91,004	196,395,349	149,972	445,066,549

Source: Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Research. Jan. 30, 1936.

Number and amount of loans paid in full to the Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner

Institution	1933		1934		1935		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Federal land banks	2,981	$4,493,596.73	4,506	$8,136,086.58	7,012	$14,715,365.98	14,499	$27,345,049.29
Land Bank Commissioner	24	35,000.00	1,476	2,118,241.63	4,238	6,011,158.76	5,738	8,164,400.39
Total	3,005	4,528,596.73	5,982	10,254,328.21	11,250	20,726,524.74	20,237	35,509,449.68

Source: Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Research. Feb. 1, 1936.

Federal land bank loans outstanding, classified according to condition, extensions and delinquent installments and foreclosures, at selected times

Year ended Dec. 31	Total loans outstanding		Loans not delinquent		Loans delinquent (total)		Extensions and delinquent installments	Loans foreclosed during the year [1]	
	Number	Amount	Number	Principal amount	Number	Principal amount		Number	Amount
1918	(2)	$156,213,891.73							
1919	(2)	293,595,395.35							
1920	126,261	349,678,987.71							
1921	151,823	432,523,141.07							
1922	221,778	639,486,434.55							
1923	274,507	799,596,834.78							
1924	313,712	927,567,597.78						1,739	$5,757,455.35
1925	342,804	1,005,684,816.60		$957,565,424.68		$48,119,391.92	$2,654,266.18	2,399	6,938,150.79
1926	366,494	1,077,818,724.32	348,734	1,010,472,980.51	17,843	67,345,743.81	3,341,990.60	2,557	8,171,778.64
1927	392,148	1,157,093,123.86	371,038	1,078,752,089.04	21,110	78,341,034.82	4,179,269.70	2,330	8,024,722.02
1928	404,865	1,194,470,055.88	383,497	1,123,412,547.41	21,202	71,408,333.83	4,321,078.41	2,957	11,264,392.09
1929	409,559	1,197,949,727.32	385,287	1,120,630,083.86	24,272	77,883,832.66	4,913,086.23	3,350	11,629,152.26
1930	410,493	1,188,132,459.70	366,625	1,052,157,107.46	43,868	137,447,246.67	8,199,658.62	4,645	16,866,108.97
1931	407,852	1,163,475,657.12	313,515	862,970,329.90	94,337	304,927,875.59	18,580,753.39	7,386	27,168,645.95
1932	400,537	1,116,691,663.76	220,145	523,098,947.13	180,392	593,592,716.63	47,536,280.48	10,039	40,419,840.29
1933	428,861	1,213,523,313.17	219,696	586,118,886.50	209,165	627,404,426.67	72,307,794.57	6,585	25,801,412.27
1934	606,344	1,896,414,669.40	401,864	1,267,960,590.23	204,480	628,454,079.17	48,024,555.28	4,763	15,244,494.18
1935	643,803	2,070,611,654.20	515,236	1,671,022,212.82	128,567	399,589,441.38	57,101,946.58	11,438	36,209,951.96

[1] Including voluntary deeds.
[2] Information not available.
Source: Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Research. Apr. 9, 1936.

Foreclosures completed, real estate disposed of, farms owned outright, and loans delinquent at selected times by Federal land banks

Year	Number of foreclosures completed during year	Amount of foreclosures completed during year	Number of farms owned outright and held subject to redemption at end of year	Number of disposals of farms and sheriffs' certificates during year		Loans delinquent
				Whole	Part	
1929	3,350	$11,629,152.26	6,641	2,234	235	$77,883,833
1930	4,645	16,866,108.97	8,532	2,826	305	137,447,247
1931	7,386	27,168,645.95	12,629	3,729	502	304,927,876
1932	10,039	40,419,840.29	18,503	5,364	920	593,592,717
1933	6,616	25,801,412.27	21,945	4,128	642	627,404,427
1934	4,780	15,244,494.18	22,960	4,858	696	628,454,079
1935	11,452	36,209,951.96	27,516	8,423	1,289	[1] 399,589,441

[1] Effective February 1935, the definition of loans delinquent was changed so as to exclude loans on which extensions have been granted.
Source: Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Research. Feb. 3, 1936.

Federal land banks and Land Bank Commissioner—Amount of interest maturing during the years 1934 and 1935, and delinquent at the end of such years

Year	Federal land banks		Land Bank Commissioner	
	Interest maturing during year	Interest delinquent at end of year	Interest maturing during year	Interest delinquent at end of year
1934	$64,905,715	$47,810,304	$7,990,342	$1,416,539
1935	75,700,308	18,035,366	31,771,701	5,957,943

Source: Farm Credit Administration, Division of Finance and Research. Jan. 31, 1936.
NOTE.—Data for years previous to 1934 not available as reports prior to that time to this office did not separate interest and principal maturities.

A study of these figures would indicate that in a few years the Federal Government will own outright the major portion of the farms on which it has made mortgage loans. It already owns over 27,000 of them.

A large portion of the outstanding loans are in default, and it is only a matter of time before they will have to be foreclosed if the debt is to be liquidated.

Until that fateful day arrives, however, the farmer struggles on hopefully, raising all the cash crops he possibly can and turning them over to his creditor.

He is producing yearly enough to support himself and his family, could the purchasing power of his produce be devoted to his domestic requirements. But he is prohibited from using it in this manner. It must go to pay interest, carrying charges, and sinking funds on the farm-mortgage debt. He is deprived of the use of his raw products and of the finished goods which are processed from these raw products.

THE FARMER'S ECONOMIC DILEMMA

Thus the farmer fights a hopeless battle, producing raw products, creating new wealth in abundance only to see it used in appeasing the appetite of a never-satisfied mortgage debt, while he and his loyal family, who have labored faithfully in producing this new wealth, are denied its use in supplying themselves with the meager necessities of life. And so we witness a nation of producers creating tremendous surpluses yet facing penury, want, and even starvation.

The surplus products about which we have heard so much during recent years represent the lifeblood of millions of good American families and should have been available for their own sustenance; but an ill-adjusted economic system has forced these products from the control of the farmer into the channels of commerce, only to clog the machinery, stop the wheels of industry, and bring despair and suffering to the processor equally with the producer. They constitute new wealth which "under the laws of Nature and of Nature's God" belongs to the producer but which society has decreed that the producer must pay as tribute for the privilege of even living at all.

Still the producer struggles on, willing even to carry the ever-increasing load of a mortgage debt—to witness the privations of a family that he loves—fighting to the end for the cause of "a bold peasantry", rather than peacefully resign himself to that subservient position of serfdom from which his foreparents fled in horror many years ago as they sought a new freedom in a new land.

However, the fateful day finally arrives, the law must be fulfilled, the clear voice of the auctioneer rings out, the hammer falls, and another family is doomed to forego the right and privilege of independent citizenship—one of the greatest advantages of Christian civilization.

SUMMARY

A condition wherein producers of the raw products—the farmers—had free access to the soil and unrestricted use of their new wealth was an essential factor in the building of our Government and the establishment of our institutions.

Today such economic independence does not prevail. Over two-thirds of the farmers are either tenants or have heavy mortgages over their farms, and this percentage grows daily.

A careful analysis of the Nation's farm population reveals that the independent farm operator, earning an honest living from the soil, and enjoying the use and benefits of the fruits of his labor, is rapidly vanishing. With this group destroyed free institutions cannot survive, and unless the farm home is rescued from its present plight our great system of free government will crumble and decay.

An unfair and unjust economic system has produced this condition. It has forced the farmers from their homes, deprived them of the fruits of their labor, and robbed them of their freedom and happiness.

It now challenges the principles of free government and threatens our Christian civilization.

Agriculture is the foundation of our economic structure. The life of our Nation is dependent upon the soil. And unless the disease which has brought agriculture down prostrate, "sick unto death", is cured, all other remedies applied in other fields will prove futile.

Before there can be a permanent recovery from our economic crisis, the farmers of the Nation must be restored to a healthy condition of normal prosperity.

It is a duty of Congress to attack this problem and to attempt its solution.

HOMESTEAD BILL (H. R. 8286) IS DESIGNED TO ACCOMPLISH THIS RESULT

It is the opinion of the author of H. R. 8286 that the bill is so designed as to be a most effective instrument with which to meet this vital issue.

In his advocacy of this legislation before the subcommittee he has recited the benefits which he believes will grow out of its enactment by Congress, as follows:

1. Under its provisions farm mortgages will be liquidated by the Government and free homesteads will again be available through the General Land Office. However, these homesteads will not be subject to debt or encumbrance.

2. Four million farm families will be raised to a position of economic independence, with the purchasing power of their new wealth restored to them. This will result in the immediate stimulation of commerce and industry throughout the Nation and will prove of great and lasting benefit to all the people.

3. It will prove a step toward a permanent solution of the Nation's chief economic problem and will cost the Government far less than it is now spending for temporary relief. In addition it will relieve the Government of the necessity for future emergency expenditures, which will inevitably be demanded under existing conditions.

4. Congress is already appropriating for temporary agricultural relief an amount sufficient to finance this entire program and liquidate the total farm-mortgage indebtedness within a very short period. (At the close of this report will be found a table showing amount of these payments.) This bill would use these funds for permanent relief instead of for temporary relief as at present.

5. The necessity for producing excessive surpluses of cash crops is eliminated by removing fixed cash charges such as interest, carrying charges of mortgaged indebtedness, and rentals, which amount in many instances to over one-fifth of the total gross cash income of the farms upon which they are levied.

6. Free homesteads will also be available for families not now engaged in agriculture, who have no means of support, and who are willing to till the soil and earn an honest living by the sweat of their brow.

7. This measure also provides for the withdrawal of submarginal lands from farm use and restoring them as a portion of the public domain.

8. It creates no new office but eliminates the necessity for many governmental agencies and thousands of Government employees now costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

9. By restoring to the producer control of the purchasing power of his raw products and relieving the need for forced surplus production a balanced economic condition as between agriculture and industry will naturally prevail.

10. The laws of supply and demand will again function in a normal manner, restoring legitimate business to a condition of normal prosperity.

13. Labor will be afforded additional employment through a normal and healthy stimulation of business brought about by increased demand for manufactured and processed goods.

14. At the same time free homesteads will always be available for industrial laborers—a safe refuge from those who would oppress the laborer and his family, and a guaranty of economic rights and human liberties—thus throwing around industrial labor equally with farm labor safeguards which are indispensable to human liberty.

15. A study of the laws of Moses, which set forth the social and civil rules which are the basis of our Christian civilization and which guided our forefathers in the creation of our Government, clearly demonstrates the fact that this legislation is in complete harmony with these fundamental principles of human conduct. It is the simple application of these righteous principles to a vital public problem which threatens the life of our Nation.

16. It will again restore the free American home—which is the unit of our civilization—to its former predominating position, making it secure from the selfish schemes of powerful and designing interests. Thus it will promote our free institutions which are of necessity built around free homes occupied by free citizens.

FINDINGS

We believe that with the Nation's farm families living in their own farm homes and applying their energies to the creation of the Nation's new wealth, while society protects them in the freedom of their homes and in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor, there can be no doubt as to the future safety and progress of our people.

We consider the provisions of this legislation to be in harmony with the principles which underlie our great representative system of government, and we deem this measure a fitting and timely step toward a permanent solution of the Nation's chief economic and social problems.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL—H. R. 8286

Section 1 is the enacting clause.

Section 2 (a) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior through the General Land Office to purchase liens and mortgages on farm lands.

(b) Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior through the General Land Office to liquidate all liens acquired under this act, and provides methods for such liquidation.

(c) Guarantees to the debtor the right to meet the terms of his obligation, if he prefers to do so, and upon payment of the debt his obligation must be canceled.

Section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, through the General Land Office, to purchase lands that have been taken over in settlement of debts since January 1, 1920, provided the title to such lands is still in the lienholder. However, it prohibits payment for same of a sum greater than the amount of the debt at time the lands were acquired by said lienholder, provided such sum shall not be greater than the normal value of the land, plus the useful value of improvements.

Section 4 (a) directs that all lands coming into possession of the General Land Office under this measure be made part of the public domain.

(b) Directs that these lands be classified according to their fertility, adaptability, and usefulness for farm purposes.

(c) Directs that those lands not suited for farm purposes be retained as part of the public domain.

(d) Directs that those lands suitable for farm purposes be divided into homestead tracts of proper size for the support of a family of average size under normal conditions, taking into consideration the fertility of the soil and general farm conditions and requirements in the section where said lands are located.

Section 5 directs that the Secretary of the Interior, through the General Land Office, grant such homesteads to any person who is the head of a family, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Requirements of homestead acts now in force must be met where same do not conflict with provisions of this measure.

(b) Preference in granting homesteads must be given to farm families now living on farms.

Section 6 (a) provides that homestead grants under this measure shall include and guarantee full and complete possession and use of the lands granted.

(b) Directs that provisions be made whereby homestead grants may be exchanged.

(c) Provides that no person shall be permitted to have title to more than one homestead tract at any given time.

(d) Provides that no person owning farm land shall be granted a homestead under this act.

(e) Expressly prohibits selling or encumbering homestead tracts granted under this act, or in any manner making them subject to any debt, except as set forth in section 7 of this act.

(f) Directs that homestead grants shall be free except for registration fee not exceeding $10.

Section 7 (a) provides that all lands coming into possession of the General Land Office under the terms of this act shall be subject to the laws, including those relating to taxation, of any State or political subdivision in which such lands are located in the same manner and to the same extent as such laws apply in the case of privately owned lands.

(b) Provides that upon failure of any owner of homestead grant under this act to comply with the provisions of section 7 (a) of this act his rights under said grant shall be forfeited and the General Land Office shall have power to eject said owner and repossess such lands, making them again eligible for entry by other qualified applicants, under this act.

Section 8 authorizes an appropriation for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Rental and benefit payments to farmers, by commodities and by months

[In thousands of dollars]

	Total	Cotton			Tobacco	Wheat	Hogs (pig)	Corn-hogs	Cattle	Sheep	Sugar	Rice	Peanuts
		Rental and benefit	Pool and sale	Total									
1933													
August	7,517	771		771	1		6,745						
September	70,741	49,254		49,254	41		21,446						
October	53,835	50,802		50,802	580		2,453						
November	10,513	7,847		7,847	372	2,294							
December	19,128	2,731	14	2,745	280	16,103							
Total	161,734	111,405	14	111,419	1,274	18,397	30,644						
1934													
January	59,658	724	31,740	32,464	272	26,922							
February	28,430	220	13,854	14,074	40	14,316							
March	9,468	123	3,336	3,459	11	5,998							
April	6,473	43	796	839	3,609	1,985		40					
May	15,765	8,141	537	8,678	4,316	756		2,015					
June	28,992	18,869	271	19,140	3,338	592		5,226	696				
July	29,961	8,072	145	8,217	1,092	569		9,727	10,356				
August	71,622	5,306	261	5,567	867	971		38,413	25,804				
September	76,073	1,771	64	1,835	364	2,126		46,524	25,224				
October	103,941	12,112	44	12,156	230	36,038		27,723	27,794				
November	72,345	23,615	18	23,633	1,691	25,688		7,651	8,547	5,135			
December	53,056	12,146	86	12,232	732	12,392		21,834	3,877	1,989			
Total	555,784	91,142	51,152	142,294	16,562	128,353		159,153	102,298	7,124			
1935													
January	70,274	13,083	5,190	18,273	2,360	6,479		36,487	6,137	537	1		
February	51,671	5,553	4,386	9,939	2,687	5,397		27,812	2,559	41	3,236		
March	49,803	3,780	1,465	5,245	7,162	3,819		30,083	529		2,965		
April	49,065	1,023	791	1,814	2,357	1,147		39,819			3,928		
May	35,583	16,043	780	16,823	3,074	2,877		10,362			2,447		
June	29,565	13,693	1,674	15,367	4,963	719		5,972			2,524		
July	19,391	4,020	327	4,347	1,476	896		11,401			1,271		
August	44,235	4,331	107	4,438	658	12,351		23,999			342	2,447	
September	57,437	6,499	45	6,544	3,645	23,562		21,913			185	1,588	
October	62,011	18,485	23	18,508	1,951	18,551		17,899			3,680	1,138	284
November	63,963	13,188	119	13,307	2,374	27,642		8,952			9,322	962	1,404
December	49,976	31,271	34	31,305	413	5,435		3,174			5,660	3,248	741
Total	582,974	130,969	14,941	145,910	33,140	108,875		237,873	9,225	578	35,561	9,383	2,429

Index numbers of gross income from farm production, prices received and prices paid by farmers, and ratio of gross income to prices paid and of prices received to prices paid, 1910–35

[Division of Statistical and Historical Research]

Year	Gross income (1910–14=100)	Prices received by farmers (August 1909–July 1914=100)	Prices paid by farmers (1910–14=100)	Ratio of gross income to prices paid (1910–14=100)	Ratio of prices received to prices paid (1910–14=100)
1910	98	102	98	100	104
1911	94	95	101	93	94
1912	100	100	100	100	100
1913	103	101	101	102	100
1914	104	101	100	104	101
1915	109	98	105	104	93
1916	132	118	124	106	95
1917	190	175	149	128	117
1918	223	202	176	127	115
1919	250	213	202	124	105
1920	201	211	201	100	105
1921	132	125	152	87	82
1922	147	132	149	99	89
1923	163	142	152	107	93
1924	168	143	152	111	94
1925	177	156	157	113	99
1926	170	145	155	110	94
1927	172	139	153	112	91
1928	174	149	155	112	96
1929	177	146	153	116	95
1930	140	126	145	97	87
1931	103	87	124	83	70
1932	79	65	107	74	61
1933	95	70	109	87	64
1934	108	90	123	88	73
1935	120	108	125	96	86

THE NEGRO AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—LEST WE FORGET

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, and include therein certain political platform declarations and brief excerpts from the Lincoln-Douglas debates and from the speeches and writings of Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following: First, certain political platform declarations; second, brief excerpts from the Lincoln-Douglas debates and from the speeches and writings of Abraham Lincoln.

THE NEGRO AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—LEST WE FORGET

Mr. Speaker, nearly 30 years ago I had occasion to become acquainted in a business way with the American Negro of the North. For 3 years I came in almost daily contact with his home and political life. I have always admired the wonderful progress made by the Negro race since the Civil War. I was proud of the part the Republican Party took in bringing about his freedom and in making that progress possible. I had been somewhat of a student of the history of the colored race and the struggle for the freedom of that race. Naturally I was greatly interested when, on April 22, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] spoke on the floor of this House on "The Negro and the Democratic Party." When I listened to the eloquent way in which he presented his cause I almost forgot that I was a Republican. I was almost convinced that I had read history incorrectly. I walked once more to the corridors of this Capitol where hangs the picture of Abraham Lincoln surrounded by his Cabinet as he signed the emancipation proclamation. I wanted to make sure that it was not Jefferson Davis surrounded by a Confederate Cabinet who had signed that immortal document.

Had I read history correctly, and did Grant actually take Richmond, or did Lee take Washington? And when the gentleman from Illinois repeatedly referred to "those States in which the Negro is permitted to vote and where his vote is counted," I wondered whether he was actually referring to the Republican States of the North or whether the Democratic States of the South had had an awakening, had abolished the "grandfathers' clauses" and other disfranchising provisions in their constitutions and actually "permitted the Negro to vote and counted his vote."

During the short time that I have been a Member of this body, I have learned to know many of the splendid gentlemen who represent the Democratic States of the South. I

have learned to like them and have often expressed my personal admiration for their ability. I have no desire to revive old prejudices nor of reopening old wounds. However, when I thought of the work the gentleman from Illinois is doing, as a member of the Democratic National Committee, in attempting to bring 2,400,000 Republican Negro voters from Republican States into the ranks of the Democratic Party; when I remembered how the entire Democratic membership applauded the speech of the gentleman from Illinois; how that membership, including the majority leader, now Speaker, and every Member from the South rose to his feet in approval when he had finished, I was forced to the conclusion that the gentleman from Illinois spoke for the Democratic Party and its leadership. And when I again read that speech and noted the glaring errors and misstatements of historical facts I felt that justice to my party and to its past leaders demanded that those errors and misstatements be corrected. If in so correcting them I have opened anew old wounds, it is the Democratic Party and its leadership and not I who is responsible.

I was amazed at, shall I say, the lack of knowledge of the gentleman from Illinois as he attempted to give the history of the Negro and the Republican Party.

I represent a group of people—

He said—

who, during a period of 60 years, the only thing they got from the Republican Party were beautiful promises made by a platform that they knew was made to be broken. For more than 50 years—

He continued—

my people have been solidly registered in the Republican Party. It is only during the last 4 or 5 years that the Negroes have found the Democratic Party is a safe place to live and vote.

What a confession! The Democratic Party has been in existence for 136 years. For the first 132 of those 136 years, the Negroes, according to the gentleman from Illinois, have found the Democratic Party was unsafe to live in and vote for, and to quote again his exact words—

It is only during the last 4 or 5 years that the Negro has found that the Democratic Party is a safe place to live and vote.

For 136 years the Democratic Party has told the Negro he was not wanted. For 136 years that party has opposed every measure for the advancement of the Negro from fighting for the retention and extension of slavery to fighting against granting and refusing to grant the Negro the rights of citizenship guaranteed him by constitutional amendment. Amendments initiated, advocated, and adopted under and through the Republican Party and its leadership. May I be so presumptuous as to ask the gentleman from Illinois and the Democratic leadership what has brought about this sudden change? Why this sudden willingness to wear sackcloth and ashes? Why this eleventh-hour repentance for 136 years of oppression of the Negro by the Democratic Party?

Again quoting the gentleman from Illinois, he said:

During all this time we were told by the Republicans that we had been freed by the Republican Party; that Lincoln was elected to the Presidency of the United States for the purpose of liberating the slaves, and because that doctrine was preached to us year in and year out we developed with an almost solid Republican block of voters in this country.

Then he quotes, in part, the Republican platform of 1860, upon which Lincoln was elected to the Presidency, as alleged proof of the fact that the Republican Party did not free the slaves. I shall refer to this quotation later.

However, before we proceed further let us compare the record and history of the two parties as expressed by their platforms, including that part quoted by the gentleman from Illinois. Let us see which party is and has been the friend of the Negro race in America. An examination of these facts and history will show that out of the resentment of the North over the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which permitted the extension of slavery, and out of the bitter opposition of the people of the North to slavery, was born the Republican Party.

During the early months of 1854 the Detroit Tribune began the publication of a series of articles advocating the organization of a new party to be composed of all elements opposed to slavery extension. Later a mass meeting was called to be held at Jackson, Mich., July 6, 1854, to be composed of all opponents of the extension of slavery, the call being worded as follows:

To the people of Michigan: A great wrong has been perpetuated. The slave power of this country has triumphed. Liberty is trampled underfoot. The Missouri Compromise, a solemn pact entered into by our fathers, has been violated and a vast territory dedicated to freedom has been opened to slavery—northern Senators and Representatives in the face of overwhelming public sentiment of the North, not daring to submit this great question to the people, have yielded to the seductions of Executive patronage and Judas-like betrayed the cause of liberty. The extension of slavery under the folds of the American flag is a stigma upon liberty.

In view, therefore, of the recent action of Congress upon this subject and the evident desire of the slave power to attempt still further aggression upon freedom, we invite all our fellow citizens without reference to former political associations who think the time has arrived for a union at the North to protect liberty from being overthrown and downtrodden, to assemble in mass convention on Thursday, the 6th day of July next at 4 o'clock p. m. at Jackson, there to take such measures as shall be thought best to concentrate the popular sentiment of this State against the aggression of the slave power.

The meeting was held on July 6, 1854, under the historic oaks at Jackson, Mich. There, after a debate, the following resolutions were passed:

The freemen of Michigan assembled in convention in pursuance of a spontaneous call emanating from various parts of the State to consider upon the measures which duty demands of us as citizens of a free State to take in reference to the late acts of Congress on the subject of slavery and its anticipated further extension do—

And then came the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the institution of slavery except in punishment of crime is a great moral, social, and political evil;

Resolved, That slavery is a violation of the right of man as man; that the law of nature, which is the law of liberty, gives to no man rights superior to those of another; that God and nature have secured to each individual an inalienable right of equality;

Resolved, That we earnestly recommend the calling of a general convention of the free States and such of the slave-holding States or portions thereof as may desire to be there represented with a view to the adoption of other more extended and effectual measures in resistance to the encroachment of slavery, and that a committee of five persons be appointed to cooperate with our friends in other States on this subject.

A resolution was then passed by which the new party was christened the "Republican Party."

In 1854, in one of the famous debates between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas, Mr. Douglas, referring to the Republican Party, said:

The Black Republican creed lays it down expressly that under no circumstances shall we acquire any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited in the country.

In that same speech he referred to the resolutions passed at the Rockford Republican convention held at Rockford, Ill., on August 13, 1854, from which he read as follows:

Resolved, That the continued and increasing aggressions of slavery in our country are destructive of the best rights of a free people, and that such aggregations cannot be successfully resisted without the united political action of all good men;

Resolved, That the citizens of the United States hold in their hands peaceful, constitutional, and efficient remedy against the encroachment of the slave power, the ballot box, and if that remedy is boldly and wisely applied, the principles of liberty and eternal justice will be established;

Resolved, That we accept this issue forced upon us by the slave power and in defense of freedom will cooperate and be known as Republicans, pledged to the accomplishment of the following purposes:

To repeal and entirely abrogate the fugitive slave law;

To resist slavery in those States in which it exists;

To prohibit the admission of any more slave States to the Union;

To exclude slavery from all the Territories over which the General Government has exclusive jurisdiction; and

To resist the acquisition of any more Territories unless the introduction of slavery therein forever shall have been prohibited.

Resolved, That we cordially invite persons of all former political parties whatever in favor of the object expressed in the above resolutions, to unite with us in carrying them into effect.

Practically the same platform was adopted in October 1854, at the first Republican State convention held at Springfield, Ill. This was the issue in the senatorial campaign in Illinois

in 1854 upon which Abraham Lincoln went down to defeat and Stephen A. Douglas was elected.

Now we come down to the first national Republican convention and the platform adopted by the convention in 1856, which reads in part as follows:

Resolved, That with our Republican fathers, we hold it to be a self-evident truth that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government were to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that as our republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life and property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence or extension therein; that we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial legislature, of any individual or association of individuals to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those "twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery."

That was the position of the Republican Party in its first national platform of 1856. What did the Democratic platform of 1856 have to say with regard to the Negro and the issues involved? That platform read, in part, as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others made to induce Congress to interfere with the question of slavery or to take incipient steps in relation thereto are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

3. That the Democratic Party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it the agitation of the slavery question under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made.

John C. Fremont and the Republican Party went down to defeat on that platform in 1856.

Who, may I ask, was the friend of the Negro in that campaign?

Then comes the Republican convention of 1860, which nominated Abraham Lincoln, and the platform to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MITCHELL] referred in his speech on April 22. On page 5887 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he quotes the Republican platform of 1860, in part, as follows:

That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

And then the gentleman from Illinois continued as follows:

I say there is absolutely no truth in the statement that he (Lincoln) was elected to free the slaves. It might have taken the Negro a long time to find out the truth, but, my friends, the vote in Illinois last Tuesday by the Negroes tells the Republican Party that it no longer has that vote in its vest pocket.

Mr. Speaker, there is a phrase in the Bible which says, "There is no God", but when that phrase is taken in its entirety, it says, "The fool hath said in his heart 'There is no God.'" The gentleman from Illinois quoted correctly the Republican plank of 1860, but only in part. What was the history of that period? Why was that plank placed into that platform, and how did it read in its entirely? The fact was that the State of Kansas sought admission to the Union. The Republican Party in that platform condemned—

The attempt of the Democratic Party to force Kansas to adopt the Constitution without the vote of the people with the clause that legalized slavery.

Section 5 of that same platform continues as follows:

Resolved, That the present Democratic administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions in its measureless subserviency to the expectations of a sectional interest, as especially evidenced in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas.

The Lecompton constitution sanctioned slavery in the Territory, prohibited the passage of emancipation laws by the legislature, forbade amendments until after 1864, and provided that the constitution should not be submitted to popular vote but should be finally established by the approval of Congress and the admission of Kansas as a State of the Union. The plank in the Republican platform to which the gentleman from Illinois refers was a protest against an attempt by the Democratic Party to force down the throats of the people of Kansas a pro-slavery constitution, and when that constitution was finally submitted to a vote of the people on January 4, 1858, the vote stood 10,226 against the constitution and 162 for it.

Continuing with that same platform quoted by the gentleman from Illinois, we read:

Resolved, That the new dogma—that the Constitution of its own force carries slavery into any and/or all of the Territories of the United States—is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with contemporaneous expositions, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country. We deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial legislature, or of any individuals to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States.

SEC. 9. That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave trade, under cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity and a burning shame to our country and age, and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

That was the position of the Republican Party as expressed in the platform upon which Abraham Lincoln was elected President in 1860. And what did the Democratic platform say in that campaign? What did the party with which the gentleman from Illinois asks 2,400,000 Negro voters to aline themselves have to say with regard to the question of slavery in that same campaign? Both the Douglas Democratic and Breckenridge Democratic conventions of 1860 adopted the same plank, which read as follows:

SEC. 6. *Resolved*, That the enactments of State legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the fugitive slave law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.

The Democratic Party readopted, in effect, the same pro-slavery platform which was adopted in the convention of 1856 hereinbefore quoted. The Breckenridge Democratic Party platform said that when a Territory is admitted to statehood—

They stand on equal footing with the people of other States, and the State thus organized ought to be admitted into the Federal Union whether its constitution prohibits or recognizes the institution of slavery.

I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois, "Where did Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party stand and where did the Democratic Party stand in 1860. Who was the friend of the Negro in that campaign?"

And then came 4 years of civil war between the North and the South, resulting in the emancipation proclamation and the freeing of 4,000,000 slaves, followed by the campaign of 1864. The Republican platform of that year read in part as follows:

Resolved, That as slavery was the cause and now constitutes the strength of the rebellion, and as it must be always and everywhere hostile to the principles of the Republican Government, justice and national safety demands its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the Republic, and that while we uphold and maintain the acts and proclamations by which the Government in its own defense has aimed a death blow at this gigantic evil, we are in favor, furthermore, of such an amendment to the Constitution, to be made by the people in conformity with its provisions, as shall terminate and forever prohibit the existence of slavery within the limits of the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Democratic Party platform was silent and said nothing on the question of slavery. Abraham Lincoln, running on the Republican platform, defeated George B. McClellan, who ran on the Democratic platform, by a total of 2,330,552 to 1,835,985. Again let me ask you who was the friend of the Negro in that campaign.

In the convention of 1868, with Gen. U. S. Grant as a candidate, the Republican convention adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That this convention declares itself in sympathy with all oppressed people struggling for their rights.

Grant defeated Horatio Seymour in that campaign on that platform by a vote of 3,012,833 to 2,703,249.

And then we come to the campaign of 1872 in which General Grant defeated Horace Greeley, who was the candidate of the Democratic Party. And what did the Republican platform of that campaign have to say about the Negro? It read in part as follows:

During 11 years of supremacy, the Republican Party has accepted with grand courage the solemn duties of the time. It suppressed a gigantic rebellion, emancipated four millions of slaves, decreed the equal citizenship of all and established universal suffrage.

Again, it read:

Neither the law nor its administration should admit any discrimination in respect of citizens by reason of race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Practically every Republican platform since the beginning of the Republican Party expressed itself in favor of the granting of full rights of citizenship to the Negro in all the States. The plank written into the Republican platform of 1908 under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt was perhaps the most typical and reads in part as follows:

We demand equal justice for all men without regard to race or color. We declare once more and without reservation for enforcement in letter and spirit of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution which were designed for the protection and advancement of the Negro, and we condemn all devices that have for their real aim disfranchisement for reasons of color alone as unfair, un-American, and repugnant to the supreme law of the land.

If the Democratic Party and its present leadership is really sincere in its profession of friendship for the Negro; if that party is sincere in its repentance and is really wearing sackcloth and ashes; if it really expects to grant to the Negro the rights of citizenship to which he is justly entitled, rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution; if the present occupant of the White House really desires to walk in the footsteps of his illustrious eleventh cousin, Theodore Roosevelt, let that party and its leadership adopt that part of the Republican platform of 1908 which demands "equal justice for all without regard to race and color." I challenge them to place that plank in their 1936 platform. I challenge the gentleman from Illinois to introduce that plank in the coming Democratic convention, the plank which sets forth so clearly the rights of the American Negro granted him in the Republican States of the North and denied him for three-quarters of a century in the Democratic States of the South. Should he attempt to do so, I fear the boundless faith he expressed as having in the Democratic Party and its leadership would be shattered beyond repair. I fear the gentleman from Illinois would come back to the Republican Party repentant and himself wearing sackcloth and ashes for having deserted the party of his fathers.

Were it not for the fact that the gentleman from Illinois seems to question just what the position of Abraham Lincoln was on the question of the abolition of slavery, I would not attempt to quote President Lincoln, so well is his position known. Has the gentleman from Illinois forgotten the Emancipation Proclamation? Permit me to quote just one paragraph from that immortal document signed by the Great Emancipator:

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within designated States and parts of States are and henceforth shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

This clause, written, signed, and issued by a Republican President, gave freedom to 4,000,000 slaves, anything said or implied by the gentleman from Illinois or his Democratic colleagues to the contrary notwithstanding. Time and again through the years Abraham Lincoln expressed his abhorrence of slavery and his fervent prayer that it be abolished. His position and that of the Republican Party was summarized and expressed on March 4, 1865, in his second inaugural address as follows:

"On the occasion," he said, "corresponding to this 4 years ago, all thoughts were anxiously diverted to an impending civil war. All dreaded it—all sought to avoid it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war. One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally throughout the Union but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest (slavery) was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union even by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it."

Referring to the war between the North and South, he said:

Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God and each invokes His aid against the other. 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.

In spite of these and a thousand other facts, the gentleman from Illinois questions the part Lincoln and the Republican Party took in freeing the slaves.

But let us now continue with his speech. Quoting a prominent Democratic leader, he says:

To begin with, I say to you that the Democratic Party doesn't owe the Negro a damn thing.

Then, according to the gentleman from Illinois, this Democratic oracle continues:

The Republican Party owes the Negro a hell of a lot and will not pay it.

The gentleman from Illinois, then speaking of the work he has been doing to bring the Negro voter into the ranks of the Democratic Party, says:

I find that in 23 States, where we expect to wage a campaign for Negro votes, where the Negro is permitted to vote, and where their votes are counted, we have more than 2,400,000 Negroes who can vote in this election.

Two million four hundred thousand Negroes who owe that right to vote and their very citizenship to the Republican Party. Let me ask the gentleman from Illinois, What about the 4,000,000 Negroes who live in the Democratic States of the South who are not permitted to vote; whose rights of citizenship are denied them, despite the provisions guaranteeing them those rights written into the Constitution by the Republican Party? The gentleman says the Democratic Party owes them nothing. I say the Democratic Party owes these Negroes the right to vote. The Democratic Party owes them the rights of citizenship; the right to serve on juries; the right of equal justice under the law; the right to protection against the lynching mob; and a thousand other rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and denied them by the Democratic Party for three-quarters of a century.

On September 15, 1858, at Jonesboro, Ill., Stephen A. Douglas, running on the Democratic platform, expressed the views of that party when he said:

Mr. Lincoln objects to that (Dred Scott) decision first and mainly because it deprives the Negro of the rights of citizenship. I am as much opposed to his reason for that objection as I am to the objection itself. I hold that a Negro is not and never ought to be a citizen of the United States. I hold that this Government was made on the white basis by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men and no others. I do not believe that the Almighty made the Negro capable of self-government.

When the gentleman from Illinois repeatedly referred in his speech to those States in which the Negro was permitted to vote he reminded us of those Democratic States in the South in which the Negro is not permitted to vote—where they still adhere to the doctrines of Stephen A. Douglas, their one-time Presidential candidate, when he said:

I do not believe that the Almighty made the Negro capable of self-government.

I know the Negro has suffered in the North, as well as in the South, under both Republican and Democratic administrations during this depression. I know he has been hungry. I know he has been without shelter. I know he has been

without proper food. I know he has lost his home. But in the Republican States of the North, at least, if he has lost his home during this depression, so has his white neighbor living by his side lost his home. If he has been hungry, so has his white neighbor been hungry. If he has been naked, so has his white neighbor been naked. If he has been without shelter, so has his white neighbor been without shelter. At least he has been given the same protection under the law, the same relief, the same food, and the same treatment that his white neighbor has been given in the Republican States of the North. Can the Democratic States of the South say as much to the 4,000,000 Negroes living in those States?

But let us analyze still further the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. Speaking of the antilynching bill, the gentleman from Illinois, pleading with great feeling, says:

There is not a man in this House but who knows how strongly I oppose lynching and how deeply interested I am in the early passage of a bill which will make this crime punishable by a Federal law enacted by this Congress.

Permit me to remind the gentleman that the only time this legislation came before this House and was passed, it came upon the recommendation of a Republican President, Mr. Harding. And when it passed there were 221 of 234 Republicans and only 8 of 115 Democrats who voted for it. Permit me to remind him that this legislation was killed by the Democratic Members of the other body. Permit me to remind him that when the recent Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill came up at the last session of Congress in the other body, it was defeated by a filibuster conducted by Democratic Members. Permit me to remind the gentleman that of 33 bills introduced on this subject in this Congress, including one by the gentleman himself, not one has seen the light of day. Let me remind him that there are 315 Democrats and only 103 Republicans in the House, and 70 Democrats and only 23 Republicans in the Senate; that the Committee on the Judiciary, which has these bills under consideration, consists of 18 Democrats and 7 Republicans. If the Democratic Party is such a good friend of the Negro, why has it buried this legislation in which the Negro race is so deeply interested? You and you only have the power and vote to pass it.

But let us go on with the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. With matchless eloquence, the gentleman continued—

I stand here and ask you, speaking to the Congress of the United States, will you not be considerate of the Negroes of this country, whether they live in Massachusetts or whether they live in my native State, the State of Alabama?

Just to what does the gentleman refer? He is asking for the Negro race the same consideration in the Democratic State of Alabama that that race is receiving and has received for years in the Republican State of Massachusetts. The gentleman condemns himself and the position he takes when he compares the attitude of the Republican States of the North with the attitude of the Democratic States of the South on the problems affecting his race. May I be so presumptuous as to ask whether the gentleman could have been elected on any ticket to any office in his native State of Alabama?

Again permit me to continue with that eloquent oration on the Negro and the Democratic Party. Quoting him, he says:

As I read the platforms back in various years and see the beautiful promises that my Republican friends have made to my people and then led us, dumb and hopeless, and voted us and took the offices and went on and forgot us until they wanted us to vote again; and then see what the Democratic Party has done and how you have opened bureaus, how you have invited cooperation from all over this country to settle our questions amicably and with a larger degree of justice than we have had under the Republican Party, I say that you are our friends, and I hail you as our friends today.

And then with a faith in the Democratic Party that knows no bounds—the party which for 75 years has denied the Negro the rights to which the gentleman refers, he says:

If it takes a century to do what I would like to do, I still believe that the time will come and I believe I will see the day when we will have the same rights in all of these States that are given all of the other citizens because we are loyal.

To what rights does the gentleman refer? Why, the rights of citizenship—the right to vote. To what States does he refer when he speaks of the violation of those rights? To the Republican States of the North? Oh, no. He refers to the oppression of the Negro in the Democratic States of the South; to Jim Crow cars, to the denial of the right of the Negro to vote and other rights written into the Constitution by the Republican Party, by Republican States of the North, and violated for three-quarters of a century by the Democratic States of the South. Then he quotes that splendid character of the Negro race, Booker T. Washington, as follows:

The law of changeless justice binds the oppressor with the oppressed and as close as sin and suffering joined they march and fight abreast.

To whom did Mr. Washington refer? To the Republican States of the North or to the Democratic States of the South? Who are these oppressors—the people of the Republican North who have granted to the Negro every right enjoyed by the white race or the people of the Democratic South who have denied him those constitutional rights? To the Republican Party which wrote into the Constitution those amendments protecting the Negro or the Democratic Party of the South which has for three quarters of a century violated those rights? Who are the oppressed to whom Mr. Washington refers—the Negro of the Republican North or the Negro of the Democratic South? The gentleman says "the Negro is being led, dumb and hopeless, to the polls by the Republican Party.' He says the Negro vote has "been in the vest pocket of the Republican Party." If he is right when he says that the Republican Party has had the Negro vote in its vest pocket for 50 years and has led the Negro voter, dumb and hopeless, to the polls, then the South is right in denying the Negro the right to vote, for no people, black or white, who are led to the polls, dumb and hopeless, and whose votes are carried in anyone's vest pocket, are qualified to vote. I deny that statement. That statement is an insult to every Negro in the United States. The Negro voter cannot be purchased by jobs or political favors. He has not forgotten the history of the past.

If there be one of those 2,400,000 Negroes to which the gentleman refers in those Northern States, who has any desire to vote the Democratic ticket in the coming election, let him read the history of the past—not a part but all of the history of the Republican Party, his party, the party which gave freedom to his fathers. Let him compare the history and the record of that party with the history and record of the Democratic Party which is now trying to have him forget the past. If he is not then convinced, let him leave his home in the Republican States of the North. Let him travel through the Democratic States of the South. Let him attempt to exercise the same rights of citizenship in the South that he has exercised in the North. Let him attempt to cast a ballot in those Democratic States in which "the Negro is not permitted to vote or where his vote is not counted." Let him attempt to have a Negro serve on the jury which is trying him for a criminal offense. Let him stand in the dark cabins of his brethren in the South and watch the Negro mothers, fathers, and children cringe in deadly fear as the howling mob goes by with one of his race, rope in hand, meting out mob justice. Let him walk along the way the next morning and see the body of one of his race hanging from the limb of a tree, tongue protruding, and compare that with the justice of the Republican North. Let him walk over the battlefields where Republican blood of the North saturated the ground that he might be free.

Let him walk the pathway over which walked Republican Lincoln, Grant, Logan, Fremont, and others. If he is still unconvinced, let him come to the Nation's Capitol, and on the way stop at the other end of the Mall. Let him visit that shrine where sits in simple silent majesty the Great Emancipator. Let him think of Lincoln and the part he and the Republican Party took in that great war. Let him go over the history of that party once more, which owes its very existence to the problem of slavery, and which sprang from the burning desire of Lincoln, Grant, Logan, Fremont, and others, to wipe slavery from the face of the earth. Let him

compare that record with the record of the Democratic Party—the party which is now trying to induce him to forget the history of the past—the party which, after 130 years of oppression, is now trying to purchase his vote with taxpayers' money by a few paltry political jobs and favors. And before he leaves, let him read again those immortal words of Lincoln inscribed on the walls of that memorial to the Great Emancipator:

Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still must it be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

Those words will sink as deeply into the grateful heart of that Negro as the lash, wielded by the slave driver of the Democratic slave-holding States of the South, sank into the back of his slave forefathers. When he reads those words, he will fall to his knees at the feet of the Great Emancipator. He will thank God for the Republican Party. He will thank God for Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President. He will thank God for Grant, Logan, Fremont, McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt and a thousand others, all Republicans. He will thank God he lives in the Republican State of the North—one of 2,400,000 Negroes who are permitted to vote, instead of living in the Democratic States of the South, one of 4,000,000 Negroes who are not permitted to vote. He will not sell his birthright for a mess of Democratic pottage nor will he be misled by false Democratic propaganda. He will learn as his fathers learned, that the Republican Party which made it possible for him to enjoy those rights is the only party that will guarantee and protect those rights. He will not desert that party in its time of need because that party did not desert him in his time of need. He will leave that shrine with the same loyalty toward the party of the Great Emancipator as his fathers had for the past three-quarters of a century.

DATE OF MEETING OF SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 286, fixing the date of meeting of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

Senate Joint Resolution 286

Resolved, etc., That the Seventy-fifth Congress shall assemble at noon on Monday, the 4th day of January 1937.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 1, line 4, strike out "Monday the 4th" and insert "Tuesday the 5th".

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. As I understand, if we do not pass this resolution at the present time, then the Seventy-fifth Congress would have to meet on Sunday?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct. I may say further that the so-called "lame duck" amendment fixed the 3d of January as the date of meeting, subject to any other provisions we may make by law. Early last year, I introduced a bill fixing the second Wednesday of January as the date of meeting. This resolution has been before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. They were ready to have hearings and possibly report it out. Unless this or a similar resolution is adopted, the Seventy-fifth Congress will have to meet on Sunday. I introduced a resolution fixing Tuesday, the 5th day of January, as the date of meeting. In the meantime, however, the Senate has sent over a joint resolution fixing Monday the 4th day of January as the date. I think Tuesday is a better day. If there were an electoral contest that would be held on the 6th, the day after we meet. The 3d is too near New Year's, anyway, and should be changed.

This resolution provides only for the next session. After that I think we can work out some permanent law as to the date when the sessions shall meet.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand, this is a joint resolution?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. It will take care of the situation, and has to be signed by the President?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me, under the circumstances, that it is perfectly proper for this resolution to pass at this time.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me it is wise for the House to take action in reference to not meeting on Sunday, because it would not make any difference to the President whether we met on Sunday or not; and you want to take into consideration the fact that you will have a new President next year. Landon will be in the White House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RETURN OF BILL TO SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 15, 1936.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill S. 4740, "To provide a graduated scale of reduction in payments under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and the Domestic Allotment Act."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

RULE FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF SUNDRY BILLS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 529.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 529

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to call up for consideration, without the intervention of any point of order, the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 2912. An act to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes.

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution to clarify the provisions of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1934, with regard to period of residence required of an alien husband of a citizen of the United States as a prerequisite to naturalization.

H. R. 3472. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874).

H. R. 7221. A bill to authorize the shortening or termination of the stay in the United States of certain aliens not admitted for permanent residence, to authorize the deportation of certain aliens admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

H. R. 12325. A bill to protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5799. A bill to declare that a citizen of the United States who votes in a political election in a foreign state loses his citizenship.

H. R. 3023. A bill to provide for citizenship to persons born in the United States, who have not acquired any other nationality by personal affirmative act, but who have heretofore lost their United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent under the laws of a foreign country, and for other purposes.

Each such bill and joint resolution, when called up, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. After general debate on each such bill, which shall continue not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule for the consideration of seven immigration bills reported unanimously from the Committee on Immigration. We are informed, after thorough inquiry, that they are noncontroversial and

can be passed expeditiously, also that they were desired by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

Under the rule, 30 minutes is allowed for the consideration of each bill, but we trust they will be completed in much less than the 30 minutes.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is a member of that committee and has done some splendid work on these matters. Is he in accord with this request?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am so informed—on all these seven bills.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is in favor of all of them?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is our information. We made that inquiry and were so informed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], yesterday, in addressing the House, made the statement that this administration had done nothing toward the collection of foreign debts. The fact of the matter is that this administration has done the only real constructive work toward the collection of foreign debts since they were incurred; and that is, it has opened the door to trade and allowed an opportunity for foreign countries to pay their debts as soon as their disturbed political situation at home will permit them to take any financial risks.

The passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff in 1930 made the default in European debt payments as inevitable as the sequence of day and night. The tariff rates imposed by that bill made the importation of goods from the debtor nations practically impossible. These war debts are largely the result of goods and supplies which we sent to the debtor countries; they are not principally the result of a direct loan of money. Consequently, even if it were not undesirable from our own viewpoint to collect all the gold in the world, and impossible economically, the common sense of the situation tells us that we will have to accept payment in goods.

The Smoot-Hawley tariff shut off these goods, and during the following summer, while Congress was in recess, the last Republican President—and I use the term "last" advisedly—without the authority of this Congress, totally ignoring France, in an obvious effort to make himself a great world leader, illegally declared a moratorium on German debt payments. This was the leverage on which the debts were subsequently repudiated by France and all the other countries. It was the last Republican President, by approving an iniquitous tariff bill and by an illegal moratorium, that made these defaults inevitable.

This administration has made many strides toward the settlement of this question by reestablishing a spirit of good will in our foreign relations and by opening up the channels of trade through reciprocity. France, following the signing of the recent reciprocity treaty, expressed a hope that negotiations to settle these debts might be reopened, and it is through this Democratic policy, and not through the Republican high-tariff policy, that these debts will ultimately be paid. For the Republican platform to declare in one breath for the repeal of reciprocity and in the next breath to demand payment of the war debts is clear evidence of duplicity and an effort to obtain votes under false pretenses.

TWO YEARS OF RECIPROCITY

On June 12, 1934, President Roosevelt signed the Trade Agreement Act, which, in my estimation, will go down in history as one of the most constructive pieces of legislation of his first administration. After 2 years it may be well to take stock of the results. There has been so much said and written regarding the trade agreements that one is at a loss to distinguish fact from fiction, or propaganda from truth.

Let us review the immediate background leading up to the program; suggest the objectives to be attained; point out some of the principles involved, and indicate the progress already made toward the fulfillment of the purposes of this measure.

TRADE BARRIERS, DECLINE OF FOREIGN TRADE, AND TARIFF BARGAINING

At the time the President asked Congress for authority to negotiate reciprocal commercial agreements, trade impediments had increased in alarming numbers; new and more drastic methods of throttling commerce had been invoked throughout the world. Former tariff walls fade into comparative insignificance when contrasted with the barbed-wire entanglement presented by the new schemes and devices for trade restrictions imposed during the last decade. As a result of the growth of these impediments and the decline of purchasing power throughout the world, international commerce reached a serious impasse. The collapse of foreign trade unquestionably prolonged and intensified the depression. It follows that the present tariff program was an essential step in the recovery program. Expansion of foreign trade has often been a major factor in business recovery. This has been true of the present recovery. Although the quantity of world trade is still running at a point too near that reached in the worst phase of the depression, substantial improvement has been registered during the last 2 years, and there is every indication of continued gains for the future.

Other countries preceded us in negotiating reciprocal trade agreements to salvage something from the depression wreckage. The United States stood helplessly aside because the Executive did not have the authority to enter into such agreements, while American agriculture and industry were rapidly losing the places they had held in world trade. Realizing the emergency conditions, Congress granted the authority requested by the President, as an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, entitled "Promotion of foreign trade", more usually known as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Under the new power granted the President, it is possible to deal with the tariff problem from a national viewpoint rather than from the standpoint of local interests and minority groups. The problem is now approached from the standpoint of the interests of the country as a whole.

We must, moreover, give due regard to our new position as a creditor nation. In spite of some recent implications to the contrary, we are still the greatest creditor nation of the world and probably shall be for some time. We cannot continue to act as if we were a debtor country. Foreign trade must be developed as a two-way traffic. One side of the street cannot be closed without interfering with the traffic of the other side.

Obviously, our exports cannot continue to make substantial headway unless imports are materially increased. Both need to be expanded; a balance should not be struck by drying up either side. We cannot indefinitely continue to balance our trade by enormous gold imports, as in 1934 and 1935. In the face of these facts, the urgency of our trade-agreements program is evident.

LIST OF COUNTRIES ON THE BARGAINING SCHEDULE

Listed below are 18 countries which indicated their desire to negotiate trade agreements shortly after the act was passed. Agreements have been concluded with 14 of these countries, or with all but Italy, Spain, Costa Rica, and Salvador. Ten of the agreements are in effect and two others will come into force on June 15 of this year.

It will be seen that the list includes some major commercial countries of the world, with their colonies representing five continents, North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa. We have concluded agreements with some of the main sources of noncompetitive products, as well as some of our best customers. The number of countries is nearly equally divided as between American and European.

A large proportion of the import trade with South and Central American countries, as well as that with Netherlands India, is in noncompetitive raw materials and foodstuffs not produced in the United States. Consequently, these products are largely on the free list. In such instances the United States could not offer more favorable conditions,

except by guaranteeing the present status during the life of the agreements. This has been done in a number of instances, but it is recognized that, while this cannot greatly increase the volume of trade, it is a very desirable stabilizing influence in a time when world conditions are so chaotic. Those countries have been willing to make substantial concessions to the United States for such guarantees.

Some of the European countries are highly industrialized, and normally most of these take a greater amount of American products than we take from them. Many articles produced even by industrialized countries are noncompetitive or only indirectly competitive with the products of American industries. But there is also a considerable range of diversified manufactures, more or less competitive in character, upon which concessions had to be made if substantial trade agreements were to be negotiated with European countries. But in all such cases a thorough analysis was made of the whole competitive situation and the probable repercussions upon the domestic industries. As was to be expected, however, some industries have objected before they were hurt.

The present status of the trade-agreements program follows.

Trade agreements calendar

Country	Public notice of intention to negotiate issued	Latest date for submitting written statements	Date for oral presentation of views
Costa Rica	Sept. 7, 1934	Oct. 15, 1934	Oct. 22, 1934
Salvador	do	do	Do.
Spain	Sept. 17, 1934	Nov. 5, 1934	Nov. 12, 1934
Italy	Jan. 16, 1935	Mar. 4, 1935	Mar. 11, 1935

TRADE AGREEMENTS SIGNED

Country	Signed	Effective
Cuba	Aug. 24, 1934	Sept. 3, 1934
Brazil	Feb. 2, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936
Belgium	Feb. 27, 1935	May 1, 1935
Haiti	Mar. 28, 1935	June 3, 1935
Sweden	May 25, 1935	Aug. 5, 1935
Colombia	Sept. 13, 1935	May 20, 1936
Canada	Nov. 15, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936
Honduras	Dec. 18, 1935	Mar. 2, 1936
The Netherlands, including Netherland India, Netherland Guiana, and Netherland West Indian Islands	Dec. 20, 1935	Feb. 1, 1936
Switzerland	Jan. 9, 1936	Feb. 15, 1936
Nicaragua	Mar. 11, 1936	(1)
Guatemala	Apr. 24, 1936	June 15, 1936
France and its colonies, dependencies, and protectorates other than Morocco	May 6, 1936	Do.
Finland	May 18, 1936	(1)

[1] 30 days from date of exchange of instruments of approval and ratification.

The foregoing countries, listed in the order of the bargaining schedule, constitute a fair balance between raw material and industrialized areas. The import trade of the countries with which the United States has concluded or announced agreements amounted to about 41 percent of the 1929 total and 45.5 percent of the 1934 total. Our domestic exports to these countries amounted to about 42 percent of the total in 1929, and in 1934 to about 39 percent of the total. Exploratory conversations are continually being carried on between the United States and foreign countries relative to further agreements.

Although the administration asked for quick action in the enactment of reciprocal trade agreements legislation, the President and other high officials knew that material and substantial gains through trade agreements could not be instantaneous. As regards the results to be expected and the attitude of other countries, the President said in his message to Congress March 2, 1934:

> I would emphasize that quick results are not to be expected. The successful building up of trade without injury to the American producers depends upon a cautious and gradual evolution of plans.
>
> The disposition of other countries to grant an improved place to American producers should be carefully sounded and considered; upon the attitude of each must somewhat depend our future course of action. With countries which are unwilling to abandon purely restrictive national programs, or to make concessions toward the reestablishment of international trade, no headway will be possible.

Administration spokesmen well knew the success of the program depended, to a considerable degree, upon other countries. Several countries not shown in the calendar have expressed a willingness to enter into agreements, but their final attitude and actions must be based on political as well as financial and economic considerations; "upon the attitude of each must somewhat depend our future course of action." Those factors, it is only fair to state, have slowed up our program in a number of instances. In appraising the success of the program these factors must constantly be borne in mind.

THE NECESSITY FOR CAREFUL PREPARATION OF AGREEMENTS AND PROCEDURE

The necessity for caution and care in making tariff agreements has been repeatedly expressed. The desire to build up trade without unbalancing legitimate domestic industries is uppermost in the minds of the negotiators; no action is recommended without a complete set of facts. It should be noted, however, that the pressure of selfish interests must not stand in the way of expediting the program at a reasonable pace.

The Department of State assumes the primary responsibility for negotiating the agreements. The ground work—collection and analyses of information for each and every reciprocal trade agreement—is laid, however, by an interdepartmental committee. It is a cooperative task of many departments and agencies of the Government; the members of these departments and agencies have spent many years in public service. The act itself requires the President to call upon the Tariff Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Commerce, as well as other governmental agencies, for information. In addition, there has been set up a committee for reciprocity information to receive data from interested parties. This information is scrutinized by the interdepartmental committee so that every possible point of view is considered; no one refuses to consider any fact bearing upon the subject of tariffs and trade. It is futile for opponents to claim that domestic interests do not get a hearing. The views of all are invited before negotiations are undertaken.

The amount of detailed study of all the items of trade between the United States and each country on the bargaining schedule is enormous. Each item must be considered in the light of the importance to the economy of the country involved, the effects of any proposed reduction on other industries, the number of workers affected, and many other factors. The number of items finally included in each agreement is no measure of the work necessary in preparation for the final document. For example, more than 100 requests for reductions by Belgium were turned down after careful study. Many other items were considered and rejected before the receipt of the Belgian requests for concessions. It is thus seen that American interests are not placed on the "auction block", as has been claimed by some of those opposed to the program. This work is under the direct supervision of the Trade Agreements Committee, upon which is represented various governmental departments and agencies. Subcommittees dealing with separate countries, groups of commodities, and special subjects, such as quotas and exchange control, serve the Committee on Trade Agreements, which is the coordinating body for all the work on tariff bargaining.

TRADE AGREEMENTS UNDER THE MOST-FAVORED-NATION PRINCIPLE

The trade agreements are being negotiated in accordance with the unconditional most-favored-nation or equality-of-treatment principle. This is a well-recognized canon of local as well as of international law. Indeed, the act itself expressly states that any concessions made to foreign countries shall be extended to all nations on equal terms, except insofar as the President may decide to withhold the benefits of tariff reductions to countries which discriminate against our commerce or whose acts and policies tend to defeat the purposes of the act. It has been found that some countries do discriminate against the commerce of the United States.

These have been warned of their future position if they do not desist from discriminatory treatment. One country has already been denied such treatment. By this action, however, it should not be interpreted that the sponsors of the program consider the act a punitive measure.

A structure of world trade based upon the fullest possible application of the equality-of-treatment principle offers the greatest promise of an expansion of international commerce. This policy places all countries on a basis of equality, avoids discriminatory treatment and the retaliation to which such discriminatory treatment gives rise. By bargaining with items of trade of which the foreign country is the principal or an important supplier, the United States is able to safeguard its interests under most-favored-nation treatment. Some oppose the application of the unconditional most-favored-nation principle; they would require a strict and narrow quid pro quo for each concession granted. Those who take this position apparently forget that the benefits of a preferential agreement may easily be nullified by the foreign country granting still greater preferences to third countries. In order to secure equality of treatment for our commerce, we must grant equal treatment to all others, unless, indeed, they already discriminate against us. It is for this reason that the Trade Agreements Act provides for the generalization of concessions. The nonpartisan Tariff Commission very wisely said in its report on reciprocity in 1919:

> Whatever the relative advantages and whatever the difference in net results, "preference", "reciprocity", and conditional most-favored-nation treatment necessitate frequent and repeated special negotiations, constant bargaining, inevitable delays, actual inequality of treatment; they are essentially indivualistic practices, while a uniform and sincere acceptance of the unconditional principle would result in the automatic and immediate generalization of all and whatever concessions any State agrees to make to any other.

Emphasis should be placed on the fact that in each trade agreement the concessions which we grant are made on those commodities for which the country in question is the principal or an important supplier. The concessions are of major significance, obviously, only to the country which is the leading supplier. As pointed out by the Tariff Commission, bargaining with every country furnishing a small part of the imports would require constant and continuous bargaining; there would be no stability in business in such a regime.

The United States stands ready to grant unconditional most-favored-nation treatment to all countries which in return accord us like treatment. There is, however, no justification for the extension of concessions to countries which flagrantly discriminate against us. Moreover, the general commercial and financial policies of certain countries may in special cases be of such a character that the essential purposes of the trade agreements act would be violated by extending to such countries the concessions which we make.

On the other hand, it is of the utmost importance for American trade that we do not overthrow the most-favored-nation principle. If we refuse to extend the benefits of the concessions made in our trade agreements we should have to denounce the unconditional most-favored-nation treaties and Executive agreements which we now have with some 30 or 40 countries. Moreover, even countries with which we do not have such arrangements in most cases accord us most-favored-nation treatment with respect to customs duties. Were we to denounce the arrangements which we have and refuse to extend concessions the great benefits which now flow to our commerce from most-favored-nation arrangements, whether formally embodied in treaties and Executive agreements or merely granted in practice, would be lost. If we refuse to extend concessions to countries with a double tariff system they in turn have every right to deny us the benefits of their lower rates. Moreover, countries with a one-column tariff could impose penalty duties against our exports. For this reason it would be a serious matter for our export trade should this country depart from the general most-favored-nation principle.

With respect to the newer forms of trade restrictions, such as exchange control, quota systems, clearing arrangements, import-control boards, and the like, this country recognizes full well the difficulties which many countries face. In negotiating with foreign countries with respect to the application of the most-favored-nation treatment to these newer forms of trade control, this Government wishes to be flexible and reasonable in its demands and to go no further than necessary to secure fair treatment for our own commerce, such treatment to be based in general upon the position of our trade in a representative period prior to the inauguration of these control measures. That position was taken in the agreement recently concluded with France.

In our domestic commercial dealings we do not think it at all strange that the price of bread to the millionaire is the same as that to the wage earner. We have long been on a one-price-for-everybody system. There are those who think it should be otherwise, but a multiple price system gives no end of trouble to the merchant as well as to the purchaser. Through most of our history our tariff has been a one tariff for all; in effect we have said to foreign countries: "We have a one-price or one-tariff system; each country must pay that price or tariff if it wishes to get its merchandise into the United States." The equality of treatment practiced in trade agreements is just this.

RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM

Much has been said relative to the gains in imports effected by trade agreements. When one takes the time to analyze the figures presented by the opponents of the program, one usually finds that the data applies to the trade of 1935, when only four agreements were in effect during any part of the year. Furthermore, many items of increased imports are frequently mentioned which have not been involved in any trade agreement. About 90 percent of the import statistics heretofore appearing in the record and elsewhere have had no relation to trade agreements.

It may be of interest to give some provisional statistical results, free from partisan bias, of the actual increase in trade since some of the agreements went into effect. I present herewith a short table which summarizes the gains in trade with countries with which agreements have been in force long enough to indicate the trend of trade.

In connection with this table, I wish to point out that there was an increase in total trade between the United States and every country listed. The gain in trade between the United States and Cuba in 1935 over 1934 (the agreement with Cuba was in effect for the last 4 months of 1934) was $47,000,000, or about 10 percent of the total gain in foreign trade between the 2 years. Of course, there are those who will say that because the imports increased in a greater volume than the exports, the United States loses in the agreement. There was no intention of balancing the trade between the United States and Cuba in negotiating this agreement. Normally, we have imported from 50 to 75 percent more from Cuba than we exported to that country; obviously in a fair agreement the increase of imports would be greater than the increase of exports. There is, however, no desire to attribute all of the gains in trade directly to the lowering of barriers through the agreement. The improvement in general business conditions brought about by other factors has had some influence. Similarly, the gains in trade with Belgium for the first year of the agreement showed substantial increases, being about $27,000,000 over the previous year. I might go on and show the gains with all the countries, but periods in which the other agreements have been in effect are, of course, shorter, and the gains are somewhat in proportion to the volume of trade and the length of time in which the agreements have been in force.

So much has been said relative to agriculture and trade agreements that a word might be said here relative to trade gains in agricultural exports. The agricultural exports to these countries during the first quarter of 1936, according

to the Department of Agriculture, increased about 15 percent above the farm exports for the same quarter of last year. This compares with an increase of only 5 percent in agricultural exports to the countries with which we have no agreements. This would seem to be strong statistical evidence that the program has been of specific benefit to agriculture. I do not have the time to go into further details as to the benefits to particular producers or sections of the country. Those interested in such benefits may readily obtain details from the proper official sources.

United States exports to and imports from countries with which trade agreements have been in force long enough to indicate the trend of trade

[Thousands of dollars]

	Exports to—			Imports from [1]—			Total gain
	1934 and/or 1935 (before agreement)	1935 and/or 1936 (after agreement)	Export gain	1934 and/or 1935 (before agreement)	1935 and/or 1936 (after agreement)	Import gain	
Cuba (calendar years 1934–35) [2]	$44,771	$59,194	$14,423	$78,761	$111,501	$32,740	$47,163
Belgium (12 months, May to April, inclusive) [3]	48,524	59,906	11,382	28,932	45,294	16,362	27,744
Haiti (11 months, June to April, inclusive) [3]	2,713	3,250	537	1,046	1,192	146	683
Sweden (9 months, August to April, inclusive) [3]	27,313	31,175	3,862	26,244	34,171	7,927	11,789
Canada (4 months, January to April, inclusive) [3]	100,296	111,177	10,881	81,245	100,956	19,711	30,592
Brazil (4 months, January to April, inclusive) [3]	15,234	15,977	743	33,594	36,862	3,268	4,011
Netherlands and colonies (February, March, April) [3]	18,370	18,850	480	25,630	30,138	4,508	4,988

[1] General imports for months before Jan. 1, 1934, imports for consumption after.
[2] Agreement with Cuba in force for 4 months of 1934.
[3] Figures for April are preliminary and subject to correction.

Source: Monthly Summaries of Foreign Commerce of the United States, Department of Commerce.

There is no desire by the administration to claim too much for this program. A healthy beginning has been made. In addition, there are some intangible results of this movement toward a more liberal foreign trade policy that are well worth mentioning. For a few moments I wish to direct your attention to that phase of the program. The support of the world was well summarized by the Honorable Francis B. Sayre in his bulletin American Must Act, as follows:

A significant and profoundly encouraging collateral result of the American program is the favorable attention which it has attracted in other nations. A large number of countries other than those named above have indicated an interest in negotiating reciprocal trade agreements with the United States.

At the Seventh Conference of American States held at Montevideo in 1933, representatives of 20 American nations unanimously endorsed the economic proposal presented by the Secretary of State of the United States. Today the basic principles of this proposal are being put into concrete operation through the American trade-agreements program.

At the Paris Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce, held in June 1935, representatives of important business groups and chambers of commerce in many countries passed a resolution "that all appropriate methods be utilized as fully as possible for the mitigation of existing barriers to trade", and "that bilateral trade agreements with the strict observance of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause be negotiated as rapidly as possible."

Signal progress was made toward general endorsement of the basic principles upon which the American trade-recovery program is based when the assembled representatives of over 50 nations at the September meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations unanimously adopted a report recommending that recovery of international trade should be sought through the means of "bilateral agreements having as their objective the application of a more liberal policy * * * based upon the principle of the most-favored-nation clause." These nations expressed the same fundamental conviction upon which the American program is based, namely, that the "removal of the impediments to the exchange of goods * * * is indispensable if economic recovery * * * is to be developed."

WORLD LEADERSHIP IN NEW WORLD COMMERCIAL POLICY

This country has determined its policy in international economic relations and has proclaimed a program of action necessary to attain that objective. It is true that very powerful influences, both within and without the administration, are strenuously working to push and pull the Nation in opposite economic directions.

There is presented the well-known division between self-containment, with regimentation on an ever-increasing scale, on the one hand, and on the other a liberal commercial policy designed to restore international trade to a high level, stabilize the foreign exchanges, and to reconstitute the normal functioning of the international price system, thereby restoring freedom of enterprise and equality of opportunity in international commerce.

The ultrahigh tariff and extreme nationalistic groups, with their powerful lobbyists, swarm through the corridors of public buildings in Washington and demand discriminating trade policies and practices designed not merely to exclude foreign imports but to give preferential position in foreign markets for our producers, thereby discrediting on every hand a broad and liberal commercial policy based on the principle of equality of trade rights.

The opponents of a liberal commercial policy would have every nation continue its desperate struggle over the next few years to restore domestic prosperity, while at the same time intensifying the existing network of trade-destroying restrictions and practices. The proponents of a liberal commercial policy, on the other hand, would work steadily over the next 2 or 3 years to cut through these trade restrictions and open the way toward an expansion of world trade as an aid to domestic recovery, thereby combining domestic measures with international measures designed to rehabilitate a full measure of domestic and world prosperity.

The next 12 months will determine whether the policy of economic isolation and narrow quid pro quo bargaining based on preferential advantages or the broad principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment shall prevail.

In some parts of the world the continuing forces of the depression, of world-wide currency derangement, and lack of equilibrium in international prices are driving on toward an increasing number of trade restrictions, quotas, exchange regulations, governmental control boards, and preferential discriminatory arrangements in spite of the above-noted progress. A continued vigorous effort must be made to stem this tide. Our country is freer than any other to lead the way and offer a comprehensive program for the rehabilitation of international trade.

The State Department, in conjunction with the interdepartmental commercial policy and trade agreements committees, comprising the ablest experts of the various divisions of the Government concerned with foreign trade, is working with all possible speed to restore the normal processes of international commerce and finance. Numerous reciprocity agreements have been concluded; others are under negotiation. The number of countries that have expressed willingness and desire to enter into these negotiations is gratifying and encouraging. More and more sections of the American public are beginning to realize the value of the two-way flow of trade. It is the hope and expectation of the administration that in the mutual concessions to be made with each and every country on the bargaining schedule, the revival of world trade will be facilitated and gradually the benefits will be apparent to all. One country cannot accomplish the task alone. By example and frequent appeals the United States seeks to move toward a more liberal commercial policy. Our rank, however, as a great Nation, our youth and energy, our wealth and resources, our relative freedom from the restrictive policies which world conditions have imposed upon many countries place upon this Nation the responsibility of leadership. The adoption of the Trade Agreements Act indicates that we have assumed and asserted that responsibility.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPATRIATION OF NATIVE-BORN AMERICAN WOMEN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2912) to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost

their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, reported from the Committee on Immigration, applies to native-born American women, who through operation of the Cable Act lost their citizenship because of their marriages to aliens and who since such marriages either have lost their husbands or been divorced and who now desire to regain American citizenship.

It allows them to be repatriated. This bill provides a short form of naturalization allowing native-born American women, who have lost their citizenship through marriage to an alient, to take the oath of allegiance to the United States and thereby be repatriated.

This bill has the endorsement of all patriotic organizations and veterans' organizations. It has been reported by our committee unanimously, and in my opinion, is for the best interest of the American women.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the committee gave a good deal of consideration to this proposal, and, personally, I have no special objection to it, except the amendment that was added to the bill by the House committee conferring a certain discretion on the Labor Department. I think that amendment should be eliminated because ample provision is embodied in the bill to take care of its enforcement. I think with that one objection the bill is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This bill has already passed the Senate. It came before the committee, and the committee has unanimously reported it with the amendment referred to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think that amendment is necessary?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman object to the amendment?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Yes; I do object to the amendment.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am willing to offer a motion to strike out the amendment in order to expedite the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. With that amendment eliminated, it is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that has come to us from the Senate, being sponsored over there by Senator JOHNSON.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, has stated, the House committee has added an amendment to this bill, which is embodied in section 2. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] stated, we have no opposition on this side so far as I know, and I am not speaking for everybody, just for those who have made a study of this matter here at this table. We will not oppose the bill if section 2, as proposed by the House committee, is stricken. I understand the chairman of the Immigration Committee has agreed to this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Section 2 of this bill simply authorizes the Naturalization Bureau to make rules and regulations. Does the gentleman desire to strike out that paragraph?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; we want that stricken out. It is not necessary, because this bill only includes certain people within a law that is already on the statute books. It includes a certain class of people that were inadvertently omitted. If we include those people, they will come within the same regulations as the others, and the purposes will have been accomplished. By adding this section we are adding something that is superfluous, and my proof of that is the fact that had it not been superfluous it would have been in the other bill. We, on this side, are afraid it might lead to unnecessary complications; consequently, this section should be stricken out.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that section 2 as inserted by the committee is essential to the carrying out of the purposes and intent of this proposed law. I do not want to jeopardize the purpose of the bill by striking out this section, if it in any way affects the very thing we are trying to do for these native-born American women.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If that had been essential, the Senate would have included it, and the bill would have passed the Senate with that section in it. However, this amendment has been placed in the bill by the gentleman's committee; consequently, in view of all these things it is not necessary.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I consent to strike out that section as proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter a woman, being a native-born citizen, who has or is believed to have lost her United States citizenship solely by reason of her marriage prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien, and whose marital relation with such alien has or shall have terminated, shall be deemed to be a citizen of the United States to the same extent as though her marriage to said alien had taken place on or after September 22, 1922: *Provided, however*, That no such woman shall have or claim any rights as a citizen of the United States until she shall have duly taken the oath of allegiance as prescribed in section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 596; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 381), at any place within or under the jurisdiction of the United States before either a court of record of general jurisdiction or a United States commissioner or, outside of the jurisdiction of the United States, before a secretary of embassy or legation or a consular officer as prescribed in section 1750 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 22, sec. 131); and such officer before whom such oath of allegiance shall be taken shall make entry thereof in the records of his office or in the minutes of the court, as the case may be, and shall deliver to such person taking such oath, upon demand, a certified copy of the proceedings had, including a copy of the oath administered, under the seal of his office or of such court, at a cost not exceeding $1, which shall be evidence of the facts stated therein before any court of record or judicial tribunal and in any department of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "relation" and insert "status."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "either a court of record of general jurisdiction or a United States commissioner" and insert "a court exercising naturalization jurisdiction thereunder."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "minutes" and insert "naturalization records."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 22, on page 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules, regulations, and forms used to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was rejected.

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.

PERIOD OF RESIDENCE REQUIRED OF AN ALIEN HUSBAND OF A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. J. Res. 336 to clarify the provisions of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1934.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply puts the American husband and American wife on an equal footing. In 1934 there was passed a law permitting an alien husband who married an American woman the right to become a citizen within 3

years. The same privilege was granted to an alien woman who married an American and she could accordingly become naturalized within 3 years. In other words, under the old law alien husbands would have had to stay here 5 years before they could become citizens, while the alien wives could be naturalized after only 1 year of residence.

So, in 1934 we equalized the opportunities under the law and this bill simply equalizes opportunities with respect to marriages that took place prior to the enactment of the act of May 24, 1934. So, if a marriage took place between a native-born American woman and an alien, or vice versa, they would be eligible for naturalization at the present time after 3 years' residence.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe there is any opposition to the bill on this side, but I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not it would be well to amend the bill at page 2, line 12, and in lieu of a 5-year period of residence insert the word "legal" and require a 5-year period of legal residence?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The representatives of the Departments of State and Labor and the experts on this question have come before the committee and have recommended this language as the proper language. I have no special interest in any particular language just so long as it will do the thing we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to have the word "legal" inserted, because it would then place the burden of offering proof if there were any short-comings with respect to residence.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will offer such an amendment, I shall be pleased to accept it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 4 of the act of May 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 797), entitled "An act to amend the law relative to citizenship and naturalization, and for other purposes", is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Section 2 of the act entitled 'An act relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women', approved September 22, 1922, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. That an alien who marries a citizen of the United States, after the passage of this act, as here amended, or an alien whose husband or wife is naturalized after the passage of this act, as here amended, or an alien husband who on or after May 31, 1931, shall have married a citizen of the United States, shall not become a citizen of the United States by reason of such marriage or naturalization; but, if eligible to citizenship, he or she may be naturalized upon full and complete compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, with the following exceptions:

"'(a) No declaration of intention shall be required;

"'(b) In lieu of the 5-year period of residence within the United States and the 1-year period of residence within the State or Territory where the naturalization court is held, he or she shall have resided continuously in the United States, Hawaii, Alaska, or Puerto Rico for at least 3 years immediately preceding the filing of the petition.'"

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jenkins: On page 2, line 12, after the word "of" insert the word "legal."

In line 13, after the word "of" insert the word "legal."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT AND RELIEF OF ALIENS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3472) to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874).

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that also comes from the committee unanimously.

This bill constitutes a step in the right direction. Under the present immigration law the Secretary of Labor, when he finds an alien stranded here, may send him back to his native land to stay, but this is true only for a period of 3 years after entry.

We have a number of aliens who find themselves stranded here and who are on the relief rolls in this country, who want to go back to their native lands, but there is no authority in the law giving the Secretary of Labor the right to send them back because they have been here more than 3 years. This bill gives the Secretary power to repatriate all of these aliens on relief rolls who seek to return to their native lands, but who have not the funds. The amount required for relief for one month and a half will send them back to their native lands and keep them there.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In other words, this bill applies only to such aliens as want to go back and there is nothing in the bill which compels aliens on relief to return to their native land?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. Benefits under this bill are only available upon voluntary application from the aliens seeking to get back to their native lands.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty accord with the statement of the chairman of the committee that this is very salutary legislation. The more of these dependent aliens we can get out of the country at a minimum cost the better for the country.

This bill also provides that aliens thus deported shall not be eligible for reentry into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time primarily to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

I believe this bill will meet with the hearty approval of very many people. There are many people who believe that when an alien becomes a public charge and is on relief there ought to be sufficient license not only to enter into a contract with him to go back, but to send him back arbitrarily whether he wants to go or not. However, such a provision is not in this bill.

When the bill was first drawn the limit was raised from 3 years to 5 years and then the 5 years was stricken out and the bill now provides for no limitation whatever. While I am not suspecting anybody on the committee or anywhere else, it does look a little suspicious to me for this reason. There may be a lot of people in this country who can easily get on relief if they want to, and they will get on relief for the sole purpose of getting back to their own country.

Somebody on the committee should have gone into that and perhaps the committee did go into that, but you can see that that will open the door to a great many for a trip back home on the part of somebody not on relief, but who can easily get on relief. There ought to be some limitation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The bill provides specifically that they cannot return to the United States after they have once been returned in this way to their native country.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman can see my point is a good point, notwithstanding that. Let me give you a specific case. Suppose here are some aged people who have nothing in their own right at all. They are living with their relatives, who are taking care of them. They are not on relief. Suppose they come along and they say, "Here is a good chance for us to go back to our native land, and we want to go back there and never come back to this country. We will go on relief and go back." That may be captious on my part, but at the same time this thing is not intended for that. This bill is intended for people genuinely stranded, who want to go back to the country from which they came.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This has been the law from 1917. It has not been abused. It has been carried out to 100 percent of enforcement, but the present law simply fixes 3 years to repatriate. We are removing that statute of limitation of

3 years and giving open power to the Secretary to take these people and repatriate them to their native land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 23 of the act of February 5, 1917, as reads as follows: "and shall have authority to enter into contract for the support and relief of such aliens as may fall into distress or need public aid, and to remove to their native land, at any time within 3 years after entry, at the expense of the appropriations for the enforcement of this act", is amended to read as follows: "and shall have authority to enter into contract for the support and relief of such aliens as may fall into distress or need public aid, and to remove to their native country, or the country from whence they came, or to the country of which they are citizens or subjects, at any time within 5 years after entry, at the expense of the appropriations for the enforcement of this act, such as fall into distress or need public aid from causes arising subsequent to their entry and are desirous of being so removed, but any person thus removed shall forever be ineligible for readmission except upon the approval of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor;".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "within 5 years."

The committee amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

[Roll No. 125]

Andrews	DeRouen	Kennedy, Md.	Sadowski
Ayers	Dies	Kleberg	Sanders, La.
Berlin	Dirksen	Kvale	Sauthoff
Bland	Ditter	Lanham	Schuetz
Boehne	Dobbins	Larrabee	Scrugham
Bolton	Doutrich	Lee, Okla.	Sears
Brennan	Drewry	Lewis, Md.	Secrest
Brewster	Duffey, Ohio	McClellan	Seger
Brooks	Dunn, Miss.	McFarlane	Somers, N. Y.
Buck	Eagle	McSwain	Stewart
Buckler, Minn.	Eicher	Maloney	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Englebright	Martin, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
Burnham	Ferguson	Maverick	Taylor, Colo.
Cannon, Wis.	Fernandez	Monaghan	Thurston
Cary	Fiesinger	Montague	Tolan
Chapman	Ford, Calif.	Montet	Utterback
Claiborne	Frey	Nelson	Wallgren
Collins	Gasque	Nichols	Weaver
Corning	Gassaway	O'Connell	Wilson, La.
Cox	Green	Parks	Withrow
Creal	Hamlin	Parsons	Wood
Crosby	Higgins, Conn.	Rayburn	Woodrum
Crowe	Hoeppel	Reed, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Darden	Hollister	Risk	Zioncheck
Darrow	Hook	Robsion, Ky.	
Dear	Imhoff	Romjue	
Deen	Kee	Ryan	

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS PROMOTING CERTAIN PROPAGANDA

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7221) to authorize the shortening or termination of the stay in the United States of certain aliens not admitted for permanent residence, to authorize the deportation of certain aliens admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York calls up the bill, H. R. 7221, and asks unanimous consent that the first reading be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under general authority granted by the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 524; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 8, sec. 215), the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall by regulation provide for the shortening or the termination of the lawful stay in the United States of every alien not admitted for permanent residence who while in the United States engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages in political activities.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings against any alien in the United States who while in the United States engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

SEC. 3. (a) The words "propaganda instigated from foreign sources" when used in this act shall only mean—

Any systematic effort, which is directed or supported from known sources outside the territory and jurisdiction of the United States and which is intended to gain, within the United States, favorable public opinion and support for (1) the adoption in the United States of any opinion, or of any course of action, or of any governmental policy, which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or (2) the extension from any foreign country to United States of the application of any religious or racial prejudices and intolerances in official and private life and in business affairs.

(b) The words "unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources" when used in this act shall only mean—

Any activities, identified with official policies of any foreign governmental agency or political party, which are directed or supported from a headquarters located in territory outside the jurisdiction of the United States and which seek to influence political action and thought, within the United States, favorably toward (1) the establishment, by unlawful means or other subversive methods if necessary, in the United States of any principle or policy of government, prevailing in the country wherein is located the foreign headquarters, which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution of the United States, or (2) the application in the United States of any policy of government, prevailing in the country wherein is located the foreign headquarters, which, by the advocacy of any religious or racial prejudices or intolerances, tends to foment political acrimony and business animosity in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to you unanimously from the Committee on Immigration. It will do a great deal for America and the American people. The bill follows one recommendation by the committee of the Seventy-third Congress that investigated un-American, foreign, and subversive propaganda. In one of its recommendations, it strongly recommended the enactment of legislation as proposed here by this bill. It found there were innumerable foreign visitors, hundreds of them, who come to our shore under the guise of being our friends. Some come here under the guise of visitors, and some come here for the purpose of business. When they get to the port of Ellis Island, their time to stay in the country is fixed at 3, 4, 5, or 6 months, or even a year.

After they enter this country we find that almost all of them are here more or less in the role of foreign spies to spread un-American propaganda, in violation of the decencies of every peaceful nation.

Under the present law, there is no way by which we can tell these so-called visitors to stop bringing in and flooding this country with propaganda, whether it be nazi, fascisti, communistic, or any other propaganda. The bill permits the Secretary of Labor, upon proof that any alien who came here under the guise of a visitor is in fact an alien propagandist engaged in spreading un-American misinformation, to send him back to his native land.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I refuse to yield now.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, do not do that. I will yield to the gentleman later after I make my statement.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point if the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall yield to the gentleman later but let me finish my statement.

We are going to amend the law so that, if a man or woman is found who came here as an alien from the other side to spread subversive propaganda which is against the best interests of this country, the Department shall be in a position to tell that alien politely to go home to his native land.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield first to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Is it the purpose of this bill to confine visitors to this country in the remarks or any lectures they make?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Would not this bill do that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would not.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Suppose somebody said that a lecture of some visitor from France or Germany or any other country was propaganda, would not this bill cause the Department of Labor to deport him?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will read page 3 he will find it simply says "any activities, identified with official policies of any foreign governmental agency or political party", of a foreign government.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Who is going to judge what is identified with a foreign government? Who is to be the judge of that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The fact of the matter is that the person we are seeking to send back home very often comes from a government who is paying him and subsidizing him to spread this un-American literature amongst our American institutions. It must be definitely established that he is coming here representing a foreign government.

Mr. O'MALLEY. And who will establish that? The Department of Labor?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Department of Labor and the Department of State.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to call the gentleman's attention to section 2 of this bill. Is it not a fact that section 2 does not deal with temporary visitors, but it deals with aliens who are permanently admitted to the United States? Is that not correct?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The language speaks for itself. I am not going to take up time in explaining it now.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman is the author of the bill, and he should be able to give us an opinion.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman can read the English language as well as I can. He can see what it means.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I am asking whether it deals with aliens permanently admitted into the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It means just exactly what it says.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty accord with the provisions of this legislation. However, I recognize that it may be subject to one or two minor amendments. Of course, the purpose of this legislation, in my opinion, is very meritorious. The object of it is to prevent visitors to this country, who come here as our guests, from abusing the courtesy and hospitality of this country when they get here. We have noticed in the press during the past year or two where recognized Communists have come to this country. Of course, they were not recognized as such when admitted, but after coming here they proceeded to abuse the hospitality of this country by preaching and spreading the doctrine of communism and other propaganda subversive to our institutions.

Mr. SCHNEIDER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am sorry I cannot yield because I do not have time. I must yield to others.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I asked the chairman of the committee, who is the author of this bill, as to the meaning of section 2. He declined to answer that question. I submit section 2 to every Member of this House. It states:

> The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings against any alien in the United States who while in the United States engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

I submit that that section applies not only to aliens who are admitted for the purpose of a temporary visit, but that section applies to every alien now residing in the United States.

As to section 2 I wish the chairman of this committee had read his immigration law, and as chairman of the Committee on Immigration he should know the immigration law; he would have found that in section 155, title VIII of the United States Code, Annotated, there is a provision which provides for the deportation of any alien who is openly advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. That is actually the law now. That is actually on the statute books. Aliens are being deported under that provision, section 155, title VIII, United States Code, Annotated, already in existence.

Now, inasmuch as you have already provided in 1917 and again in 1922 for the deportation of aliens who are seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, why do you need section 2? It seems to me that section 2 goes beyond the class of people who seek to overthrow the Government by force and violence. It tends to deport those people who are advocating views which may be contrary to the views held by the Liberty League, the Hearsts, and other reactionaries in this country.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman says "an alien residing here permanently." If a person becomes a citizen he is not an alien and he cannot be deported.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is true.

Mr. CONNERY. Any person here who puts out this subversive propaganda against the United States should be deported, should he not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not the point. The point is, first, an alien must reside here 5 years before he may become a citizen; second, there is already on the statute books section 155, title VIII, which provides that any person who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence is to be summarily deported.

That provision is mandatory, and you can check up on me by calling up the Department of Labor. This section goes beyond the advocacy of the overthrow of government by violence. Anything can be interpreted by a Secretary of Labor to mean unlawful political activity. Today you may have a liberal Commissioner of Immigration; tomorrow you may have a reactionary Commissioner of Immigration; and you are putting power in his hands which goes beyond the mere prevention of the advocacy of the overthrow of government by violence. If you want to deport people because they are engaging in the dissemination of subversive propaganda you can do it under title VIII, section 155.

Mr. CONNERY. That cannot be done. The only people who can be deported under that section are anarchists. No person can be thrown out under that section, for instance, for spreading German Nazi propaganda.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It can be done, as I have said, because the law is clear and has been repeatedly used. You can call up the Commissioner of Immigration now and check up. This very day people are being deported for allegedly advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence. Since you have covered that, why do you need this? You are going beyond subversive influence; you are attempting to deport people who tomorrow will be advocating views which a Secretary of Labor might construe to be unlawful political activity. This is the beginning of the reactionary laws against the civil liberties of our people. This bill is the worst piece of alien baiting I have ever seen. It goes to the very heart of our Bill of Rights. Adopt it and you have scored another victory for Black Legion reaction.

The ambiguous language in this bill is similar to the general and ambiguous language which was put in the alien and sedition laws by the Federalist Party years ago in this country, and it was those alien and sedition laws which wiped out the Federalist Party. I hope this Congress will not repeat the error.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the bill now under consideration. It seems to me if people coming here from foreign countries do not agree with our form of government, they ought to go back without any invitation, but if they will not, we ought to send them back. I think the bill does not go far enough and propose, therefore, to offer an amendment which will provide also for the deportation of criminal aliens. Many of us have tried for some time to obtain adequate laws for the deportation of criminal aliens from this country. The language of the amendment which I shall offer is the language that was included in and approved by the Immigration Committee in the Kerr bill and is taken bodily from that bill. It was one of the provisions of the bill. That bill never went through, because it had in it many other features which many Members thought let down the bars on immigration. There has never been any objection, so far as I know, to the deportation of criminal aliens. That is all I seek to do by this amendment, and the language of the amendment is identical with the language taken from the Kerr bill approved by the Immigration Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD].

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not require 5 minutes. All I want to say is that I am heartily in favor of this bill as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

It is quite apparent from some of the statements that have been made that the Members who made them have not read the bill and do not understand it. The purpose of this bill is to terminate the temporary stay of and deport certain aliens found to be promoting and disseminating certain propaganda instigated from foreign sources.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman read section 2.

Mr. MILLARD. I am coming to that in a minute.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, which was appointed pursuant to House Resolution 198 of the Seventy-third Congress, filed its report to the House (H. Rept. 153, 74th Cong., 1st sess.) under date of February 15, 1935.

In that report the Special Committee on Un-American Activities recommended, in part—

> That Congress should enact a statute conferring upon the Secretary of Labor authority to shorten or terminate the stay in this country of any visitor admitted here under temporary visa, whenever, in the judgment of the Secretary, such visitor shall engage in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda or engage in political activity in the United States.

The public hearings held before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, the printed record of which were available to your committee, together with the full report of that special committee, indicate very clearly the need for a new statute as is proposed by this pending bill.

Notwithstanding existing provisions of law, it developed during the progress of the comprehensive investigation by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that the promotion of the dissemination in the United States by aliens of subversive propaganda instigated from foreign sources was not solely deemed sufficient grounds for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to initiate procedure under the immigration acts to remove aliens engaged in those questionable activities, whether those aliens were here on temporary status or on permanent residence status.

Your committee is convinced that, especially at this time, Americanism is the only "ism" we should encourage among citizens and residents of the United States. There is not now any reason why our immigration laws should not be corrected so that deportation would follow activities by any alien desiring to spread in the United States any kind of alien doctrine or philosophy inconsistent with our constitutional plan of government or racial or religious intolerance proposals which endeavor to aline Americans against Americans for internal discord in the United States.

While this measure is not retroactive with respect to aliens who have heretofore engaged in propaganda activities, the continuance of their propaganda activities after the enactment of this act will subject them to the penalties contained herein. Also the enactment of this measure now will serve notice to all persons abroad who may contemplate coming here to carry on propaganda that their activities here will subject them to removal proceedings.

I think this is a good bill, although, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] suggested, it may need amendment. Subdivision 2 of section 3, I think, should be amended, but in the main this bill should be passed, and passed at once.

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

Mr. MILLARD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Speaking of section 2 of the bill, is there any reason why an alien who is spreading unlawful or illegal propaganda should not be banished?

Mr. MILLARD. He should be.

Mr. RICH. I think section 2 in this bill is a good section.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, can anybody give us a definition of unlawful propaganda?

Mr. RICH. Any propaganda that advocates the overthrow of our Constitution and our form of government.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman in his zeal forgets all about the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] seems unduly exercised about section 2. Section 3 reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. (a) The words "propaganda instigated from foreign sources" when used in this act shall only mean—
>
> Any systematic effort, which is directed or supported from known sources outside the territory and jurisdiction of the United States and which is intended to gain, within the United States, favorable public opinion and support for (1) the adoption in the United States of any opinion, or of any course of action, or of any governmental policy, which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or (2) the extension from any foreign country to United States of the application of any religious or racial prejudices and intolerances in official and private life and in business affairs.

In other words, the worries of the gentleman from New York about a strike and as to whether they could deport somebody who was taking part in a strike, it seems to me, are wholly unwarranted for the reason those connected with it have to be influenced by foreign propaganda, or it has to be shown that some foreign government is attempting to influence people who are connected with that strike.

I have known every Secretary of Labor with the exception of Mr. Wilson, including Secretaries of Labor Davis, Doak, and Miss Perkins. I have never known any of them who would step into a strike and try to deport anybody on that account.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. How about the San Francisco strike? The gentleman knows that in the bitterness of a strike serious charges are made against individuals engaged in the strike. Once those charges are made, the burden of proof under the immigration law falls on the alien and not on the Government.

Mr. CONNERY. It falls on the Government.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No. The burden is on the alien. The law is clear on that point. An alien has the burden, under the law, to prove his right to enter or remain in the United States. This is unfair, but it is the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under general authority granted by the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 524; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 8, sec. 215), the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall by regulation provide for the shortening or the termination of the lawful stay in the United States of every alien not admitted for permanent residence who while in the United States engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages in political activities.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Page 2, line 4, after the word "in" and before the word "political", insert "unlawful."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings against any alien in the United States who while in the United States engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 2, line 8, after the word "engages", strike out the rest of line 8 and all of line 9 and the words "States engages" in line 10.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in the beginning that my opposition to this bill is not because I want any foreigners to come to this country and advocate communism. I am constitutionally and fundamentally opposed to communism, and I do not believe there is a Member of this House who is more opposed to that philosophy of government than I am.

I know it is the intention of the members of the committee to curb the teaching of communism in this country by foreigners who may come here for this express purpose. To that extent, I am in sympathy with the members of the committee, but I respectfully submit to the Members of the House, that this committee has gone further than they should to accomplish this purpose.

The language that my motion would strike from section 2, goes further than any member of this committee really wants to go. I call attention again to the fact that my amendment strikes out the language in lines 8, 9, and 10, as follows:

In the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages.

So that my amendment still leaves in the section the prohibition against any alien, while in the United States, engaging in unlawful political activities instigated from a foregn source. My amendment leaves that part in, but strikes out the other language which seems to me to be clearly objectionable.

Under the provisions of that paragraph, Einstein could be deported for teaching the theory of relativity, because it had not been previously thought of in this country. He could be deported on the ground he was spreading propaganda in this country that was directed from a foreign source. If Pasteur had come to this country years ago and disseminated information along certain medical lines, he could have been deported for no other reason than the fact he was teaching something along scientific lines that Americans had not previously thought of.

The language should not be in this bill, and I submit to the good judgment of the House that it should be stricken out.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONNERY. There is nothing in the theory of relativity or the pasteurization of milk that interferes with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BOILEAU. All right. I will refer to something very near and dear to my friend. John Jones, a law-abiding alien who had lived in this country for 25 years and who had supported the N. R. A. and A. A. A., could be deported because he had advocated something inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States.

This language is very clear. Read subsection (a) of section 3 where it attempts to define the language. Down here in line 19, in defining the meaning of this language, the bill states "which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution or laws of the United States", and Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States, advocated the N. R. A. and the A. A. A., which are contrary to the Constitution. I am not finding fault with him. I voted for those acts myself because I thought they were right. However, if I had happened to be an alien and this bill had been law, they could have deported me, and had Franklin D. Roosevelt been an alien they could have deported him, and the fact that I was doing what I thought was best for my country would not have made any difference.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman made the statement that under this bill if he had been an alien and had advocated the N. R. A. he could have been deported. I call his attention to the language here that says, "engaged in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources."

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not yield any further. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language I am referring to is—

Who while in the United States engaged in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources.

Mr. SCHULTE. That is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. I want to clarify this matter for the benefit of the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman is a member of the committee and I do not suppose I can give him any information, but I am sure he is in error, because in section 2 there are two separate and distinct provisions. One states that—

The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings against any alien in the United States who, while in the United States, engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources.

Mr. SCHULTE. Read on.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is the end of that particular provision. Then it states—

Or who, while in the United States, engages in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

Then subparagraphs (a) and (b) of section 3 attempt to define these two expressions as used in section 2, and I submit that the definition contained in paragraph (a) of section 3 clearly makes it a deportable offense for a person to advocate anything that is inconsistent with the Constitution or the laws of the United States. It does not say "attempting to overthrow our Government", but advocating any principle that is inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States or the laws of the United States.

Now, the N. R. A. and the A. A. A., the Supreme Court has said, are inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, and you and I know that the people who advocated these laws were not undesirable aliens, they were good, American citizens, and I submit to you that aliens who were here at that time and who advocated them would have been subject to deportation as provided here, subject, of course, to the limitation that it must have been started from a foreign source, but I submit to you that the principle involved is the same whether it was thought of first here or in some foreign country. I submit that the language I have referred to should be stricken out and I propose at the proper time to offer another amendment to strike out subparagraph (a) of section 3 so we will leave in the bill the provision that makes it unlawful for a person coming here from a foreign land to engage in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. SCHULTE. No one questions the gentleman's Americanism or his love for this country, but is the gentleman in sympathy with the principles of the bill?

Mr. BOILEAU. I submit that my amendments are perfecting amendments. My amendments will do what you claim this bill should do, and remove the objectionable features that may be used for the purpose of oppressing decent aliens in this country.

I submit that this country is too big to pass such legislation as this, which would put a club over the heads of good, law-abiding aliens in this country.

Mr. SCHULTE. This bill does not put a club in the hands of anyone and refers to those engaged in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

Mr. BOILEAU. My amendment leaves that language in the bill and takes out the other provision in the section.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. As an illustration of what might happen under this proposed law if the language were interpreted as I interpret it, some alien in this country who was written a letter by his brother to support the N. R. A. could be held for deportation under this bill under the language—

Engaged in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank my colleague for that contribution, because that could happen and I am sure we do not want to do that. When you consider this bill and use your sober judgment I am sure you will not vote for this measure unless these amendments are adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, no law-abiding American need fear anything from the language in this bill. It is not directed against law-abiding Americans.

Mr. BOILEAU. Did I understand the gentleman to say that no law-abiding citizen should object to this language?

Mr. BLANTON. I said and repeat that no law-abiding American need fear anything whatever from the language in this bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not directed against law-abiding Americans; it is directed against Communists who get their orders from a Russian Government across the waters to destroy organized government and organized constitutions. This is all this bill seeks to reach.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just a minute?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not yield to the gentleman.

I am not concerned about taking such good care of the Communists who get their orders and money from Russia. I am concerned about America. I am concerned about Americans. I am concerned about the welfare and interests of American girls and boys who grow up in the United States. You are going to find me on this floor fighting every subversive influence that comes into the Nation. I am fighting it now, keeping it out of our schools here, in spite of every "red" in Washington [applause], in spite of every "red" newspaper in Washington. [Laughter and applause.] There are five of them here. We have got enough of it.

I have been chairman of a subcommittee that was asked to appropriate $78,660 annually to help put communism into the schools every year. My subcommittee has gone into the subject exhaustively. There are 63 citizens' organizations here which elected a committee to look after their school interests, and to keep communism out, and appointed a man as chairman of it, Judge George E. Sullivan, to keep subversive teachings out of our local schools. This federation of 63 citizens' associations appointed Hon. George E. Sullivan, a splendid gentleman of Washington, as their chairman.

He came to me and said on behalf of the committees, the mothers, and fathers in these 63 different citizens' organizations who pay the salaries of teachers in the schools here, "We want you to submit these questions to the teachers in Washington and find out whether they are Communists." [Applause.]

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not just now. These fathers and mothers who pay the salaries of these 3,167 officers and teachers had a right to appeal to us. This District is controlled by Congress. When they appealed to us through the chairman of that committee, Hon. George E. Sullivan, who submitted the kind of questions they wanted asked, these mothers and fathers of Washington, I felt that they had the right to ask them. So I sent the questionnaires.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. There have been some "reds" around here who did not like it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman is not confining himself to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes, I am. The question of this language in this bill reaches communism here in Washington. This whole bill before us deals with communism. It was communism in schools that this questionnaire dealt with that I sent to the 3,169 officers and teachers on the part of the fathers and mothers of Washington. There is nothing to the gentleman's point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. And because I properly exercised my right as chairman of the subcommittee that handles the District appropriation bill, and all appropriations for the officers and teachers of the Washington schools, and all of the expenses paid to the Board of Education here in Washington, and responded to the appeal of the fathers and mothers of Washington, made through their delegated authority, Judge George E. Sullivan, and sent questionnaires to the 3,169 officers and teachers to elicit facts that were pertinent and material to the requested appropriation of $78,660 which was still before my subcommittee undecided, a certain Representative from Illinois, without giving me any warning, without notifying me of his intention, and at a time when I was busy with my coconferees of the House in conference with Senate conferees, trying to agree upon 87 Senate amendments to an annual appropriation bill, presented a resolution in the House, and was having it read at the Clerk's desk, when friends telephoned me about it.

I am glad that it will appear in the RECORD, and that it will show the questionnaire that I sent to the 3,169 officers and teachers, for I want every father and mother in the counties of Alexander, Franklin, Jackson, Perry, Pulaski, Randolph, Union, and Williamson, in the State of Illinois, to turn to page 9947 of the RECORD and read said questionnaire, and read said resolution, and then determine whether I was treated fairly and justly, and whether there is any question that the fathers and mothers of Washington did not have the right to ask, and whether they approve of the

author of said resolution going before the Board of Education and advising teachers not to give such information, but to ignore such request.

I want the readers of this RECORD to remember that as soon as said resolution was read, the Speaker promptly ruled that it was out of order, and that he sustained a point of order against it. I want the readers of this RECORD to remember that the Speaker held that said resolution in no way reflected upon me. If it had been a reflection upon me, it would have given me a personal privilege, under the rules of the House.

A little bunch of "reds" in the schools—and there are just a few of them—and a little bunch of "reds" that circulate around here on Capitol hill, whom we all know, are not going to stop me one minute in my fight against communism. I will be here a long time after they are gone and forgotten, every last one of them.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Not just now. I want these "red" newspapers in Washington to remember that this morning when I was in conference with the Senate managers trying to agree upon a bill—and we did, a bill, a complete agreement on 87 Senate amendments—in my absence, without saying a word to me about it, a resolution incited by them was taken up here that they knew was not in order, so that the "red" newspapers could attack me; but it will not do them any good. We are going to run the "reds" out of the schools of Washington. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want any of my friends to think that I am out for an alien campaign. As a matter of fact, in my 14 years in this House I have been advocating laws to safeguard decent, lawful, and proper alien admissions to the United States, and to insure the union of families. I hope to appeal to this House within the next few days to stay the deportation of a number of lawful aliens in this country, who have committed no crime, while the Congress is preparing some law to assure these decent people here proper, humane relief. I have nothing against anybody, but I will fight just as much as you will to protect this country from subversive poison that enters our shores, either by way of smuggling or by other forms.

Mr. Speaker, if you want something constructive in legislation, do not amend this bill, whether it be on this side of the House or on that side. This committee has given study to this bill for almost 2 years. We are not trying to hurt anybody.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Suppose a European medical association had a member who made some great medical discoveries and he came to this country to lecture on that——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would not have anything to do with this.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Yes, it would. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct in his interpretation of the language of this bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will answer the gentleman if he will be patient for a moment. Section 2 states:

> The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings against any alien in the United States who while in the United States engages in the promotion or dissemination of propaganda instigated from foreign sources or who while in the United States engages in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

Under section 3 (a) we give you a definition of what that actually means for the purposes of this act:

> SEC. 3. (a) The words "propaganda instigated from foreign sources" when used in this act shall only mean—
>
> Any systematic effort, which is directed or supported from known sources outside the territory and jurisdiction of the United States—

In other words, this man to whom the gentleman refers can come and teach and talk, and no one is going to deprive him of free speech or free press, but when we can show that he represents an invisible or foreign government which seeks by its own act to enter this country for the purpose of spreading from foreign headquarters unrest in our labor movement or in any other domestic movement, whether it is fascism, nazi-ism, or any other "ism", I say to you we ought to say that we have the right to tell them to go back home.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman seems exercised about a man coming over here and lecturing, say, on a medical proposition. The bill says:

> Any systematic effort, which is directed or supported from known sources outside the territory * * * which is intended to gain, within the United States, favorable public opinion and support for (1) the adoption in the United States of any opinion, or of any course of action, or of any governmental policy, which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution or laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment. Like my colleague [Mr. BOILEAU], I am afraid of the broadness of this bill, because I fear it may put a weapon into the hands of some people with which to persecute decent, law-abiding aliens, who may or may not express some opinion to arouse the ire of some bureaucrat. We have had a great deal of political persecution of people who did not agree with the opinions of some of those who may hold important positions. I, myself, have been a victim of some of this political persecution, as have my friends and family. We have seen instances where even the income-tax laws have been used to harass and persecute those who did not agree with certain political opinions. I do not want to see this Congress pass a bill so broad that it might serve as a weapon of intimidation and political control in the hands of any officials who may be in office today or in the future.

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

Mr. O'MALLEY. I cannot yield now. I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment inserting the word "unlawful" before the word "propaganda." That should clarify this unnecessary law a little bit and give protection to innocent persons who might incur the ill will of those in power.

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

Mr. O'MALLEY. I shall in a minute. I think that my amendment may clear up some doubts about and restrict the abuses possible under this section, but I still feel it is too broad as now written. We do not need section 2 the way it is written to prevent any unlawful activities and the spread of unlawful propaganda as our laws now stand. As I gather the wording of section 3, it seems to me that anybody who might advocate anything in this country that is contrary to established opinion or to governmental policy could be deported at the will and direction of a Secretary of Labor. When I had the discussion with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] I told him that I believed that a brother of a man in this country awaiting his citizenship papers could have written to his brother alien in this country and asked him to support the N. R. A., and that when the N. R. A. was declared unconstitutional somebody in the Labor Department, if this bill had been the law, could have had that man deported for advocating a governmental policy that was unconstitutional.

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

Mr. O'MALLEY. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. The mere insertion of the word "unlawful" would not be sufficient, because section 3 (a) attempts to define what is propaganda, and you would have to change that section or knock it out. I submit that rather than confuse the issue we should strike this language out in section 2 and strike out all of section 3 (a).

Mr. O'MALLEY. We have to get at one thing at a time in this House. I am not like the gentleman from Texas,

I have always felt that this continuous advertising of communism and Communists has done more to make their ranks grow in this country than anything else. I know that when I was a boy and was told I should not read a book, I tried to get that book and take it up into the attic or behind the woodpile and read it, and when the papers and the Halls of Congress are today full of talk about communism in the schools it is natural that the juvenile mind will want to investigate communism or any other "ism" that is being given all kinds of unnecessary free advertising by some 100 percenters. If those who want and speak about communism would give one-half their time and energy toward eliminating poverty, providing jobs for every man wanting work, communism as a doctrine would disappear.

Mr. CONNERY. But in the case the gentleman speaks of, of an alien writing about the N. R. A., the language of the bill is "any systematic effort." If the individual merely talked about the N. R. A. he would not come under this.

Mr. O'MALLEY. But who is to judge what is "systematic efforts"? Is it to be some bureaucrat in the Department of Labor who speaks when the strings are pulled, or should we rely on the intelligence of our people to tell right from wrong? I am one who believes that our people are too intelligent to need any guardians to tell them what to read, hear, or believe. I will never subscribe to the dictatorship theory of trying to legislate thought or opinion out of existence. That precious guarantee of free speech gives us always the right to refute and defeat false doctrines by truth and fact. To throw a man in jail because his beliefs do not agree with ours, whether he be American or alien, is to hark back to the days of witch burning, inquisition, and feudal tyranny. Provide work, homes, health, and independence for our people, and we will not need to waste their time with laws such as these.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio to the amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 2, line 8, strike out all after the word "engages" and all of line 9 and the first two words in line 10; strike out the period in line 11 and add "or engages in any activities which encourage the violation of any law or which seek to overthrow the Government and nullify the Constitution"; strike out all of section 3.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on this question and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment which I am about to offer will cure this whole situation. My amendment includes the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], and takes out section 3, which seems to be obnoxious. At the same time, it does everything that section 3 really should do.

As modified by my amendment, section 2 will read as follows:

That the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings—

Against whom? Against any alien who engages in any unlawful political activity instigated from foreign sources. This will be enough, so far as that is concerned, and I think will satisfy everybody interested in this proposition.

Then it goes on further to provide—

Or against any alien who engages in any activities which encourage the violation of any law.

In other words, any alien who seeks to set himself up as an advocate of the violation of any particular law or who goes further and seeks to overthrow the Government. I leave out the words "by force and violence", for they are in another statute. Who seeks to overthrow the Government, how? By unlawful activity or any kind of propaganda, whatever it may be, to nullify the Constitution. I think this answers every question and satisfies everybody.

In addition, my amendment goes further, and strikes out all of section 3.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Has the gentleman included the words "United States" in his amendment?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I will accept that modification.

Mr. KRAMER. The gentleman accepts that?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; both as to the United States Government and the United States Constitution.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Why does the gentleman leave out the words "by force and violence"?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is already the law. The law now provides that, but does not provide against unlawful political activities and against unlawful propaganda.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I think the gentleman might just as well strike out the third and final clause of his amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. It is already covered by existing statute.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I did not include the words "by force and violence" because that is included in existing law, but existing law does not protect against the spreading of propaganda advocating the overthrow of government.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Under the gentleman's interpretation of his own amendment, I doubt if George Bernard Shaw could deliver his lectures in the United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. My amendment does not seek to interfere with men like him.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I do not think we want to make ourselves ridiculous.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If the gentleman words his amendment to make it unlawful to advocate the overthrow of the Government, but does not include the phrase "by force and violence", he will make it a criminal offense to advocate or spread any propaganda in favor of a change of government through orderly processes. That would be excluded.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; that would not be considered unlawful, because the Constitution gives that right. The Constitution may be amended through orderly processes. The Constitution itself contains that very provision.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does not the gentleman believe his language goes too far; that, as my colleague from Wisconsin suggests, it goes so far as to make criminal any attempt to advocate a constitutional amendment? Would not a man advocating a constitutional amendment subject himself to the penalties of this bill, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not think it could be so interpreted at all. All I am trying to do is to straighten this tangle out and get along.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I think the gentleman's amendment goes too far, and that under it anybody who advocates a change in our present form of government would subject themselves to penalties.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not agree with the gentleman at all.

Mr. O'MALLEY. What does the gentleman mean by overthrow of government?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am trying to reach the spreading of unlawful subversive propaganda.

Mr. O'MALLEY. What is overthrow of government? Is it change by election, change by amendment of the Constitution, or what?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is a very difficult thing to determine. Whereas the present statute would deal with

those who seek to overthrow the Government by force and violence this would reach those aliens who, inspired by influences from foreign sources, seek to engage in unlawful political activity.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does not the gentleman believe this would reach also the man who advocated a change of government by constitutional amendment?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I think he is excluded. It is not aimed at any lawful change in the form of government at all.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CAVICCHIA. I think the gentleman prepared this amendment with malice aforethought because he would exile the Democrats who are now in power, for they have been accused in the last 4 years of trying to overthrow the Constitution. I urge the gentleman to include as well the words "by force and violence" in his amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman's facetiousness is understood by all of us and is duly appreciated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN and Mr. CELLER rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, inasmuch as several Members are seeking recognition, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York for 2 minutes only in order to be able to recognize some of the others.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio would take the very heart out of this proposed legislation in that it would make it a local proposition, whereas the committee is attempting to stop agents of foreign governments who come to this country for one purpose, but who do something else, which is contrary to the best interests of our country. This amendment changes the whole purpose, not only of section 2 but the following section, in which the committee makes its legislative definitions.

It seems to me if you want something that will help the particular department of the Government involved to stop this flow of propaganda whether it be from the Nazis from left or right or in between, we have to take the bull by the horns and call a spade a spade. What is the use of kidding about it with language? This committee has studied the matter for 2 years. It has had the best experts appear before it, and I am willing to take the opinion of men in the various departments who know the subject than to take an amendment which is offered here on the spur of the moment during debate on the floor and argued for a minute or a minute and a half.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] improves the bill, and if it is adopted I shall vote for this measure. However, I should like to see incorporated in the amendment the words "by force or violence." No one, and certainly not an alien who is here by sufferance, should advocate modification of our institutions by revolution. But proposing changes in the social and economic order by peaceful and democratic means must be distinguished from advocacy of force. While it may be argued persuasively that it is not within the province of visitors to chart the course this Nation should follow, the fact that it is difficult and sometimes impossible to draw the line between a general discussion of problems affecting the world as a whole and specific proposals as to how those problems should be met here should cause us to move slowly in placing restrictions upon the liberty of speech of visitors from abroad when in the exercise of that liberty they keep within due bounds.

Some of the statements made by Mr. George Bernard Shaw during his last visit to this country might have been construed to be within the prohibitions of this bill. Regardless of what you and I may have thought of those statements—personally I regarded them as juvenile twiddle—we should have made ourselves the laughing stock of the world if we had undertaken to make them the ground for deportation.

From the days of the alien and sedition laws to the present time, we have burned our fingers every time we have tampered with the right of free speech. England is the most successful democracy in the world, and it is significant that it is the one country in which it is almost impossible to get into jail by talking too much. The English people believe in letting every agitator have a soap box, knowing that the best way to answer a fool is to give him a chance to expose his folly.

It is said that an American visitor in London, hearing a speaker utter seditious sentiments in Hyde Park, approached a "bobby" and asked him why he did not arrest the offender.

The officer replied, "The only person I could arrest would be somebody interfering with his right to talk."

The Hyde Parks of England are the safety valves of her democracy. So long as the steam blows off there is no explosion. We in the United States have much to learn from the mother country. Certainly we shall do better in following her than in adopting the repressive policies of Germany, Italy, and Russia. We shall do better, too, if we follow our own tradition, which is the tradition of liberty. We tread on dangerous ground when we undertake to curtail, one by one, the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

In this connection let me speak briefly of that un-American piece of legislation known as the "red rider." I am frank to say that I do not want teachers, in Washington or elsewhere, to advocate communism in the schools any more than I would want them to advocate capitalism, or the New Deal, or even Republicanism. It is the function of the public schools to teach children not what to think, but how to think. But to hedge teachers about with restrictions that make it prudent for them to skip the chapters on Russia, in history and geography, is so absurd and so unreasonable that it would make one laugh if it did not also make one want to cry.

I am an uncompromising individualist, and as such have no sympathy with communism, fascism, or any other system or philosophy that would subordinate the individual to a totalitarian state. And it is principally because I am an individualist that I am opposed to the so-called "red rider."

The "red rider" is too much like a Russian ukase to be tolerated in America. It belongs to an order of society such as the Communists would like to establish in the United States but is alien to a country in which freedom of thought and expression have always been taken for granted.

I am opposed to the "red rider" because the very fact that it is on the statute books serves to obliterate a distinction which all who believe in the American system should want to keep clear—the distinction between the brutal suppression that is necessary for the very existence of a communistic society and the freedom of opinion which exists only in democratic states.

If we in America undertake to quarantine people against ideas, we shall only succeed in giving respectability to the devices by which dictators in other lands keep their subjects in intellectual handcuffs. We shall make oppression under a Stalin seem less objectionable, and whatever liberty there is in the United States—or should I say, "in the District of Columbia"?—relatively less desirable and less worth fighting to preserve.

I am opposed to the "red rider" because it gives Communists too much to squawk about. Those gentlemen like to play the role of martyr. They are never so happy, or so well paid, as when it can be made to appear that they are persecuted. For one, I should like to have them seem to be what most of them are—bourgeois who are prosperously engaged in just another kind of racket; orators orating for the very dollars they pretend to despise; writers collecting capitalistic royalties for writing books against capitalism. Certainly we should not keep alive a law that makes communism seem more defensible than it is.

While this bill is under consideration I want to refer briefly also to some activities of which newspapers have in-

formed us during the last 2 days. Those activities remind me of an incident that is said to have happened in the life of a certain Dukhobor in Canada. You know, the Dukhobors have certain ideas that to most people seem peculiar. Once in a while they get the notion that they have a divine right to disrobe and to convert the whole community into a nudist colony. One day the particular Dukhobor of whom I speak came into one of the frontier villages of the Canadian Northwest dressed in his birthday clothes.

It became the responsibility of the policeman who represented constituted order in the community to arrest him; but, unfortunately, the Dukhobor was lithe and young, whereas the policeman was a middle-aged man. A middle-aged man is a fellow who has quit growing at both ends but keeps on growing in the middle. The policeman was encumbered with a big overcoat, a heavy helmet, and a club. It soon became apparent that thus weighted down he could not overtake the Dukhobor; so he discarded his club—he did not feel the need of it. Then he dispensed with his helmet and peeled off his overcoat. I shall not embarrass you by giving every detail of the story, for it is sufficient to say that when the policeman finally captured the Dukhobor one could not tell which was the Dukhobor and which was the policeman. [Laughter and applause.]

So I feel that when our distinguished colleague from Texas and others begin to strip off one by one those rights which have been vouchsafed to us in the fundamental law of the land in their effort to defeat propaganda that is supposed to have entered this country from Russia they may only be hastening the time when it will be impossible for the world to tell which is Russia and which is America. To that thought I desire to call your attention. I feel that I should not be doing my full duty if I did not take the floor today to utter this solemn warning. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, cne can readily see how far one will go if he has a sort of communistic mania when we contemplate what the gentleman from Texas has said today and what he did recently when he sent that letter to the members of the District school system. He went so far as to ask whether or not the teachers believed in God. He went so far as to ask what books they read and whether the books influenced them. It is but one step further to ask what your religion is, whether you are a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Jew. He might next ask whether they read Shakespeare or whether they read the Greek philosophers and to answer whether or not those philosophies have influenced them. I advise each to answer that it is none of his business. If perchance some statement of a philosopher might be in contradistinction to one or more of the principles of our Government and the individual believes in same, the gentleman from Texas would have the person very likely ostracized and banished from our school system. And so it is with this bill. While I am in sympathy with the amendment that has just been offered, my objection goes to the entire bill, because as the previous gentleman has so eloquently stated, it is difficult to determine where to stop. We whittle away one by one all the fine elements of our Bill of Rights that Jefferson gave us, and who you might remember when the Constitution was adopted insisted upon not finally accepting, as far as he was concerned, unless and until the Bill of Rights was included therein. This bill strikes at free speech, the right of petition, and other cherished guaranties of the Bill of Rights, which embraces, by the bye, citizens as well as aliens.

The gentleman who has just preceded me has well stated that if George Bernard Shaw under certain conditions would want to come over here, and lecture on forms of government, he might be banished and excluded. That would hold good for the very distinguished author who died only a few days ago, Gilbert Chesterton, because of his pronouncements, some of which might not jibe with our Constitution.

What under the sun is the Constitution? All the recent decisions of any importance have been the result of divided opinions. Four distinguished jurists say the Constitution is thus-and-so and five others say, "No; it is something else." Who is to tell us what the Constitution really is? I would ask you to pause before you pass a bill of this character.

It is coersive bills of this character that breed discontent. They bring about the very evils sought to be prevented. You cannot cork up emotions. You cannot bottle up opinion. Something bursts if you do. George the Third tried it to his sorrow. Our foundling fathers refused to have plasters over their mouths. They rebelled against regimentation of their thoughts and opinions. The sponsors of the bill are forgetful of our Revolution and why it was fought.

The Czars of Russia tried these sort of bills. Communism is the result.

The Kaiser likewise tried to browbeat. Nazi-ism is the sequel. Fascism was born of force and restriction of free speech and thought.

Hyde Park, London, is the greatest place to let off steam. It is a saving grace of England. Let these wild agitators get it off their chest. It will relieve them and the country as well.

Will anyone please tell me what the last words of the bill mean?—

The application in the United States of any policy of government prevailing in the country wherein is located the foreign headquarters, which, by the advocacy of any religious or racial prejudice or intolerance, tends to foment political acrimony and business animosity in the United States.

What a jumble of words! What confusion of thought!

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill, and am not in favor of striking out its enacting clause, but under the parliamentary situation this is the only motion I can make to get the floor, hence it is pro forma, as it is absolutely necessary to enable me to have an opportunity to answer the gentleman from Minnesota, who without foundation made an attack on me a moment ago.

What is there unreasonable about pertinent questions that could and should be asked under this bill after it is passed and is being enforced? How are you going to determine whether people are violating it or not? It will be necessary for a check-up to be made on them. Would the gentleman from Minnesota criticize anyone for seeing that the law is enforced after we pass it? If not, then why did he criticize me when I responded to the appeal of the fathers and mothers of Washington in their efforts to see that the law against communism is enforced?

On the 1st day of July 1935 a law went into effect here in Washington, that was passed by Congress by the unanimous vote of the House of Representatives and by the unanimous vote of the United States Senate, which prevents any officer or teacher connected with the public schools of Washington from indoctrinating communism in the public schools.

There are 3,169 officers and teachers in the Washington public schools. Most of them are splendid men and women, patriotic and sincere. But there are some, so your subcommittee was constrained upon ample evidence to believe, who are seeking to communize the schools here.

Through their duly accredited representative the fathers and mothers of 63 different citizens' associations in Washington appealed to me, as chairman of our subcommittee, to send a questionnaire to all teachers and officers to ascertain, if possible, which of them believed in communism, or such doctrines of communism as disbelief in God and disbelief in all forms of religion, as these parents furnished the money that paid the salaries of these teachers and officers, and they felt that they had the right to know such facts about their own employees.

The Constitution places the control of the District of Columbia and the schools here, so far as laws are concerned, in Congress, and my subcommittee was the accredited committee of Congress that passes upon all school appropriations; hence, when these fathers and mothers appealed to

me as chairman, through their accredited representative, George E. Sullivan, I felt that they had the inherent right to do so. How are you going to determine whether a party is a Communist, acting under instructions from Russia, except by finding out the facts?

As I said a moment ago, when Mr. George E. Sullivan came before our committee, we had been asked by the Board of Education to appropriate $78,660 for so-called "character education", which we learned was being used to put communism in the schools. Mr. Sullivan came before us, and we asked him these questions:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Sullivan, do you appear in a representative capacity?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do. I appear for the Federation of Citizens' Associations as chairman of their special committee on eliminating antipatriotic and other subversive matter from the District of Columbia public schools.

Mr. BLANTON. You are the duly authorized representative of the Federated Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am.

Mr. BLANTON. How many associations are federated in your organization?

Mr. SULLIVAN. There are between 60 and 65 different organizations, each of which has two delegates to the assembly of the federation, which is our deliberative body.

Mr. BLANTON. And you are their authorized representative?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am.

Mr. BLANTON. They have delegated to you, these sixty-odd associations, the authority to act for them at this meeting?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. And you appear for them?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. And you speak for them?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. And with authority from them?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

This was his authority, and you will find every one of these questions and answers in our hearing before he ever testified.

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

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not, right now, not after what the gentleman said. Whenever a gentleman so far forgets himself that he can make an attack on his colleague with no grounds whatever for it, I cannot yield to him.

When Mr. Sullivan came to my office he stated that—

Practically all of the 3,169 officers and employees of the schools are splendid men and women, but there are a few "reds" among them, just like you will find among all audiences around here, and they are trying to use subversive methods on the pupils, and we want you to submit a questionnaire to them.

What is there wrong in asking them whether or not they are Communists? This is one of the questions. Have not the fathers and mothers here the right to ask that question? Certainly they have.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I cannot yield, Mr. Speaker.

One of the first beliefs of a Communist is that there is no God. Another is to break down religion of all kinds and to destroy churches.

These 63 citizens' organizations, through their representative, Judge George E. Sullivan, said, "Ask them if they believe there is a God", and ask them if they believe in some form of religion—not any particular form of religion but any form. We did not ask them whether they were Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, Buddhist or Mohammedan, we merely, on behalf of the mothers and fathers who pay their salaries, asked them if they believed in some form of religion.

Oh, the gentleman from Minnesota does not like that. He says that is improper. Well, a lot of people back home, I hope, in his district will not think it improper.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I cannot yield. I will leave it to them.

I know that in my office I have a stack of letters numbering more than a thousand from some of the best fathers and mothers in Washington saying, "Mr. BLANTON, we are behind your committee in stamping this communism out of the schools", and we are going to stamp it out in spite of the gentleman from Minnesota. He is not going to stop us. We are not going to be stopped by any specially prepared resolution, which the Speaker of the House promptly rules is improper and out of order. We are going on with this fight.

The "reds" have not yet succeeded in repealing the law against indoctrinating communism in the schools. It is still the law. It has been the law since last July. It will be the law next July. And it will be the law July of next year.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the questionnaire that was sent to the 3,169 officers and teachers of the schools here has been put in the RECORD today. I want it preserved. I want all of the fathers and mothers in Hennepin County in the great State of Minnesota to read that questionnaire, and determine in their own minds whether such questions are improper. Let them determine whether they would want teachers to be teaching their children, if such teachers are Communists, and if they do not believe there is a God, and if they do not believe in some form of religion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not insist on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw the motion. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MALLEY and Mr. MARCANTONIO objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. Has any time been used in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Texas?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman seek recognition in opposition to the motion? If so, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from New York for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What is before the House? Is the question on the motion to strike out the enacting clause?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of discussion about this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and if given opportunity, I shall offer an amendment, on page 2, line 18, after the words "United States", to insert the words "by force or violence", and I think that may cover everything in which we are interested. Some of us agree that this goes too far as it stands now, but that the words "by force or violence" will cover the entire situation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I had made up my mind at the proper time to ask that my amendment be so amended as to include those words, and I shall do that at the proper time.

Mr. CONNERY. I might say to the gentleman that I think the Chairman feels that the rest of his amendment after the period on page 2, after the words "foreign sources", will localize the situation, and takes away from the bill what they intended to do in preventing aliens coming here and advocating communistic, fascist, or nazi propositions which would overthrow the Government. I ask the gentleman if he would read his amendment now just as it is.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. My intention is that the first part of section 2 remain as it is, and apply to aliens who are here who scatter this propaganda of foreign sources, and then the balance of the amendment applies to any alien in this country who seeks to overthrow the Government.

Mr. CONNERY. Has the gentleman "force or violence" in his amendment?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; but I agree to put it in.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I tried to get an opportunity to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] if he believes there are any "reds" in the Democratic administration, when that administration made possible the recognition of Russia, and I thought perhaps the gentleman could inform me how that recognition of Russia came about?

Mr. BLANTON. It did not come about with my consent. I would end the recognition now if I could. It was a great mistake. We may regret it very much. I hope there are not many "reds" in the Democratic Party, and I will say to my friend that I am as good a Democrat as there is on this floor, and I am in favor of kicking out all "reds" from the Democratic Party. I shall work hard to help get them out.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Was the gentleman in favor of the recognition of Russia?

Mr. BLANTON. No. Certainly not. I am now in favor of withdrawing all recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU and Mr. O'MALLEY) there were—ayes 23, noes 147.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

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

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the eloquent speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CHRISTIANSON], I should like to accept the words "by force or violence." May I do that at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to incorporate in his amendment the words "by force or violence." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio to the amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 2, strike out, in line 8, all after the word "engages" and all of line 9 and the first two words in line 10; strike out the period at the end of line 11 and add "or engages in any activities which encourage the violation of any law or which seeks by force or violence to overthrow the Government or nullify the Constitution"; strike out all of section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 62, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk again reported the Boileau amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken—and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were—ayes 51, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LAMNECK] offers a preferential motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAMNECK moves that the bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were ayes 21 and noes 118.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

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

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'MALLEY: Page 2, line 8, after the word "of", insert the word "unlawful"

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The words "propaganda instigated from foreign sources" when used in this act shall only mean—

Any systematic effort, which is directed or supported from known sources outside the territory and jurisdiction of the United States and which is intended to gain, within the United States, favorable public opinion and support for (1) the adoption in the United States of any opinion, or of any course of action, or of any governmental policy, which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or (2) the extension from any foreign country to United States of the application of any religious or racial prejudices and intolerances in official and private life and in business affairs.

(b) The words "unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources" when used in this act shall only mean—

Any activities, identified with official policies of any foreign governmental agency or political party, which are directed or supported from a headquarters located in territory outside the jurisdiction of the United States and which seek to influence political action and thought, within the United States, favorably toward (1) the establishment, by unlawful means or other subversive methods if necessary, in the United States of any principal or policy of government, prevailing in the country wherein is located the foreign headquarters, which is inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution of the United States, or (2) the application in the United States of any policy of government, prevailing in the country wherein is located the foreign headquarters, which, by the advocacy of any religious or racial prejudices or intolerances, tends to foment political acrimony and business animosity in the United States.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if this law had been in force 3 weeks ago when a certain——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I am stating it. If this law had been in force 3 weeks ago, at the time of a certain convention that was held in Cleveland——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not recognize that as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. It was my impression that in order to clarify the language of section 3, in accordance with my amendment in section 2, that the word "unlawful" should be put in there also. I ask unanimous consent that in line 12, section 3, the word "unlawful" be inserted before the word "propaganda."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not recognize that as a parliamentary inquiry. Of course, the Chair, under the present status, does not recognize the gentleman for a unanimous-consent request for that purpose. The Chair will undertake to recognize the gentleman at the proper time to offer his amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: In line 20, page 2, strike out the words "inconsistent with" and insert the words "subversive of"; likewise, on page 3, line 13, strike out "inconsistent with" and substitute the words "subversive of."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the committee has no objection to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman at this time if there is any Member who has an amendment to offer to this section.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'MALLEY: Page 2, line 12, after the word "words", insert the word "unlawful."

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am simply trying to clarify section 3 to make it correspond with the wording of section 2 as amended by my amendment adding the word "unlawful." I hope the amendment is acceptable to the committee. If the chairman of the committee will assure me it is acceptable I will not consume any more time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We have already placed the word "unlawful" on page 2, line 8, and I suppose in order to be consistent we should put it in here.

Mr. O'MALLEY. That is it exactly.

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

Mr. O'MALLEY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Is it my understanding that the word "unlawful", in section 3, now declares what the meaning of "unlawful propaganda" will be?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Yes.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 2, line 12, after the figure, strike out all of subsection (a), beginning in line 12 and ending in line 24.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this language in subsection 3 (a) is entirely unnecessary. As I understand it, my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY] offered an amendment, which was accepted, in line 12 by which he inserted the word "unlawful" before the word "propaganda." Is that true?

Mr. O'MALLEY. That is correct. It was also in the preceding section, in line 8, so that it is in both places.

Mr. BOILEAU. I did not understand the amendment was offered before in line 8. I thought the amendment offered was in line 4; but in either event, this change of the word "unlawful" does not meet the entire problem. Especially is this true if the word "unlawful" is not inserted in section 2.

May I propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Was any amendment adopted which inserted the word "unlawful" in section 2?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment was adopted inserting the word "unlawful" after the word "of" in line 8 and before the word "propaganda."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the mere insertion of the word "unlawful" does not actually change the meaning of the section at all, because in the definition at the beginning of section 3 it is stated "unlawful propaganda instigated from foreign sources when used in this act shall only mean", and then the definition is given; so the insertion of the word "unlawful" does not alter the definition at all, because the same definition that applied to the phrase without the word "unlawful" is made to apply to it with the word "unlawful."

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman must bear in mind that we must take what we can get; and by the inclusion of the word "unlawful" the Department of Labor at least will promulgate regulations, and any alien who is persecuted or harassed unfairly can seek recourse to the courts, and the courts may be able to decide what is lawful and what is unlawful under the Constitution.

Mr. BOILEAU. I submit that even with the word "unlawful" in it the section is just as bad as it was before. I think the same objections that were raised against the bill before still apply.

I believe we should vote to strike out this paragraph because, in my judgment, it is un-American and undemocratic. It is contrary to the fundamental principles of our Government that people cannot come here from foreign lands without the fear of having some bureaucrat subjecting him to deportation because he may say something in good faith and without any thought of undermining or effort to undermine our Government, which might be construed by such bureaucrat as advocating something inconsistent with our Constitution.

Even we Members of the House have demonstrated in the past that we do not always know what is or is not constitutional. The President of the United States apparently is not always sure what is or is not in violation of the Constitution. If we are going to submit some poor, ignorant immigrant to deportation because he happens to follow the example of the leadership of this House and the President of the United States in advocating certain philosophies of government, then it seems to me we are a far cry and a long way from the America which was established here as a refuge from political oppression. This, in my mind, is a direct attack against freedom of speech.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, to accept this amendment would be practically to destroy the purpose of this bill. We specifically define the very language which the gentlemen complain about and which they fear may cause unjust deportation. You do not have to worry about aliens being deported if they are lawfully in this country and are behaving themselves. We are after those aliens who are not friends of this country but who come here in the pay of foreign governments to spread un-American doctrines.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Under section 2 of the bill, could they not have deported George Bernard Shaw for the rather satirical remarks he made when he was here?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; but George Bernard Shaw was speaking for himself. We are dealing here with those individuals who are engaged by foreign governments for pay to do what was done during the World War—to come here and spread these un-American doctrines and movements. This bill would not have any application to the incident to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. FLETCHER. We maintain a system of exchange professorships where American professors exchange their professorships with foreign professors. If this bill were enacted would it not be possible for some fellow who has a phobia along these lines, one of these patriotic paranoiacs to kick out very good, intelligent professors, like Einstein, for instance?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is not the intention to kick out a laborer, a professor, or anybody else. I reiterate my previous statement that what this committee is aiming at and the evil we are trying to root out, is to prevent an alien who comes to our shores under the guise of a visitor, but is found in fact to represent secretly a foreign government for the dissemination of propaganda which is against the best interests of our country. That is all there is to this bill. It has nothing to do with the deportation of aliens generally.

It simply gives us the right to terminate the stay of an alien who comes here on a 1-year permit and who uses the hospitality of this country to spread these subversive doctrines. Instead of having to smell that and stomach it for a year we can deport him.

Mr. Speaker, we want to do like they do in other countries. Let an alien go into Germany and say "boo" about Hitler and he will be shot. Let an alien go into England and breathe wrong and he will be called before the Department of Secret Service. An alien cannot go into any European country and do what the foreign propagandists are doing over here and get away with it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman want to make this Government the same kind as they have over there?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], the author of this bill, made a very elucidating remark. He states what we want to do by means of this law is what they are doing in other countries. He specifically mentioned Germany. I hope he will not revise his remarks but will leave his original statement, because it reveals the real intent behind this bill. I for one am opposed to repeating in this country what they are doing in Germany. I for one am ever opposed to having this country conform its form of government to that of Germany. I for one am ever opposed to destroying the Bill of Rights as guaranteed under our Constitution in order to imitate Germany. The gentleman from New York has revealed by his remark just what the intent of his law is.

The Hearsts, Liberty Leaguers, Tories, Bourbons, and all other reactionaries have launched their campaign of suppression against the civil liberties of the American people.

The first attack is aimed at the alien. During this period of unemployment the alien is an easy target. The native American and the naturalized in many instances has been made to feel that his unemployment is due to the fact that some alien is occupying his job. Unfortunately a great majority of the unemployed workers have become easy and ready victims of this silly propaganda. Therefore, the suppressionists find great support in their program of deporting aliens.

Mind you, however, they are not interested in deporting the docile alien who is willing to work for starvation wages. They are not interested in deporting aliens who are willing to work under conditions such as exist in many of our public-work project colonies, where the worker at the end of the month owes more money to the commissary than he actually receives in wages. They are not interested in deporting aliens who are willing to work as scabs, strikebreakers, industrial ammunition, and agricultural peons. The alien who organizes, the alien who protests, the alien who joins his fellow worker in trying to better their living conditions is the alien whom they are seeking to deport.

It is the old, old story over again. Prior to 1920, when the industrialists were ever hungry for cheap labor, we find, for instance, the American Manufacturers Association severely opposed to restrictive immigration. This was only natural. They found alien labor cheap and submissive. However, this cheap alien labor refused to be cheap labor for long. This submissive alien laborer refused to remain submissive for long. He began to organize, to strike, and to protest for better working conditions. He was impelled by human desire to better his standard of living and that of his children. This alien laborer was able to beat the sweatshops of New York City to a standstill. It was the pioneer spirit of the alien who brought the torch of unionism among the textile workers of New England. Labor leaders may come and go, but the two outstanding martyrs of the labor movement will always be two aliens, Niccola Sacco and Bartolemeo Vanzetti.

Alien labor on the whole was no longer docile, and no longer submissive, and no longer willing to be exploited. Consequently, this type of alien labor was no longer desirable to the exploiter of labor. In 1922, the American Manufacturers Association and all of the industrialists insisted on closing America's door to immigration, and in 1936 the suppressionists seek to deport the alien whose conduct becomes inconsistent with the best interests of the exploiter of labor.

The depression paved the way for this program of deportation. People were made to believe that fewer aliens in America would make more jobs for Americans. Hence any form of deportation can very easily receive the approbation of a great portion of the American people, especially among the unemployed. Here the suppressionists find very fertile territory for their scheme.

This bill, therefore, is the first shot fired in this campaign against the progressive alien. It is in line with the program of labor exploiters and reactionaries in general. It is aimed at the militant alien in the United States. It seeks to terrorize the militant worker. It plays into the hands of the lowest labor exploiter. You want this bill to fight subversivism? In fact, you are aiding the real subversives. Those who would destroy our Bill of Rights are the real subversives. The reactionaries are trying to set up a dictatorship. Pass this bill and you help to destroy the Bill of Rights. Destroy the Bill of Rights and you are doing the work for these reactionaries.

Mr. Speaker, I say this bill is not only un-American but it is subversive. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on this amendment now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU], which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Boileau amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SCOTT: Strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as I view it, reads a good deal like some of the more inflammatory of the Hearst editorials, and it is an additional reason for my opposition to the bill. I concur heartily with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] in his view of the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I personally consider myself just as good and loyal an American citizen as any Member in this House or in the country, and a little better than some that I might mention, so far as loyalty to our form of government is concerned.

The bill under consideration is brought in here under the guise of an attack on communism. That has always been popular. I recognize that fact. It is especially popular in the House, and it will always find its supporters. I would support a bill of that kind, too, if I tnought the bill was going to eliminate the possibility of any Communists from a foreign country creating a communistic form of government in the United States. If this bill sought to accomplish that purpose, I would be for it; but I think it goes much too far in its provisions. I consider it dangerous to the Bill of Rights.

In the argument on this bill this afternoon the proponents have shouted, "Communism; communism; communism."

I think that in place of spending all of our time here attacking the possibility of the spread of communism in the United States and the establishment of a communistic government we should give a little of our attention likewise to the possibility of the establishment of a Fascist or a Nazi form of government in the United States by use of force and violence; we would, I believe, be giving our attention to a much more serious problem. I am not as much afraid of the Communists in this country as I am afraid of the Fascists in this country.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is always shouting about "reds." We have been told about the "red" newspapers, about the "red" sympathizers, the "red" Members of this House, and the "red" individuals on the Hill. I have no idea to whom he refers. What is a "red"? If there are any

"reds" here, so, too, are there Fascists on the Hill. This has been very definitely proven by some of the things that have happened recently.

The Fascists have a mouthpiece in the Hearst papers of the District. There are those who might be called the Fascist leaders on Capitol Hill, who attempt, by threats and intimidation, to keep down any criticism that might be leveled against the action of any committee or the chairman of any committee or any subcommittee of this House. Attempts have been made to break down any opposition by deliberately using Fascist methods that would put the recipient of a letter in such fear that he would not dare open his head in reprisal. This very thing has happened. The president of this federation of associated citizens, mentioned by the gentleman from Texas, has said that he did not believe that the federation dare do anything about that letter, because at the present time the District of Columbia appropriation bill is in conference and nobody wanted to arouse the ire of the chairman of that subcommittee, because he might do something else to the District.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I should like to get the reaction of the gentleman from California on this point. Under the wording of this bill, if a member of the English or French Parliament came to America and advocated the restoration of the N. R. A., could he not be deported under this language?

Mr. SCOTT. That is the way I interpret the bill. I also think when the eminent Japanese Christian Kagawa was over here recently speaking on the subject of cooperatives and attempting to establish in the United States a feeling in favor of the establishment of such cooperatives, he was doing something that might tend to arouse some reactionary businessmen and stir them up over the possibilities of his particular proposal. Under my interpretation of this bill, I believe he could be deported.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I wish to express my agreement with the statement of the gentleman that we have to be more afraid in this country of a Fascist dictatorship today than we have to be afraid of communism.

Mr. SCOTT. Right.

And, now, Mr. Speaker, unlike the recent motion that was offered to strike out the enacting clause, I mean this, and I ask for a vote on the motion. Let this bill be returned to the committee for revision.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and the motion was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 3, line 19, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. That an alien who entered the United States either from a foreign country or an insular possession, either before or after the passage of this act, shall be deported in the manner provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155, 156), at any time if he—

"(1) Has been convicted of violation of any narcotic law of any State, Territory, insular possession, or the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this clause shall not apply to an alien who proves that he was an addict and was neither a dealer in nor a peddler of narcotics or their derivatives; or

"(2) Has been convicted in the United States within 5 years of the institution of deportation proceedings against him of a felony or any other crime involving moral turpitude (even if the alien was not sentenced to imprisonment); or

"(3) Knowingly and for gain encouraged, induced, assisted, or aided anyone to enter the United States in violation of law, or on more than one occasion knowingly encouraged, induced, assisted, or aided anyone to enter the United States in violation of law; or

"(4) Has been convicted in the United States within 5 years of the institution of deportation proceedings against him of the crime of possessing or carrying any concealed or dangerous weapon (even if the alien was not sentenced to imprisonment).

"The Secretary of Labor may specifically designate persons holding supervisory positions in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to issue warrants for the arrest of aliens believed to be subject to deportation under this or any other statute: *Provided*, That no person shall act under a warrant issued by himself.

"Any employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall have power to detain for investigation any alien who he has reason to believe is subject to deportation under this or any other statute. Any alien so detained shall be immediately brought before an immigrant inspector designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Labor and shall not be held in custody for more than 24 hours thereafter unless prior to the expiration of that time a warrant for his arrest is issued.

"The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

"The provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws (including sec. 19 of the Immigration Act of Feb. 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 155)), and shall be enforced as part of such laws."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the amendment in order to give the gentleman an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of some importance to all the Members, and I think it will be profitable, whether you agree with me or not, to let me have your attention for the 5 minutes I have.

This is the amendment for the deportation of criminal aliens, which I referred to in general debate this morning. You probably did not hear the amendment read, owing to the confusion in the Hall, and I may say that this amendment is not my language. This amendment is a provision for the deportation of criminal aliens from this country which was taken bodily from the Kerr bill reported by the Committee on Immigration. So if there is any trouble with the language of this bill, it has at least been given thorough and complete study by the Committee on Immigration and came out of that committee with its approval.

It provides nothing but the things which the Kerr bill provided for getting rid of criminal aliens who have been infesting this country for years. You may ask any Member of this House whether he favors the deportation of criminal aliens, and he would tell you, "Yes, he is very much in favor of it"; but every time we undertake to do it it has either got to be hooked up with some bill which lets a whole lot of people into this country who have no business here, or it has got to be subject to a point of order. I wish to test the good faith of the chairman and the membership of the Committee on Immigration. This is not my language. This is their language. They said that the deportation of criminal aliens is a thing much to be desired. They wrote it into law. I have adopted their words. I understand there is to be a point of order made upon it. I ask the gentleman, in all good faith, in all good confidence, not to make a point of order on this amendment, which he says is most desirable, and which he has told this House repeatedly he is trying to get through and enacted into law.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact the sections, as offered in the gentleman's amendment, are only part of the general law which contains other provisions?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Certainly they are only a part. Certainly it is only a portion of the other bill, and the only reason they let it go out in the other bill was because there were features in the Kerr bill that they knew would open the bars to a certain extent. I am undertaking to close up the bars on criminal aliens, and it affects no other class or kind of people. I appeal to the Immigration Committee, and especially to the chairman of that committee, to show his good faith on this subject of the deportation of criminal aliens, and not to make the point of order which he has reserved. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his point of order?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is not germane to the bill in question. Secondly, it covers certain laws and sections and amends laws going back to 1916, 1917, 1918, 1924, 1926, 1930, and 1932. We could not possibly, by any means of calculation, even assuming we desire these amendments, in good conscience and properly and in fairness to the departments and the Government, write into this bill almost a new immigration act. The Committee on Immigration not only provided for the deportation of criminal aliens, but also it has provided relief for deserving aliens who technically may not be by right in the United States, because they had not paid a head tax of $8 several years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to address the Chair on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under section 2 of the bill under consideration, the Secretary of Labor shall be authorized and directed to institute deportation proceedings against certain persons engaged in unlawful practices. My amendment goes a step further on the same subject of deportation and provides that those people who have already violated the law and have been convicted shall be subjected to deportation just as much as those people who, while they advocate unlawful things, have never been convicted. It seems to me that so far as the question of germaneness is concerned, the purpose of this bill under section 2 and the purpose of section 4 which I have offered are identically the same—for the deportation of criminal aliens. Section 2 of the present bill provides for the deportation of those criminal aliens who never have been convicted of the crime for which they are being deported. My amendment provides for the deportation of those people and only those who have been convicted. It seems to me that the two questions are on all fours, and that my amendment is germane to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in the opinion of the Chair, affects an entirely different class of aliens than those covered by the bill pending before the House. Section 2 confines itself to the discrimination of unlawful propaganda instituted from foreign sources or relates to any person—

who while in the United States engages * * * in unlawful political activities instigated from foreign sources.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia relates to entirely different classes than the class covered by the pending bill.

There are precedents for the decision of the Chair. Cannon's Precedents, page 602, section 3046:

To a bill regulating entry of aliens into the United States, an amendment providing like restriction on admission of anarchists, Bolsheviks, and others was held not to be germane.

The Chair is of opinion that the principle underlying the ruling referred to is applicable to the present question. For these reasons the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the opinion of the Chair, but in the hope that the House may not agree with the Chair, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

The question was taken and the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. In line 11, page 3, the word "principle" is misspelled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the spelling of the word "principle" in line 11 on page 3 will be corrected.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state the point of order.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that the gentleman from New York is out of order in moving the previous question. We have a right to offer amendments. Under the rule adopted for the consideration of this bill we have a right to offer amendments, and I rise for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair overrules the point of order because the motion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is in order and is of higher privilege. The only way for Members to be able to offer amendments is to vote down the previous question.

Mr. BOILEAU. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is it not proper at this time to offer amendments without the privilege of debating them?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the previous question must be voted down before any amendment can be offered. The question is, Shall the previous question be ordered?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'MALLEY) there were ayes 137 and noes 31.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'MALLEY) there were ayes 172 and noes 22.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

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

So the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized.

RECIPROCAL IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS UPON CERTAIN ALIENS SEEKING ENTRY AS ACTORS, VOCAL MUSICIANS, ETC.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12325) to protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I offer a substitute in lieu of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, submits the following committee amendment to the bill H. R. 12325: Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of the immigration law to the contrary, no alien actor, vocal musician, operatic singer, solo dancer, solo instrumentalist, or orchestral conductor shall hereafter be admitted to the United States, whether seeking entry for temporary stay or for permanent residence, unless prior to issuance of visa the Secretary of Labor has received an application for permission to enter for professional engagements and such permission has been granted to the alien, prior to his embarkation from foreign territory, by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to provisions hereinafter stated in this act.

SEC. 2. The number of otherwise admissible alien actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, solo dancers, solo instrumentalists, and orchestral conductors admissible to the United States under this act from any foreign country during any calendar year shall hereafter be limited to the number of American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, solo dancers, solo instrumentalists, and orchestral conductors, of similar qualifications, which the government of such foreign country has, upon application, granted permission to enter such foreign country for professional engagements during the same calendar year.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the limitations as prescribed by section 2 herein, the Secretary of Labor may authorize the admission for temporary stay for professional engagements during specified periods of time of any alien actor, vocal musician, operatic singer, solo dancer, solo instrumentalists, or orchestral conductor, subject to

the provisions of this act, if otherwise found admissible as a nonimmigrant under the immigration laws, upon application made to and approved by the Secretary of Labor prior to the alien's departure from any foreign country upon a finding by the Secretary of Labor, after a full hearing and investigation, that an artist, having qualifications similar to those of the alien seeking admission under this section, cannot be found in the United States among unemployed citizens or lawful permanent resident aliens.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the limitations as prescribed by section 2 herein, the Secretary of Labor may authorize the admission for permanent residence for professional engagements or career of any alien actor, vocal musician, operatic singer, solo dancer, solo instrumentalist, or orchestral conductor, subject to provisions of this act, if otherwise found admissible as an immigrant under the immigration laws, upon application to and approval by the Secretary of Labor after a full hearing and investigation prior to the alien's departure from any foreign country upon a finding by the Secretary of Labor that the permanent admission of such alien artist would not immediately displace, or prevent employment of, a citizen or lawful permanent resident alien having similar professional qualifications to those possessed by the alien seeking admission under this section.

SEC. 5. The question of availability in the United States of citizens or lawful permanent resident aliens who are actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, solo dancers, solo instrumentalists, or orchestral conductors, and who are unemployed or subject to displacement by admission of alien artists under this act, shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor, who is directed to seek the cooperation and counsel of reputable American organizations and associations of actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, solo dancers, solo instrumentalists, or orchestral conductors, before making such determination.

SEC. 6. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act; but all rules and regulations insofar as they relate to the administration of this act by consular officers abroad, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State, on the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor. This act, and rules and regulations issued pursuant thereto, are in addition to and not in substitution for the existing immigration laws and shall be enforced as part of such laws, rules, and regulations.

Mr. DICKSTEIN (interrupting the reading of the substitute). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the substitute.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, to that I object.

(The Clerk concluded reading the substitute.)

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which, if passed, will protect American actors and artists in this country. At the present time none of our artists or actors can enter any foreign country to do any work under contract without first getting a labor permit, and then they are permitted only a short stay.

On the other hand, we are on the receiving side. We are receiving in this country thousands of actors in Hollywood. They are going there in flocks. Some are not actors at all, but they get a contract from somebody in the United States and the American consul is compelled to give them a visa because they do not come under the contract-labor provision; in other words, the consul is compelled to issue visas to a lot of "hams" just because they come from European countries. Some producers like their foreign names in preference to American names, American art, and American artists.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 15,000 American actors are on relief under P. W. A.; they are acting on public money. The producers in this country are not interested in American art.

In this bill we simply ask that before any person from abroad is brought into this country to perform, he or she must apply, or the producer in Hollywood must apply, to the Department of Labor and prove to the Department that they cannot obtain people in this country to do the same work; in other words, give the Americans a break first, and if they cannot find Americans, then they can bring the foreigners in.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SISSON. Had this bill been the law some time ago would it not have kept out, for example, that famous group of English players known as the Ben Greet Players, who came here from England to play Shakespeare?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We are not going after people possessing distinguished merit.

Mr. SISSON. What is the difference between a distinguished actor and a "ham" actor?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That will be determined by their standing in their art.

Mr. SISSON. I do not believe the Department of Labor or any other department would be able to draw the line between what is distinguished and what is not distinguished in the realm of art.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This bill, as I say, is designed to protect American actors and artists.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to use the time allotted me for general debate under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood that the amendment stage had been reached. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from New York and he was recognized for 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, all time has not been consumed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. We have had no time whatever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can be recognized under the 5-minute rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Under the rule on each of these bills 30 minutes was allowed for debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment has been offered and is now pending.

Mr. CELLER. The chairman of the committee rose and asked for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But he offered an amendment which has been read and is now pending.

Mr. CELLER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is not this a substitute amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Even if a substitute amendment were read, that would not rob the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the time allowed them under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman did not yield time to anyone. The gentleman from New York offered an amendment. The Clerk read the amendment and time, under the rule, had expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. At what point was it incumbent upon the chairman of the committee to claim his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After the Clerk reported the bill.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum. We are not going to have this bill railroaded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that Members can obtain the floor under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If the chairman of the Immigration Committee did not take any of his time, and there were 15 minutes allotted to the minority side, how did the chairman of the Immigration Committee get time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He offered an amendment and spoke under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The chairman of the Immigration Committee offered an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He offered a substitute amendment.

Mr. O'MALLEY. What amendment was that? May we have the amendment read again?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to the original bill by direction of the Committee on Immigration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And the amendment was reported.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to get acquainted with the procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Did the gentleman ask unanimous consent to offer his substitute, or by what procedure did he get the substitute amendment before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman offered his amendment as a matter of right.

Mr. O'MALLEY. As an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As an amendment; as a matter of right.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I understood the gentleman to say he offered a substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He offered a substitute amendment by direction of the committee.

Mr. O'MALLEY. By direction of the committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes. He offered a substitute amendment to the bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the chairman of the Immigration Committee a question. Is my understanding correct that the American Federation of Musicians, of which Mr. Webber is the president, were opposed to the musicians being included in this bill at all?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is why the committee amendment is now offered in substitution of the original bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Is my understanding correct that Mr. Webber, president of the American Federation of Musicians, or the Musicians' Union, is in favor of this substitute?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This eliminates the musicians completely.

Mr. CONNERY. Are they in favor of it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no question about that, because it eliminates them entirely. They stated they did not want to be included in this bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Did Mr. Webber appear before the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Counsel appeared, and there was an agreement, which is the reason for the introduction of another bill. We are now offering the substitute bill.

Mr. CONNERY. Is that satisfactory to them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MEAD. It occurs to me if the musicians' union saw fit to be eliminated from the provisions of this bill, we ought to make inquiry as to the attitude of other organizations and associations who are still included in the bill. If it is advantageous for one group to escape the penalties included in the bill, what about the other groups that are left in the bill? Has the gentleman any information about that matter?

Mr. CONNERY. No. I know one of the reasons the musicians are against it is because employers bring famous conductors over here from Europe, who take half pay to come to the United States and do American conductors out of their jobs. The foreign conductors will work cheaper than the American conductors, and the same situation is true with the musicians. I know of the instance of a conductor, one of the leading conductors of the United States, Ray Kavanaugh, who was Earl Carroll's leader in many New York hits, who was not allowed to appear in Europe because the union over there refused to allow him to work in Europe. It seems to me we may be opening the door pretty wide. I do not know about the actors, but that is the position of the musicians.

Mr. MEAD. Has the gentleman any figures with reference to the number of American stars employed in European countries as against the number of European stars employed in this country?

Mr. CONNERY. I have not the figures, but I can say there are hundreds of European stars working in the United States and very few American stars working in Europe. They take better care in keeping American actors out than we do in keeping foreign actors from the United States. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON], who was a very distinguished actor on the stage before he came to Congress, will tell you that the English actors alone drove many American actors off the stage in New York.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes. That was some years ago. At that time, when American actors were commanding a salary of $400 to $800 a week, English actors came over here in hordes to work for $150 a week. Does this bill prohibit the importation of foreign actors? Are the motion-picture producers against it?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; they are all against it.

Mr. SCHULTE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCHULTE. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the musicians' organizations wish to be exempt from this particular bill owing to the fact they believe they are secure enough under the other act? That is the reason this bill was completely changed.

Mr. CONNERY. How does that apply to the actors in general? I understand there are very few who can come into the United States today, but that under this reciprocal proposition they say "We will let you send in 10 if you will let us send 10 to Europe."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the Speaker recognize me following the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY]?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will be fair.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. The question I wanted answered is whether this is really going to protect the American actor or open the door by allowing the Secretary of Labor to let in some more actors from Europe.

Mr. SCHULTE. Only to the extent there is reciprocity provided for in the bill. In other words, the bill allows as many American actors to go into foreign countries as we allow foreign actors to come in here. It seems that in the past the practice has been that they have flooded this country with actors because we did not have this particular provision.

Mr. CONNERY. And we did not send any of them over there.

Mr. SCHULTE. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does the gentleman think that under this bill we can get crooners shipped over to Europe?

Mr. CONNERY. Well, I like crooners myself. I like Rudy Vallee, Bing Crosby, and the rest of them. I think they are artists in their line.

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

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

Mr. MEAD. This bill, as I understand it, means a complete disbarment of the ordinary actor, oftentimes referred to as the "ham" actor.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not like to have any actor referred to as "ham." [Laughter.]

Mr. MEAD. But it permits the entry into this country of those who are in the category of stars or artists, and therefore such men as Representative HOUSTON and Representative SCHULTE and the distinguished Representative from Massachusetts would not be barred or discriminated against under the provisions of this measure.

Mr. CONNERY. I thank my good friend from New York for putting us in that category. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

I think the Members should know what they are voting on and I may say that this bill has not been explained by anybody but, in a word, it seeks to apply a sort of tariff barrier just as previous administrations sought to keep out foreign importations by setting up tariff walls. We now seek to apply tariff walls to personalities and artists, just as though these artists or these musicians or these actors were just so many sacks of potatoes, or just so many ears of corn.

The minute you put up a tariff wall, or a tariff quota, against British, or German, or French personalities, opera singers, solo dancers, or whatever you may call them, they are going to retaliate, and they are going to build a higher tariff wall of art and talent, if I may use those terms; just a little bit higher than yours, and then you are going to respond with a still higher wall, and then you are going to put all art in a strait jacket. I do not think you want to do this, but you will do it under the provisions of this substitute.

What was the first bill? The first bill was the bill on which we have a report and it provided that actors or artists could come over to this country if they were of distinguished merit and ability. This is stricken from the bill and makes the bill far worse.

If you are going to apply this quota system involved in this bill to actors and artists, why not apply it to bricklayers and machinists and other laborers? This is the first time in the history of all immigration statutes that you seek to apply a sort of tariff or quota to artists.

What is the evil that this bill seeks to repeal? There is no invasion to the American stage by foreign actors. When I testified before the Immigration Committee on February 5 I stated that there were 31 plays running in New York. Of these, there are only seven in which one or more British or Canadian actors or actresses were employed. They were Call It a Day, Pride and Justice, Ethan Frome, Libel, Victoria Regina, Jubilee, and Lady Precious Stream. In those 7 productions there were less than 20 British or Canadians out of probably more than 500 actors and actresses, all told. Let us take the play Call It a Day. It contains several prominent British actors in the cast—Gladys Cooper, Phillip Merivale, and Lawrence Grossmith. It is a play about English family life. Take these British actors out of the cast and replace them with Americans endeavoring to portray purely English life and manners and the play would be a dismal failure. Libel concerns an English courthouse with decidedly English barristers, judge, and jury. It is as utterly British as Cheshire cheese. American actors would be decidedly miscast.

Films like Mutiny on the Bounty, Captain Blood, and Calvacade contain many British in the cast, but those films made more money for the American producers in the British Empire than in America—thus giving employment to thousands and thousands of Americans. Last year the play Wind and Rain was produced in New York. It dealt with students at Edinburgh University. The effect of the play depended altogether on the presentation of the atmosphere of a Scotch boarding house. Most of the actors producing that atmosphere were not of distinguished merit or ability. They would have been barred by this bill. The effectiveness of this play would have been destroyed, because it was a play of atmosphere, not of plot. Journey's End was a play concerning British tommies in the trenches. It was a drama essentially of British character. The passage of this bill would have made proper presentation of Journey's End impossible.

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

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. CURLEY. Is not the point made by the gentleman carefully taken care of in section 2?

Mr. CELLER. I know section 2 and I know what the gentleman is going to say—that if you cannot find such an artist here you can bring a foreign artist in—but who is to determine that? Somebody in the Labor Department?

Tremendous pressure will be brought to bear upon those in the bureaus to show you that people in this country who want to take that part or lead that band are perfectly capable of doing so—just as good as a foreigner—and thereby refusal of the visa of a man or woman wanted over here will be brought about.

Other countries aid the drama and music and the art of music. They subsidize productions and musicians. They put actors and dramatists on pensions. They appoint poet laureates. We, on the other hand, tax admissions and pass restrictive measures of the type of the instant bill. No proper explanation was given of this bill. In a word, it seeks to set up something in the nature of tariff barriers on the importation of alien actors, musicians, singers, dancers, instrumentalists, and orchestral conductors. It limits the admissions of such artists into the United States to a number of similar American artists that are admitted into any other country.

In effect, it says to all countries, "We are going to erect tariff barriers against art and artists." It is offered in the hope that foreign nations will quail and become frightened. We tried this idea of "stand and deliver" in tariff legislation years ago. We held, as it were, a tariff pistol at the head of other nations. What happened? They did not give a tinker's damn about our threats. They retaliated by pointing a pistol at us. They erected tariff walls higher than ours. We responded by erecting walls yet higher. Now we are applying the same principle to art and artists. Why limit these walls to actors and instrumentalists, and so forth? Why single them out? Why not apply the so-called quota system to others?

By this bill we say to England, "We will let in 100 British actors if you take in 100 American actors." Why just limit this to actors and artists? Why not extend it to bricklayers, mechanics, corset makers, doctors, nurses?

Under this bill Arturo Toscanini could be kept out of our country if the Italian quota of orchestra leaders or artists were filled. Lawrence Tibbetts could be kept out of England by the same token—if England followed our example and adopted a similar measure—if the American quota for singers were filled.

Of course, the proponents will answer that section 3 of the bill would permit the Secretary of Labor to authorize the admission into this country of unique and unusual artists, after an investigation which would show that similar artists could not be found in the United States. Under this, the cry will always be raised that an artist here in the United States is just as good as the desired foreign artist. Extreme pressure will be brought to bear upon the Secretary of Labor. As a result, a Toscanini would be kept out of America and a Tibbett would be kept out of England.

Let us beware of these tariff-artist walls. We are trying to break down these commodity tariff walls by reciprocal treaties. We have at last come to our senses as to commodities. Shall we start building instead artist-tariff-wall Frankensteins?

You cannot treat artists in quotas as so many sacks of potatoes or bales of cotton. No two actors or artists are alike. They are personalities and are wanted for particular roles, for particular parts, for particular functions. You cannot substitute one solo instrumentalist for another—a violinist for an oboe player, or a harpist for a tuba player, or a bandmaster for a concertmaster. Next we would be trading a George Arliss for two American tap dancers. We would give a Katharine Cornell for three Swiss yodlers, or a Charles Laughton for a couple of ham jugglers. Finally, we would let George Bernard Shaw come into this country in return for a dozen "pulp magazine" writers à la Laura Jean Libby.

If this bill had been enacted some years ago, I question whether or not Charles Chaplin, Lynn Fontaine, Marie Dressler—who unfortunately is now dead—Lionel Barrymore, Leslie Howard—to name but a few—would have been admitted. At the time of their entrance they were merely persons. Now they are personalities. The quotas could have then been filled. What a loss that would have been to the American drama and the American screen.

Cavalcade, a very famous motion picture, was a pageant of English history. Several English artists were brought over to play in it. Their presence made the picture a success. Their parts could not have been played by Americans. The success of that movie meant the employment of thousands of American supernumeraries—ushers, scene shifters, musicians, carpenters, painters, designers, dressmakers, tailors, laborers, and extras. The same might be said concerning the pictures Mutiny on the Bounty, Tale of Two Cities, and Captain Blood.

A former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in a radio address, said:

There is a growing conviction among foreign merchants that our films are the subtlest but most effective type of advertising for American goods.

The auxiliary services rendered by the American motion-picture industry to world trade are too well known to require extended description. It has been proved beyond question that our motion pictures, bringing to other peoples an idea of the comforts and conveniences of American life, help to sell countless other kinds of American merchandise, thereby stimulating our entire foreign trade and commerce.

I was curious to know the British attitude toward our American actors. I herewith set forth correspondence between the British Actors' Equity Association and the British Ministry of Labor. The attitude of the British Ministry of Labor shows free admission of American artists and entertainers.

BRITISH ACTORS' EQUITY ASSOCIATION,
Holborn, London, E. C. 1, March 11, 1936.

HENRY MOSKOWITZ, Esq.,
Executive Adviser, The League of New York Theaters,
1501 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR MR. MOSKOWITZ: I enclose herewith the particulars you request in your letter of the 20th February.

As I anticipate that you may be using this as evidence before Congress, I thought it necessary to obtain the information from H. M. Government, and also to have it authenticated by the appropriate department.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED M. WALL,
Hon. General Secretary.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR,
3, Richmond Terrace, Whitehall,
London, S. W. 1, March 10, 1936.

A. R. 3095/1936

DEAR MR. WALL: Enquiry has been made into the questions affecting the admission of American actors into Great Britain, about which you sent me on March 2 a copy of a letter addressed to you by the League of New York Theaters.

I am afraid it is not possible to give you at short notice a list of American actors now working in this country, but the request from New York will perhaps be sufficiently met by a statement of the recent issues and refusals of permission to American actors. It will probably be of interest, both to your association and to your New York correspondent, to have a comprehensive statement covering the various separate groups of artists and entertainers, and such a statement in respect of the year 1935 is enclosed. The statement shows that the total number of applications during that year was 914, and that only 11 of these were refused; the figures for theatrical artists are 103 applications and 2 refusals. Notes as to the reason for refusal are given at the foot of the statement.

These figures confirm that the Ministry's general policy to issue freely permits for foreign artists and entertainers is being maintained.

The statement does not include any reference to American bands, to which special considerations apply. It is the Department's present policy not to issue permits in respect of American bands, for the reason that under regulations passed a short time ago, British bands were debarred from taking engagements in the United States. It is felt that so long as this attitude is maintained, the issue of permits for American bands to take engagements here would not be justified. We are quite ready to reconsider this attitude as soon as we have evidence that the United States authorities are equally willing to reverse their policy in respect of British bands. (The reference is only to bands of the light entertainment type; it does not apply to orchestras such as the New York Philharmonic which would, of course, be admitted without question.)

There is no objection to your sending a copy of this letter and of the enclosed statement to the League of New York Theaters if you so desire.

Yours sincerely,

R. E. GOMME.

A. M. WALL, Esq.,
Hon. Gen. Secretary, British Actors' Equity Association.

[Enclosure]

Statement of applications in 1935 for permission for United States actors, artists, and entertainers

Type of employment	Number of permits issued by Ministry of Labour	Number of cases of permission given by home office to United States nationals already in the country	Number of refusals
Legitimate stage	95	6	[1] 2
Variety and cabaret	625	6	[2] 2
Concert vocalists	16	1	
Concert instrumentalists	40	2	
Film artists	36	6	
Circus artists	13		
Boxers and wrestlers	39	2	
Miscellaneous	15	1	[3] 7
Total	879	24	11

[1] Two applications for permission for American students to theatrical engagements (unpaid in 1 case and at a low rate of salary in the other) that could readily be filled by British subjects.

[2] (*a*) Variety artist working on the minimum rate who had already completed 6 months' employment here; (*b*) application for permission for variety artist by an unregistered agency.

[3] This item includes 4 professional dancing instructors and 3 ice-hockey players.

Under these circumstances, what is the need of this bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word to correct the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that under the present law no bricklayer or laborer can enter the country because the law prohibits them from doing so, but the present law does not prohibit the flock of alien so-called actors from all sections of the world coming here. As a matter of fact, every producer and every moving-picture operator has scouts throughout the European countries to look for talent. They bring them in by the boatload, you might say, upon the theory that they are going to develop foreign art, without giving the American artists a similar opportunity. This is going to stop the number that has been coming in, and I hope that no amendment will be made to this bill.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that during recent years there has not been much of an incentive for American actors to draw them into foreign countries?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They would not let them come in.

Mr. HOUSTON. And even here Americans could not get a job.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are 15,000 on relief now under the P. W. A.

Mr. HOUSTON. But American actors would have an opportunity to get work, if you put in this quota.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York as a substitute for the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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

CONDITIONS OF LABOR UNDER CONTRACT WITH UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 549, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 549

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 3055, a bill to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts, loans, or grants by the United States, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of

the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] 30 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 1, line 12, after the period insert the following: "It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now in the bill, and such substitute, for the purpose of amendment, shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution from the Committee on Rules provides for consideration of what is known as the Walsh-Healey bill, which bill regulates specifications in connection with the purchase of supplies by the Government of the United States. It provides that no less than the prevailing minimum wage shall be paid to workers in the community where the supplies are manufactured or where the work is performed. It provides that there shall be not more than 8 hours a day for those who labor nor in excess of 40 hours per week, and provides further that no person under 18 years of age shall be employed. It provides, further, that the factories shall be conducted under sanitary conditions, free from hazardous conditions, and provides for the safety and health of the employees. It provides, further, that no convict labor shall be employed in the manufacture of these supplies.

It makes certain exemptions. For instance, supplies of materials that should be purchased in the open market, or stock mechandise, in other words, as I understand it, and that nothing to be purchased under $10,000 in amount shall be considered; that agricultural, nursery, dairy, and perishable products shall not be considered subject to the law.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is a type of social security that has been considered for a great many years. The Government in buying its supplies should lead the way in providing reasonable hours of work, limiting them to 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week, and should provide a minimum wage according to the scale prevailing in the community.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. This is not an N. R. A., nor has it any connection with it?

Mr. GREENWOOD. No; it has nothing to do with that, concerning any arrangement of codes in industry or business as such; it applies only to supplies purchased by the Government for Government use.

Mr. HOUSTON. No code?

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. We found out that the 40 hours under the P. W. A. worked out beautifully.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We believe there is great advantage gained under the operation of the National Recovery Act.

Mr. CONNERY. As we have already seen it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if any hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary or a subcommittee thereof as to the possible effect of the 40-hour mandatory provision?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I presume that such hearings were had on that provision. The Rules Committee understood there had been hearings on all provisions of the bill, and the bill was reported. The chairman of the committee appeared before the Committee on Rules. Just how elaborate those hearings were on that particular point, some member of the Committee on the Judiciary could answer better than I can.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My information is that none was held on the 40-hour per week provision.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I cannot say as to that.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I was very much interested to hear the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Labor, Mr. CONNERY, that the 40-hour week was satisfactory. I am glad to know the chairman of the Committee on Labor is in favor of the 40-hour week.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I inadvertently said "40-hour." As a matter of fact, under the P. W. A. it was 30 hours, and it worked beautifully. If the gentleman will look up the law he will see that.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Now, I should like to give you some statistics that were interesting to me, and I think will be interesting to the House. I found some statistics by an eminent scholar concerning production in factories in this age of machinery and invention. I think we will all concede that the question of unemployment, where manpower has been displaced by machinery, is one of the most serious questions that is confronting our people. These statistics which I have bear on the necessity of having some legislation that will limit the hours per day and per week, and will fix some sort of a reasonable minimum concerning wages upon a proper standard of living.

These statistics will show that the value added to commodities by manufacturing process was 73.9 percent greater in 1929 than it was in 1921, while the wages during that same period increased only 27.2 percent. While invention, discovery, and mass production had added a value of 73.9 percent to manufactured goods during that period, yet wages increased only 27 percent.

Furthermore, that labor produced 36.7 percent more in 1929 than it did in 1921, on a comparative or proportionate basis. But while labor increased the volume of production 36.7 percent in that 8 years it only received an increase in wages of 11.3 percent, showing the very small amount of the increase that was produced by labor because of invention, machinery, and discovery, operating in mass production that fell as an advantage to labor.

In 1921 labor received 44.7 percent of the value added by manufacturing process, but by 1929 this percentage had slumped to 36.14 percent, showing a decrease. While labor, using machinery, was increasing the volume and value of production on a comparative basis, yet its wages were constantly decreasing on a comparative basis.

During this same period the aggregate net profits of all corporations increased more than 100 percent. Making a comparison of wages and profits with the use of the machinery and invention, the profits were going as high as 100 percent, yet the proportionate percentage of wages was decreasing. In other words, labor was not receiving a fair distribution from mass production, through machinery, discovery, and invention. That is what creates this problem of ever-increasing manpower displaced by machinery and advanced methods. There should be something done, if the Government can do it, that will spread this employment over a wider field, and, if it be necessary, to reduce the hours per day and per week. The greatest thing needed in this country is the opportunity of men to earn a living by the use of their hands and their minds.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If you are going to utilize the hand of man so that he is occupied, then if you are going to put in all of the improved machinery so that a man has nothing to do, how are you going to do what you are trying to do?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I take it for granted that we cannot stand in the way of progress and of invention. No one assumes that, but we can assume that the advantages that come from invention and discovery will be more equally distributed. A man who becomes an inventor gets a monopoly on that article. In the aggregate increase of wealth there must be a better division, so that this employment spread shall be wider, by reducing the hours of labor.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Idleness breeds discontent.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That is right.

Mr. RICH. It does not make any difference who the individual is, if he has not something to do to keep his mind busy he will eventually get into trouble. Now, if that is the case, do you not think we ought to regulate improved machinery in some manner to give the 12,000,000 people jobs who are out of work, and then we would have industry paying the expenses of keeping those people, instead of running up this great national deficit that we are doing at the present time?

Mr. GREENWOOD. There may be some merit in what the gentleman says; and if he will prepare a bill along a line that will in any way control this question of how machinery shall be operated, I shall be glad to consider his bill on its merits.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Do not make a speech; ask a question.

Mr. RICH. I do not want to make a speech. The gentleman knows I could not get a bill through this House; but if I were on the Democratic side of the House I would do that very thing.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Oh, I think that is a violent assumption. If the gentleman will prepare a bill that has merit to it I am sure he will get a hearing.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We found about 10,000 employees in the Postal Service. We found that postal employees today were doing 159 percent more work than the postal employees were doing in 1932. We took 4 hours off the workweek of every postal employee and put all the unemployed postal employees to work. This same percentage spread over the industries of America, shortening the workweek that much, would eliminate unemployment in this country. The benefit resulting from the machine should now result in a shorter workday insofar as industry is concerned.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; it is along the line of my argument. We cannot stand in the way of invention and discovery. Improved machinery is bound to come, but there can be some regulation; and this is a move in the right direction, that the extra profits that arise and the value that comes from these things and the use of mass production shall be more fairly distributed to the men who work and that there may be a greater spread of employment through a shortening of hours. As I say, this is a move in this direction.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. When the gentleman speaks of shortening hours, he does not, of course, advocate cutting wages. In other words, the gentleman believes in keeping wages as they are.

Mr. GREENWOOD. This bill provides that they shall pay the prevailing wages in the community where the work is performed; so the bill takes care of the very proposition of which the gentleman speaks.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I just wanted to make it clear that the taxpayers of this country are footing the bill for the Post Office Department. If some of you fellows had to meet pay rolls, you would know what it is to run a business, and would have a greater appreciation of the tremendous debt you are piling up for this Nation. The Post Office Department is going into the red faster and faster. Some day you will wake up to see that there is a wreck ahead. I am not advocating low wages; I am advocating sound business principles in the affairs of government.

Mr. MEAD. I would remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Post Office Department has been developing a surplus since this administration came into power.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further for a colloquy between these two gentlemen. I thank the gentlemen for their contributions and take it for granted they probably are not so very far apart.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. I would direct the gentleman's attention to section 9 of this bill, which makes certain exemptions, and should like to have the gentleman's construction of the section as to whether things like manufactured lumber, cotton, furniture, and things of this character would or would not be included in this bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I should like to answer the gentleman, but some of these questions could probably be answered better by members of the legislative committee. I know if it applied to all products there would be a good many complications. I do not think it applies to stock merchandise. I understand it applies particularly to supplies manufactured to conform to specifications by the Government.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. Lumber or cotton goods might be specified in an order.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the language of section 9, the first sentence of which reads:

> This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment as may usually be bought on the open market unless especially manufactured to conform to particular specifications.

I think this language is very clear; and, in my judgment, do not think it would cover the articles the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. It is not the gentleman's judgment that it would apply to them?

Mr. HEALEY. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a good many questions have been asked which probably should have been directed to members of the legislative committee that held hearings.

I think, however, this bill is a step in the right direction and will help solve the unemployment question and uphold the standard of living. It will set an example of what the Government considers a fair day and a fair week as to hours of labor and provides for the prevailing wage as a minimum. The Government undertakes to lead the way for better economic conditions and a better spread for employment.

I believe it is a movement in the right direction for social security. I therefore trust the rule shall be adopted and that this measure will be enacted into law.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not know as I have any particular objection, is the gentleman willing to let the final vote on this bill which is under consideration today go over until tomorrow morning?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; that can be arranged.

Mr. SNELL. Then I have no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. For the convenience of the Members, I think it is proper for the Chair to state that we expect to

proceed until 6 o'clock in the consideration of the pending rule and then take a recess until 7:30 o'clock this evening for the further consideration of the bill.

CONDITIONS OF LABOR UNDER CONTRACT WITH UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, the other day there was a bill on the Consent Calendar entitled "A bill extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", which, if enacted into law, would have extended the classified civil service in the United States. It was represented that this bill was an extension of the merit system, which is the cornerstone of our civil-service legislation. The bill is the very antithesis of that.

The bill, if enacted into law, would authorize by Executive order the placing within the classified service, as defined by the act of March 27, 1922, any position or group of positions in the executive branch of the Federal service which now or hereafter may be exempted by statute from the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

The civil-service law, the Pendleton Act, was passed in 1883. Since that time various branches of the executive civil service have been brought under the merit system set up by that act and its subsequent amendments. Over 80 percent of the employees of the Government not wearing a military uniform were under the competitive classified civil service, obtaining their positions and holding them on the basis of merit.

When legislation sought by reason of the emergency and for the purpose of taking care of relief was passed, every single bill of that kind contained the language, when referring to the employment of personnel: "Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923."

This meant that no person need prove merit before appointment, and no person need be paid a salary or was limited to a salary within the classification in which his kind of work and the value of his work fell.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SIROVICH. My distinguished friend, for whom I have a very wholesome respect, will remember the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill was passed under the Republican regime while Mr. Hoover was President. The bill, as brought in, had the same clause, without regard to the civil service, and when we offered an amendment to that effect it was voted down. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill which came in under the Republican administration of Mr. Hoover also had the same clause inserted, and when an amendment was offered it was defeated.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not recall those circumstances. The first set-up of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation called for a board of financial experts. Possibly there were some substantial reasons for exception at that time, but not so with these bills that I am speaking of, because at no time when employees were put to work and exempted from the civil service were there not on the civil-service registers eligibles in excess of the number appointed without regard to the civil service and these people would have been available for such appointment.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONNERY. I wish I could feel the same way as my friend from New Jersey, but we put the provision in the Wagner-Peyser bill, covering the United States Employment Service, that they could appoint them without regard to the civil service, but the Secretary of Labor called for a civil-service examination. In order for anybody to get to be a director of that Employment Service he has to have a high-school education. A lot of common laboring men, who had been working previously in factories, could not become a director of employment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That was by regulations subsequently enacted. There are, as a matter of fact, on the Government pay roll a quarter of a million employees at the present time who should be under the civil service and, as a matter of fact, are not.

The proposition now is to take these 250,000 employees and put them under the civil service. Why are they employees? Because they were recommended by ward leaders, by county chairman, by district leaders, and by political workers, and every one of the 250,000 were inducted into the civil service because of value rendered to the Democratic Party in the election.

It is now proposed to freeze those into the civil service, giving them a civil-service status, to the exclusion of a quarter of a million people for years to come who otherwise would have the opportunity on the basis of merit to enter the civil service.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RAMSPECK. How does the gentleman from New Jersey reach that conclusion in view of the fact the bill to which he is referring requires a competitive examination? It gives no privilege to the people who are now holding these non-civil-service jobs.

Mr. LEHLBACH. It freezes them in their employment, and in the event one of these individuals who is now in the service should die or resign, his or her place will be filled by competitive examination. But the purpose of the bill is to retain these people in the civil service, but it says they shall not have a classified status.

If that means anything at all, it means simply that they cannot be transferred to an old-line job in a department in which civil service has for years been the rule, or else that they can be separated from the service for the avowed reason of politics or religion, which is the only protection not accorded to them that is accorded to every other employee who has civil-service status.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from New Jersey, of course, is more familiar with the history of civil service than I am, having been on the committee longer and in Congress longer, and the gentleman knows, of course, that only in one instance in the entire history of the civil service has a group been brought in without giving them the privilege of noncompetitive examinations, and that was in the case of the Prohibition Bureau in 1927; but this bill, which is my own bill and which was purposely drafted that way, requires a competitive examination before they get a civil-service status.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; but these people are in employment and it is not proposed——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 more minutes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And it is not proposed to separate a single one of these people from his employment. It simply says that he may not acquire that status by being in the anomalous situation where he is holding a position in a class which is under civil service while he himself has not acquired civil-service status. This does not interfere with his working there; it simply interferes with his having a right to a transfer without a subsequent civil-service noncompetitive examination.

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

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. Is it not a fact that since the establishment of civil service in 1883, by Pendleton, that during both Republican and Democratic administrations, where emergency legislation was put forward and people were appointed without regard to civil service, they were ultimately frozen in the same as is being done today?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Where they were originally appointed when civil-service regulations did not exist; but here is a situation where, without that exempting language in your statutes, every one of these people would necessarily, under the law of the land, be under the civil service and would have had to get civil-service status on the basis of merit before they could have been appointed.

Here is what you have done: You have exempted a quarter of a million people from having to show merit before you appoint them, and then, after having appointed them on a political basis, you want to cover them into the advantages of civil service. This is what you are trying to do by this legislation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say quite frankly that the purpose of the bill and the reason it is drawn as it is was to prevent the very thing the gentleman is charging the bill does. The Civil Service Commission drew it for me, although they do not approve it, I may say to the gentleman. They prefer noncompetitive examinations; but this does not freeze them in. It will make it necessary for them to hold competitive examinations for every group brought in and give everybody a free chance, and that is what I desired to do.

Mr. LEHLBACH. But this does not remove them from the service which they hold. They do not have to compete with anybody to continue in their jobs. It is only if they want a different job that they have got to acquire a civil-service status.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, no.

Mr. LEHLBACH. And it is only when they go out——

Mr. RAMSPECK. What happened to the Prohibition Bureau when a similar bill was passed?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Your McKellar amendment took care of that. It was not the working of the civil-service proposition.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am not talking about that; I am talking about the act of 1927, during a Republican regime, when they put them under civil service and required them all to take an examination and left out those who did not pass the examination.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I know that; but you do not do that here.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is exactly the same act.

Mr. SIROVICH. But even with respect to the people employed in emergency classifications, the gentleman will find that at the present time it is a well-known fact on our Democratic side of the House that more Republicans have been appointed than Democrats, and therefore the proposed examination in the bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] will give everyone an equal opportunity.

Mr. LEHLBACH. As I read this bill, it does not remove a single person from the position he is now holding.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The bill does not, but the Executive order bringing them under civil service would do that.

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; the Executive order would not deprive them of their positions, it would simply deprive them of these benefits by reason of this section which says that the incumbent of any permanent position affected by any Executive order which may be issued under authority of this statute who does not have a classified status may acquire such status only upon receiving a new appointment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3055, to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts, loans, or grants by the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3055, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. WARREN having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 3055, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a conference report upon the bill (S. 2456) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, for printing under the rule.

UNITED STATES HOUSING BILL

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the membership to the following statement by M. J. Colleran, president of the Operatives of Plasterers' and Cement Finishers' Association, a member of the American Federation of Labor Housing Committee, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, on the United States housing bill S. 4424, April 23, 1936, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 23, 1936.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As a member of the A. F. of L. Housing Committee, I am, of course, in hearty accord with the provisions of this bill. Its passage, substantially in its present form, will be labor's principal concern in the current session of the Congress. I will not dwell, however, on the enormous and urgent need for a program of low-rent housing. Nor will I go into the reasons why such housing can be supplied only through machinery such as that set up in this bill. President Green has gone into these matters at considerable length before your committee already.

But I do want to take a few moments of your time to bring out a point which, I believe, has so far not been mentioned in the testimony. It may help to place the significance of this bill in a broader perspective, eliminating at the same time some of the strangeness and novelty which may seem to adhere to it. For I merely want to show that the general principle given such admirable working form in this piece of legislation received official and administrative sanction as long ago as 1921. Indeed, it was enacted into law by Congress in 1930, through the good offices of Senator WAGNER himself—even though it has never actually been put into operation.

What I refer to, of course, is the principle of long-range planning for public-works construction.

The idea that public or public-aided construction is a major weapon of any modern Government against unemployment and depression has been generally recognized for so long that I do not need to dwell on it. That such construction ought to be planned and timed in order to provide a cushion of employment when most needed has likewise been a matter of general agreement. But, still, in spite of all the talk, and in spite of the large sums actually spent on public-works construction during the past 4 years by various temporary Federal agencies, no permanent machinery has been set up which could plan out a long-range future program of construction.

Way back in 1921 Mr. Herbert Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce and in a special capacity as chairman of a committee on unemployment, presented an eight-point report to President Harding. The main point in this report was the long-range planning of public works. It recommended the immediate appointment of a committee to take up the problem of planning and carrying out a long-range program of public-works construction, to offset future depressions. This committee, however, failed to function.

We are a Nation that soon forgets. In 1922 we began to move back to normalcy, and then, in the midst of plenty, we failed to provide for the lean days of depression that were to follow. The three administrations from 1921 up to the present one failed to provide a plan to offset future depressions.

It may seem strange that my own direct and special interest in this problem dates from the big boom building year, 1923. To all outward appearances the building workers were receiving very high wages and bonuses; contractors vieing with each other at skyrocketing wages; mechanics were at a premium.

Organized labor realized that this condition could not last. They then decided to appeal to the Government which, during this period, was also in the field with a large building program, competing with private industry for mechanics.

A committee of organized labor of the building trades, with a committee representing the consumer and investor, pleaded with the authorities in Washington at that time, requesting that the Government defer, in whole or in part, their building-construction program until some later date when unemployment would exist in the building trades.

This action called forth a great deal of public attention at the time, because it demonstrated that the building trades want steady employment, long-range planning, and stable wages rather than high peaks and deep depressions. If some such agency as that recommended by Mr. Hoover in 1921 had been in existence, our own suggestions could have been incorporated in a plan which might, in turn, have considerably lightened the burden of the current depression, at least in its early stages.

In 1928, at the very peak of prosperity, Senator WAGNER introduced his first bill on a planned long-range public-works program. This bill was very much like the suggestions in Hoover's report of 7 years earlier. (As a matter of fact, I distinctly remember Mayor LaGuardia, who was then in Congress, telling the other Republican Congressmen that they ought to go along with it, since it was Hoover's original idea.) After a serious operation in committee, wherein this bill had its vitals removed, it evidently went on the convalescent list.

That brings us up to 1930. Let us see what the records have to say on unemployment. At an American Federation of Labor convention held in October of 1930 in the city of Boston, Mass., several statesmen appeared and addressed the convention. The addresses of these statesmen show that they were deeply concerned in the problems of widespread unemployment. Among those appearing was the HONORABLE DAVID I. WALSH, the present chairman of this committee. He advanced one of the most constructive arguments that could be used in behalf of and for the enactment of this Wagner housing bill. I will now quote, in part, the Senator's remarks:

"Unemployment. What is worse? What are the awful consequences of war—death, disease, famine, poverty? Of unemployment? Poverty, yes; debilitation, yes; disease, yes; and there is in addition undernourished children, suffering from cold, suffering from want of food, fathers disheartened and discouraged, mothers made physical wrecks from breaking hearts. Is there anything worse in life than the evils of unemployment that strikes at the very foundation of hope and cheer and peace in the human breast? Isn't there some place in our Government where one commanding voice must speak and behind that voice a heartfelt desire to remedy the pestilence against which he seeks a remedy? Only through the statesmanship of the official leader in public life who is entrusted with the responsibility to guide and protect us in the hour of emergency can we get relief.

"When there is no sympathy, when there is an attempt to urge that it is exaggerated, when that condition exists there can be no planning, there can be no developing of a statesmanlike policy that will seek a solution. My friends, the time to remedy the problem of unemployment is not in the midst of unemployment, though it is a good time to concentrate attention upon the disastrous consequences of the policy of unemployment; it is an opportune time to call public men's attention to the problem and ask for a remedy, but unemployment should be attacked by a policy of prevention. Just as our Government is spending millions of dollars and exerting all its efforts and strength to prevent disease, to prevent the breaking down of the public health, to protect us in the time of war, we are justified in asking the Government to spend money and effort to protect us from unemployment in times of peace."

It is evident from these remarks just quoted that Senator WALSH was whole-heartedly in sympathy with some legislation by someone which would help to solve the problem of unemployment.

Now, at that same convention, I will quote from President Hoover's address the following:

"But most of these problems are problems of stability. With the job secure, other questions can be solved with much more assurance. You, as workers, know best of all how much a man gains from security in his job. It is the insurance of his manliness, it upholds the personal valuation of himself and of his family. To establish a system that assures this security is the supreme challenge to our responsibility as representatives of millions of our fellow workers and fellow citizens. The discharge of that responsibility does not allow present difficulties to rob us of our clear vision or the wholesome faith and courageous aggressive character for which our country has been long the leader of the world.

"The demonstration of Nation-wide cooperation and team play and the absence of conflict during this depression has increased the stability and wholesomeness of our industrial and social structure. We are justified in feeling that something like a new and improved tool has been added to the working kit for the solution of our future problems.

"No one would invite either war or business depression, but from them may come some new inspirations. We find in these times courage and sympathy, generous helpfulness from our work people to those unfortunates suffering not alone from the present but from fear for their future. We find inspiration in the courage of our employers, the resolution of the Nation that we shall build steadily to prevent and mitigate the destructiveness of these great business storms. It is this inspiration which gives confidence for the future, and confirms our belief in fundamental human righteousness and the value of our American conception of mutuality of interest in our daily work."

We, too, the representatives of labor in convention assembled, felt that we might add our efforts toward a solution, the same which was embodied in a resolution presented and approved by the convention, which reads as follow:

"To request the President of the United States to create a long-range planning committee of public works to avert unemployment.

"Resolution no. 54. By Delegates M. J. Colleran, W. A. O'Keefe, J. E. Rooney, T. A. Scully, Duncan Payne, of the Operative Plasterers' International Association of the United States and Canada, and Arthur M. Huddell, of the International Union of Operating Engineers:

"Whereas the question of unemployment and how to cope with it is one of the major problems of this convention; and

"Whereas President Hoover in his address to the convention stated that the Government was doing all in its power to relieve the present depression; and

"Whereas consistently for the past 28 years we have been visited by a depression every 7 years; and

"Whereas in 1921 President Hoover acting as chairman of a committee to study future unemployment appointed by the late President Harding, brought back 12 principles of a probable solution; and

"Whereas the sixth principle of the 12 proposed a long-range planning committee of public works; and

"Whereas nothing has been done to create such a board, who, in the opinion of many, would be the means of averting future depressions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the American Federation of Labor with the presidents of the other departments call on the President of the United States and request that a long-range planning committee of public works be created so as to avert future unemployment.

"The report of the committee was unanimously adopted."

But with all of the wonderful statements made, and with resolutions adopted, we fail to find any action by the Government until February of 1931, and although many here may have forgotten it, the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 is the law of the land. It has, however, never been put into operation. This bill also was sponsored by Senator Wagner. Following are some of the provisions of that act:

"SEC. 5. Whenever, upon recommendation of the board, the President finds that there exists, or that within the 6 months next following there is likely to exist, in the United States or any substantial portion thereof, a period of business depression and unemployment, he is requested to transmit to Congress by special message, at such time and from time to time thereafter, such supplemental estimates as he deems advisable for emergency appropriations, to be expended during such period upon authorized construction in order to aid in preventing unemployment and permit the Government to avail itself of the opportunity for speedy, efficient, and economical construction during any such period. * * *

"SEC. 7. For the purpose of aiding in the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression and of permitting the Government to avail itself of opportunity for speedy, efficient, and economical construction during such periods, the President may direct the construction agencies to accelerate during such periods, to such extent as it deemed practicable, the prosecution of all authorized construction within their control.

"SEC. 8. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to arrange the construction of public works so far as practicable in such manner as will assist in the stabilization of industry and employment through the proper timing of such construction, and that to further this object there shall be advance planning, including preparation of detailed construction plans, of public works by the construction agencies and the board."

Obviously, this was not a housing act. Nor could the board thus authorized actually receive large appropriations for public works or engage in or assist construction. Nevertheless, the idea enacted in Senate bill 5776 of the Seventy-first Congress depended for its successful carrying out on the existence of a permanent Federal agency, equipped with adequate funds and powers to promote, assist, and carry out a really sizeable construction program in a field where such construction is needed on a very wide scale. The fact that there is no such agency in existence today is certainly one main reason why the act has never been put into practice.

The only field which answers these requirements, which would make it possible to plan a really effective long-range construction program, is the field of low-rent housing. The social necessity of such construction in this country is almost limitless. Properly administered, a low-rent housing program in no way competes with legitimate private construction enterprise. And, in boom years when private enterprise is employing most of the building workers and there is an adequate supply of dwellings, the construction of publicly assisted housing for low-income families can be temporarily curtailed.

In England, ever since the war, an admirable balance has been maintained between public and private residential construction. This balance, in the opinion of Tories and Laborites alike, has been primarily responsible for England's speedy recovery.

Are we going to follow England's example? What's more, are we going to carry out our own enacted principles? Or are we

just going to sit around pretending it is still 1921? The answer will lie in whether the Congress enacts the United States housing bill into law at this session—or not.

There has been much comment as to whether this bill will interfere with private interests, but is it not a fact that the President of the United States on several occasions during the last 3 years called on private interests, banks, financial institutions, and large industries to assist the Government in getting some of the 12,000,000 unemployed workers back to work? And what was their response? There are still 12,000,000 unemployed.

We recommend that in the appropriations and bond issues authorized for the first 4 years, that instead of $1,000,000,000 to be used over that period, it be increased to 2 billions, so as to assure greater success. If it was needed in 1928 it surely is needed in 1936, and I quote from Gov. Ralph G. Brewster's remarks made at a conference of governors at New Orleans on Wednesday morning November 21, 1928:

"With an annual expenditure of 7 billions upon construction, America is in a position to stabilize prosperity to a most remarkable extent. Public authority spends more than a billion and a half. With this we are here primarily concerned. Private business will soon follow such practical demonstration as government may make since the great commercial interests of the country have the most vital stake. This may apply not alone to construction but to the renewal and extension of capital facilities of every sort. It is the considered recommendation of the one who has received the overwhelming mandate of the American people to guide and guard their progress in the next 4 years that a construction reserve may prudently be accumulated in time of plenty against the lean year that is to come."

Now, in conclusion, we heartily approve and pray for the passage of this housing bill for the reasons, first, of its potentialities toward the relief of unemployment; second, for its long-range planning effects, which will stabilize employment; third, for its slum clearance, which will help eradicate sickness and pestilence, which in turn will lessen crime; and, finally, this is the "big push" that was needed to end depression.

We recommend, in accordance with the provisions for the setting up of an independent, permanent United States housing authority that the committee and the Congress give serious consideration that the personnel of the authority board shall be composed with at least one representative from the ranks of labor who is thoroughly qualified and familiar with the construction industry.

DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives of June 17, 1936 (the Senate concurring), I return herewith H. R. 12848, "An act to provide an additional place of holding terms of the United States District Court in the Eastern District of Kentucky, and to amend section 83 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1936.*

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a bill providing for the coinage of 50-cent pieces for the California Bridge Celebration. The bill was messaged over to the Senate. While on its way the Senate passed a similar bill. The bills are in regular form, one bill having passed the Senate and one bill having passed the House. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill, S. 4464, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in celebration of the opening of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge there shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 200,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition, and of a special appropriate single design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1936, irrespective of the year in which they are minted or issued, shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the San Francisco Clearing House Association, upon payment by it of the par value of such coins, but not less than 25,000 such coins shall be issued to it at any one time and no such coins shall be issued after the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by such association and the net proceeds shall be used by it in defraying the expenses incidental and appropriate to the celebration of such event.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purposes, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

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

The similar House bill was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed without amendment to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution 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.

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. 8442) entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes."

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. 11140) entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by further increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3440) entitled "An act to amend certain acts relating to public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents and acts amendatory thereof."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8597) entitled "An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled 'An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea'; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COPELAND, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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 foregoing bill.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 12. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to divide the eastern district of South Carolina into four divisions and the western district into five divisions" by adding a new division to the eastern district and providing for terms of said court to be held at Orangeburg, S. C.;

H. R. 300. An act for the relief of F. P. Bolack;

H. R. 686. An act for the relief of John Collins;

H. R. 796. An act for the relief of A. E. Clark;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of Frank A. Boyle;

H. R. 1392. An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the island of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of Charles P. Shipley Saddlery & Mercantile Co.;

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

H. R. 2262. An act for the relief of William H. Locke;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of Julia Miller;

H. R. 2400. An act for the relief of Blanche Knight;

H. R. 2495. An act for the relief of Thomas Berchel Burke;

H. R. 2496. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Moran;

H. R. 2497. An act for the relief of William H. Hildebrand;

H. R. 3160. An act for the relief of Irene Magnuson and Oscar L. Magnuson, her husband;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of Jessie D. Bowman;

H. R. 3694. An act for the relief of Florence Byvank;

H. R. 3907. An act for the relief of James L. Park;

H. R. 4085. An act for the relief of Joseph Watkins;

H. R. 4219. An act for the relief of John J. Ryan;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Albert Gonzales;

H. R. 4565. An act for the relief of Lucile Smith.

H. R. 4619. An act for the relief of Joseph Salinghi;

H. R. 4699. An act for the relief of Estelle M. Gardiner;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Brenner;

H. R. 5635. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the mayor and aldermen of Jersey City, Hudson County, N. J., a municipal corporation;

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. 5752. An act for the relief of May Wynne Lamb;

H. R. 5870. An act for the relief of K. S. Szymanski;

H. R. 5900. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Moore;

H. R. 6258. An act for the relief of D. E. Woodward;

H. R. 6702. An act for the relief of Annie E. Daniels;

H. R. 7270. An act for the relief of Clara Imbesi and Domenick Imbesi;

H. R. 7555. An act for the relief of W. N. Holbrook;

H. R. 7743. An act for the relief of Mrs. David C. Stafford;

H. R. 7764. An act to relieve restricted Indians whose lands have been taxed or have been lost by failure to pay taxes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8028. An act for the relief of the Great Northern Railway Co.;

H. R. 8033. An act for the relief of Juanita Filmore, a minor;

H. R. 8055. An act to provide for economic studies of the fishery industry, market news service, and orderly marketing of fishery products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8200. An act for the relief of the seamen of the steamship *Santa Ana;*

H. R. 8220. An act for the relief of Helen Mahar Johnson;

H. R. 8671. An act for the relief of R. H. Quynn, lieutenant, United States Navy;

H. R. 8759. An act to amend the act known as the "Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930", approved June 10, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 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. 9926. An act for the relief of Robert B. Barker;

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. 1014. An act to authorize a study of the park, parkway, and recreational-area programs in the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10225. An act for the relief of W. D. Lovell;

H. R. 10435. An act for the relief of Emma Hastings;

H. R. 10527. An act for the relief of Harris Bros. Plumbing Co.;

H. R. 10677. An act for the relief of Cora Fulghum and Ben Peterson;

H. R. 10712. An act to authorize the transfer of land from the War Department to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 10916. An act for the relief of Carl Hardin, Orville Richardson, and W. E. Payne;

H. R. 11203. An act for the relief of Andrew Smith;

H. R. 11218. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds now on deposit, or later placed to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11262. An act for the relief of Brooks-Callaway Co.;

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of the estates of N. G. Harper and Amos Phillips;

H. R. 11522. An act to amend the charter of the National Union Insurance Co. of Washington, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11614. An act to amend the Judicial Code, to divide the middle district of Georgia into seven divisions by adding a new division to the middle district, and providing for terms of said court to be held at Thomasville, Ga.;

H. R. 11643. An act to amend certain provisions of the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 210–212);

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. 11819. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

H. R. 11820. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

H. R. 11915. An act to amend the Coastwise Load Line Act, 1935;

H. R. 11916. An act to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 12006. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Kennebec River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods;

H. R. 12033. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights-of-way over public lands and reserve lands to the city of Los Angeles, in Mono County, in the State of California;

H. R. 12074. An act to consolidate the Indian pueblos of Jemez and Pecos, N. Mex.;

H. R. 12073. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in New Mexico as an addition to the school reserve of the Jicarilla Indian Reservation;

H. R. 12202. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of Six Mile Creek, in Logan County, Ark., with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement;

H. R. 12240. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the tributaries, sources, and headwaters of the Allegheny and Susquehanna Rivers in the State of Pennsylvania, where no examination and survey has heretofore been made, with a view to the control of their floods and the regulation and conservation of their waters;

H. R. 12305. An act to define the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 12311. An act for the relief of the P. L. Andrews Corporation;

H. R. 12408. An act for the relief of Robert D. Baldwin;

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. 12461. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Burtons Ferry, near Sylvania, Ga.;

H. R. 12514. An act authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County, Md., over Hart Island and Miller's Island to a point near Tolchester, Kent County, Md.;

H. R. 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;

H. R. 12622. An act for the relief of Dr. Harold W. Foght;

H. R. 12685. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Horry, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Waccamaw River, at or near Red Bluff, S. C.;

H. R. 12799. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, N. C., known in history as the Lost Colony, and the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English parentage to be born on the American Continent;

H. R. 12896. An act to provide for the transfer of the surplus decommissioned lightship *No. 82* to United States Ship Constitution Post, No. 3339, Veterans of Foreign Wars;

H. J. Res. 415. Joint resolution to carry out the intention of Congress with reference to the claims of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota against the United States;

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation with respect to agricultural income and the financial and economic condition of agricultural producers generally", approved August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 522. Joint resolution for the relief of William W. Brunswick;

H. J. Res. 583. Joint resolution authorizing the Veterans' Administration to prepare and publish a compilation of all Federal laws relating to veterans of wars of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions.

RECESS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until 7:30 o'clock tonight.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 7:30 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7:30 o'clock p. m.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution amending section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

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

S. 283. An act for the relief of Beatrice I. Manges;

S. 2047. An act to promote the general welfare of the Indians of the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2912. An act to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

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 agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the foregoing bill with an amendment.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Congress, by a joint resolution approved June 19, 1934, authorized me to accept membership for the Government of the United States in the International Labor Organization. Pursuant to that authorization I accepted such membership on behalf of the Government of the United States.

Representatives of this Government and of American employers and American labor attended the nineteenth session of the Conference of the International Labor Organization held at Geneva June 4–25, 1933.

That conference adopted, the American representative voting favorably, five draft conventions and one recommendation, to wit:

The draft convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds.

The draft convention limiting hours of work in coal mines (revised 1935).

The draft convention concerning the reduction of hours of work to 40 a week.

The draft convention concerning the establishment of an international scheme for the maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age, and widows', and orphans' insurance.

The draft convention concerning the reduction of hours of work in glass-bottle works.

The recommendation concerning unemployment among young persons.

In becoming a member of the organization and subscribing to its constitution this Government accepted the following undertaking in regard to such draft conventions and recommendations:

Each of the members undertakes that it will, within the period of 1 year at most from the closing of the session of the conference, or if it is impossible owing to exceptional circumstances to do so within the period of 1 year, then at the earliest practicable moment and in no case later than 18 months from the closing of the session of the conference, bring the recommendation or draft convention before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action. (Art. 19 (405), par. 5, Constitution of the International Labor Organization.)

In the case of a Federal State, the power of which to enter into conventions on labor matters is subject to limitations, it shall be in the discretion of that Government to treat a draft convention to which such limitations apply as a recommendation only, and the provisions of this article with respect to recommendations shall apply in such case. (Art. 19 (405), par. 9, Constitution of the International Labor Organization.)

In accordance with the foregoing undertaking the abovenamed five conventions and one recommendation are herewith submitted to the Congress with the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, to which the attention of the Congress is invited.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1936.*

ENROLLMENT OF FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Concurrent Resolution 58, affecting the enrollment of H. R. 12624, the first deficiency appropriation bill, fiscal year 1936, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 9, insert in the proper place under the heading "Senate" the following:

"To pay Anna Louise Fletcher, widow of Hon DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, late a Senator from the State of Florida, $10,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DISTRICTS OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2456) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, that simply provides for holding of terms of court?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. It provides for the places of holding the terms.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2456) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the said bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to appoint an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, who shall, at the time of his appointment, be a resident and a citizen of the State of West Virginia; and who, when appointed and qualified as provided by law, shall exercise all the powers conferred by existing law upon judges of the district courts of the United States; and who shall, as to all business and proceedings arising in said northern and southern districts of West Virginia, as now constituted or which may be transferred thereto, succeed to and possess the same powers, and perform the same duties within said districts, that are now possessed and performed by the district judges heretofore appointed for and now serving therein, respectively.

"The present district judge for the northern district of West Virginia shall hold regular terms of court in said northern district, at the following places and times, that is to say:

"(a) At the city of Martinsburg on the first Tuesday in April and the third Tuesday in September in each year;

"(b) At the city of Wheeling on the first Tuesday in May and the third Tuesday in October in each year;

"(c) At the city of Elkins on the third Tuesdays in June and November in each year;

"(d) Said judge shall also hold such special terms as may be necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of said court; the same to be held at said places and at such times as he shall appoint.

"The present district judge for the southern district of West Virginia shall hold regular terms of court in said southern district at the following places and times, that is to say:

"(a) At the city of Bluefield on the third Tuesdays in January and June in each year;

"(b) At the city of Lewisburg on the first Tuesday in March and the third Tuesday in September in each year;

"(c) At the city of Charleston on the third Tuesdays in April and November in each year;

"(d) Said judge shall also hold such special terms as may be necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of said court; the same to be held at said places and at such times as he shall appoint.

"The district judge for the said northern and southern districts of West Virginia, to be appointed under this Act, shall hold regular terms of court in said northern and southern districts at the following places and times; that is to say:

"(a) At the city of Clarksburg, in said northern district, on the second Tuesdays in January and September in each year;

"(b) At the city of Parkersburg, in said northern district, on the third Tuesday in March and the second Tuesday in October in each year;

"(c) At the city of Huntington, in said southern district, on the second Tuesdays in May and November in each year;

"(d) Said judge shall also hold such special terms as may be necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of said court; the same to be held at said places and at such times as he shall appoint: *Provided, however,* That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of the district judge for the northern district of West Virginia the judge appointed pursuant to the authority granted by this Act shall become the district judge for the northern district of West Virginia and no successor shall be appointed to the vacancy thus occurring in the position created by this Act," and the House agree to the same.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
U. S. GUYER,
Managers on the part of the House.

M. M. NEELY,
CARL A. HATCH,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL JUSTICE FOR CRAMP'S SHIPYARD

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, during the campaign of 1934, speaking on the radio to the people of Philadelphia, I said—and I quote the exact words:

We have a great shipyard in northeast Philadelphia that has been idle for many years. I have been the first publicly to call the attention of the city to this situation in the hope that it may somehow be remedied. It is quite possible that no one will ever be able to open the yard. But, if I am elected, I shall communicate with the President or the Navy Department to see if something cannot be done. If that should fail, I shall myself introduce a bill in the hope of accomplishing this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the political and partisan opposition that has been mustered by some against my efforts in this direction, I am happy to say that I have kept faith with the people who elected me. As early as the summer of 1934, I had personally visited the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Claude A. Swanson, to bring the plight of Cramp's Shipyard to his immediate attention.

Again, when the prolonged strike at the yards of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation in Camden caused serious delay in the construction of the cruisers and destroyers there being built, I urged upon the Secretary of the Navy the advisability of transferring the construction of some or all of these vessels to Cramp's Shipyard, emphasizing that the yard would then be in a position to expedite their construction. Acting Secretary of the Navy, Hon. H. L. Roosevelt, agreed with me with regard to the strike, but stated that he could not then do anything in the matter that I had suggested with respect to the reopening of Cramp's.

Taking up the matter with President Roosevelt, the following letter was sent to him:

AUGUST 1, 1935.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States, the White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Assistant Secretary of the Navy, you doubtless made many visits to the old Cramp's shipyard in northeast Philadelphia. This yard has not been in operation since 1927, and is now in position to begin work if assistance can be rendered through one of the Government departments to guarantee the first-mortgage bond issue.

Within 6 months of the opening of the plant, direct employment could be had for 1,000 men, with at least 2,000 others working in plants supplying material, machinery, and other supplies. At the end of a year the direct employment would be doubled, with the result that about 6,000 men would be employed directly or indirectly. With the present need for ships, it seems probable that the plant could be kept busy for a period of 10 years or more.

The committee for reorganization, which is an operating group made up of former department heads or assistants of the old yard, has succeeded through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Reserve, and private corporations in tentatively arranging for approximately 65 percent of the necessary financing, but the balance needed to pay off the present owners and back taxes has not yet been obtained. The entire project requires some $2,700,000 to purchase, pay back taxes, and supply working capital, which amount could be liquidated over a period of 10 years.

As the representative of the people of the district in which Cramp's shipyard is located, I have been ceaselessly endeavoring to find some means by which the plant might be renovated and reopened. I feel quite sure that the people of my district will deeply appreciate it if you will assure them, through me, that some steps may be taken through a Government agency to guarantee the first-mortgage bond issue and assist us in bringing about the reopening of this famous old shipyard.

As a lieutenant in the Naval Reserve, I have on more than one occasion noted Your Excellency's friendliness toward the Navy and its proper maintenance: and in this respect, as well as a representative of the people directly interested, I ask you, Mr. President, if at all possible, to let me have an answer that will be helpful in alleviating unemployment and distress in this district. I know that the residents of the district will be deeply interested in the reply that you may make to them through me. I remain,

Very respectfully yours,

CLARE GERALD FENERTY.

In his reply the President briefly told me that the Navy Department advised him "that it has no funds with which to extend financial aid in such a case."

It was not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the matter had been referred to the President, for the committee on reorganization, with whose officers I have been and still am in constant contact, had themselves appealed to the President for assistance.

I did not trust entirely to obtaining help from either the Navy Department or the President. So, on August 23, 1935, I introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution directing the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works to allot $3,000,000 from his fund of five billions to the committee for reorganization of Cramp's Shipyard, Inc., stating in the resolution itself that this would "aid in the carrying out of the plans already formulated by the committee for the restoration and reopening of Cramp's Shipyard, which would immediately give employment directly and indirectly to at least 2,000 men, with the number doubled within a year, ultimately reaching the number of 15,000."

Among the newspapers commenting favorably upon this, the Daily News of Philadelphia nearly a year ago said:

Congressman FENERTY's proposal that the Government advance $3,000,000 for the reopening of Cramp's Shipyard is sound. Moreover, it is a test of the good faith of the administration in trying to put men to work.

Hundreds of millions have been wasted upon fads and experiments. Here is something practical. By granting a loan to the workers who plan the reopening of the plant more than 2,000 Philadelphia mechanics will be given jobs; a great industry will be revived; Government boats can be built well at a modest figure.

From the New Deal viewpoint it may have the objection of encouraging private industry and American initiative, but in time this old-fashioned idea will again become popular.

And the Polish Star, a newspaper widely read, particularly in the neighborhood adjoining the shipyard, stated as recently as 2 weeks ago:

Congressman FENERTY introduced a bill to have $3,000,000 allotted for the opening of Cramp's Shipyard, a bill which the Democrats are now trying to kill. The reopening of Cramp's and its effect on the numerous now unemployed Polish and American workers in the northeast can readily be realized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where is that resolution of mine today? It lies embalmed in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations, composed of 28 Democrats and only 11 Republicans. It is an unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, that members of the Democratic Party, who so loudly proclaim that they are the friends of the unemployed, have thus prevented this meritorious measure, based upon true social justice, from reaching the floor of the House, where I might have had an opportunity to lift my voice and urge its adoption. I believe that a matter of this kind, involving the distress and need of thousands of deserving people, should be above politics and should receive the support of even my political opponents rather than their criticism and opposition. It is a dangerous thing for any country when the majority in power plays politics with human misery.

And I ask my Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle: What has been gained by you in preventing this measure from emerging from the committee? Though introduced by a Republican, it would, if enacted, have aided the distressed and hungry and unemployed of all political parties and of all conditions in life. It would have assisted not only the workers themselves but the little-shop keepers on the streets of our great northeast Philadelphia, and would have caused hundreds of thousands of dollars to flow into the channels of industry and trade throughout a great and populous locality. Your refusal to report it has deprived us of an opportunity to fight for its adoption.

The session is now nearing its close, and still you of the Democratic side continue in your refusal to aid my constant efforts to further the project and have the committee report the bill to the House, and it now appears that, with your Democratic majority in control, there will be no opportunity this session for my resolution to reach the Speaker's desk of this House. Well, that is in your hands. You control the committees and can prevent even praiseworthy measures from being reported to the House. But I expect to be here again next year, and I now tell you that I shall continue to plead the cause of those who are truly interested in alleviating unemployment among the people of Philadelphia by the reopening of this efficient and famous shipyard.

Mr. Speaker, with a million more unemployed than there were 2 years ago, surely there can be no valid reason for the Democratic majority to hinder a measure such as this, whose only purpose can be unlimited benefit to the people of my district and the city of Philadelphia.

It may take time, it may seem to some of you like a zealous but futile attempt to perform the impossible. Some of you may ridicule our efforts and say that we are attempting to achieve too much, but, in spite of all of this, I intend to persist in my endeavors in this regard until the voice of the people is finally heard by those who, if they would, are in a position to assist the needy and unemployed toward a restoration of the prosperity that 10 years ago made America overflow with plenty. I have kept faith with the people. I shall continue to fight to have others do so. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this point to extend my remarks and include therein brief excerpts and a letter written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONDITIONS OF PUBLIC CONTRACTS

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3055) to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts, loans, or grants by the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3055, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the object of this legislation is to require persons having contracts with the Government for the performance of public work and for the supplying of material and equipment to conform to decent, fair labor standards in the performance of those contracts.

The House bill, which begins on page 21 of S. 3055, differs materially from the provisions of the Senate bill, which was passed last year in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

The committee held extensive hearings on this bill and has made many changes which have met the objections that were offered to the original Walsh bill, and we believe that the bill that is now presented for your consideration is a sound and workable measure.

Briefly, this bill provides that on any contract made by any agency or instrumentality of the Government for the manufacture or for the furnishing of materials and supplies and articles of equipment in an amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included the following representations and stipulations:

First, that the contractor is a manufacturer of or a regular dealer in the supplies and materials and articles or equipment to be manufactured or used in the performance of the contract.

The purpose of that section is to eliminate from transactions with the Government those bid brokers who maintain no factories or plants or regular establishments but simply offices. In some instances those offices are maintained in their own vest pockets. Yet they are able to compete successfully with legitimate industry and submit the lowest bid, far below the estimates of regular dealers. Then, when they have secured the contract, they sublet the work to notoriously low-wage factories, thereby impairing the wage structure of a whole industry and preventing equality of opportunity for the legitimate dealer in bidding on Government contracts.

The second provision of subparagraph (b) provides that there shall be no refunds or so-called kick-backs. It guards against that practice, a practice which has unfortunately development on Government work, where persons employed for $5 or $6 a day would turn back a portion of their wages under prearrangement with their employers.

The second provision of subparagraph (b) relates to minimum wages. We have had a great deal of talk about this bill being a small N. R. A. bill for Government contracts. This is absolutely not the truth. This bill does not set the standard for minimum wages by reference to the codes that obtained under N. R. A., but definitely sets it as the prevailing minimum wage for similar work or in the industries operating in the locality in which the contract is to be performed. The bill merely provides for a proper determination by the Secretary of Labor with respect to such prevailing wage. After that determination has been made the figure will be included in the stipulations in these contracts.

Subparagraph (c) is the hour provision. The committee felt that the provision requiring that no person be employed on these contracts for more than 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week was a fair one; that it was now pretty universally the practice of most industries to stay within these limitations; and that present economic conditions require that the maximum be set at no more than 40 hours a week.

In subsection (d) it is provided that no person under 18 years of age, and no prison labor will be employed in the performance of these contracts.

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

Mr. HEALEY. If the gentleman will let me finish this section I shall be pleased to yield then.

Subparagraph (c) deals with sweatshop conditions, insanitary factories, and requires that these contracts be performed in plants or factories that conform or comply with the State laws where there are State laws regulating these conditions.

This is the basic section of this bill. These are the conditions that will be written into future contracts if this bill is enacted into law. We feel that if these conditions are included in future Government contracts that we will have cured many evil practices which have cropped up in the most vicious forms under Government contracts, since the existing law requires that all contracts for supplies, materials, and equipment must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, the only qualifications being financial responsibility only.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Referring to the gentleman's statement in reference to that paragraph of the bill dealing with child labor, has the Committee on the Judiciary reached the conclusion that a youth who has attained the age of 17 years and 10 months is a child?

Mr. HEALEY. The Committee on the Judiciary felt that the 18-year provision meets the most enlightened opinion concerning the employment of children in industry.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask another question?

Mr. HEALEY. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is there a single State in the Union which now has child-labor laws that fix 18 as the limitation of childhood?

Mr. HEALEY. I believe there are several States which require school attendance until the age of 18.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is very different.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The second section deals with the penalty for the employment of children and convicts, and also makes provision for the recovery of deductions and kick-backs, and the procedure for their repayment to those persons from whom these sums have been withheld.

The third section provides for that, list of chronic violators of the act, published by the Comptroller General and furnished to the various contracting agencies of the Government, so that bids submitted by such persons may be rejected.

The fourth section is the administrative section and provides that the law shall be administered by the Secretary of Labor. It will be observed that the bill provides that the Secretary with the consent of the States may employ such State and local officers and employees as he may find necessary to administer the provisions of this act. The Secretary in this section is given authority to make investigations and to promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 5 is the procedural section dealing with the hearings that may be held pursuant to the provisions of this act. It provides for witnesses and the attendance of witnesses at any hearings that may be called. The Secretary may only make findings after proper notice and hearing.

Section 6 provides for the various exemptions and dispensations that may be granted either under existing contracts in an emergency or where the particular industry may not be in a position to live strictly up to the provisions of this act. Authority is given to the Secretary under the terms of this section to make exemptions and dispensations where the facts so warrant in the opinion of the contracting officer. This section of the act also provides that the Secretary may permit an increase in the maximum hours of labor stipulated in the contract, but shall set a rate of time and a half for any overtime.

Section 7 deals with definitions.

Section 8 takes out of the terms of this act the Buy-American Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, and the regulations of W. P. A. and P. W. A.

Section 9 provides:

This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment as can usually be bought in the open market unless manufactured according to particular specifications.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the gentleman inform us whether the provisions of section 9 would apply to standard materials such as bolts, nails, wire, and the like?

Mr. HEALEY. It is my understanding it would not apply to articles of that kind.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I should like to ask a question in regard to the power given the Secretary of Labor to fix minimum wages. Let us assume an industry in a certain locality that has some Government contracts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Let us assume an industry has some Government contracts and it is also manufacturing material for private sale. If there is not any other industry of like character in that community, will the Secretary of

Labor fix the minimum wage that is now paid in that industry?

Mr. HEALEY. That is an administrative problem. As I view it, the prevailing wage is already a fact which already exists. The Secretary's duty is simply to inquire and ascertain what that prevailing wage is.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. That is what I wanted to know about.

Mr. HEALEY. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that section 11 provides that this bill will not become effective until 90 days after the date of approval of the act and, further, that provisions requiring the inclusion of representations with respect to minimum wages shall apply only to purchases or contracts relating to such industries as have been the subject matter of a determination by the Secretary of Labor. In other words, the stipulation regarding minimum wages will not be included in any contract until a determination has been made by the Secretary of Labor to ascertain what that minimum prevailing wage may be in the particular industry or industry group.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that a bill of this magnitude and scope should be brought up this late in the session and at this late hour during the day and with considerably less than a quorum present, because, in my opinion, we have not had before this Congress a bill of greater importance than the one under consideration tonight.

This bill has been pending before the Judiciary Committee for 10 months. One version after another has been considered and all have been rejected until this final draft came before us. It is a most unfortunate coincidence, and I call it a coincidence, that the day the Judiciary Committee reported this bill favorably every member of that committee received the following telegram, and I want to read it to you. May I say in advance that this telegram comes from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and is addressed to every member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Chairman Sumners advises that a meeting of the House Judiciary Committee will be held tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock for the purpose of taking action upon Healey-Walsh bill. Lack of a quorum at today's meeting prevented action upon this measure. Labor is tremendously interested in this bill and firmly expects it to be enacted into law before Congress adjourns. For this reason, I respectfully urge you to be present at meeting of the Judiciary Committee tomorrow morning, as herein stated. Your absence from this meeting will be construed as opposition to the measure and as being unfriendly to labor. Our representative will be present at tomorrow morning's meeting. Do not fail us. Be present.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman believe this telegram affected the judgment of any member of that committee?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I should hate to think so; and, as I stated in the beginning, it was a mere coincidence, but a most unfortunate one. I have more respect for my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee than to think they would stultify themselves and reverse their conscientious opinions as expressed during 8 or 9 months upon the receipt of a telegram like that. Nevertheless that is what happened. For 9 months the bill was held up in our committee. The telegram was received, and the next day the Judiciary Committee reversed itself. That was simply a coincidence. Let it go at that.

The original bill that was passed by the Senate was the Walsh bill. That came over to us last August, and tremendous pressure was exerted to pass the bill before we adjourned. If you recall the provisions of that bill, they required that the N. R. A. codes in effect as of May 1935 should be frozen into the law of the United States. The Judiciary Committee could not swallow that. We had one perversion after another of that bill. Perhaps I should say modification. Five or six drafts were made, until finally we got the bill now pending before us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman point out the material differences between the House bill and the Senate bill?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. The essential feature of the Senate bill was that no one could do business with the Federal Government unless he complied with the codes in effect in May 1935. It was an attempt to put into permanent law the N. R. A. codes which had been outlawed by the Supreme Court so far as the Federal Government could do so through its great purchasing power. We have considered various modifications of that proposal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Let me get down to the bill under consideration this evening. The bill pending before us contains two essential features, which I want you to think about. They have never been considered in committee. We have never had a hearing on them. First, it provides that nobody can do business with the Federal Government who works employees longer than 40 hours a week or 8 hours a day. That is one feature. The second is that nobody can get a contract with the Federal Government or do business with the Federal Government unless he subscribes to a stipulation in his contract which permits the Secretary of Labor to say what the prevailing wages are in his particular industry.

Now, first of all, let us talk about the 40-hour law. We have had no hearings about that. This matter has never been before the Congress or the Judiciary Committee. We have not given the businessmen or the manufacturers of this country any opportunity to be heard on it. It is a brand new proposition in this House. After this telegram, which I say was an unfortunate coincidence, we passed out a bill containing that clause.

This is a pretty big country. We have a good many factories. We have a good many sections. In my town it so happens that our factories are rather uniformly organized on a 44-hour-week basis. I am a little selfish about this, so far as I am concerned. There is scarcely a factory in my town that can bid on a Government contract if this bill passes. It will hurt employees and employers alike.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes more.

Some of you gentlemen may have factory districts similar to mine. Some of my factories work less than 40 hours a week, some work more, and most of them work 44 hours a week. This bill means that so far as Government contracts are concerned, nearly every factory in my town will be boycotted and outlawed. Some of you gentlemen have the same situation, I am sure.

Here is an effort to put the factories of this country in the same strait jacket, put them under the same blanket, cut them to the same size and make an arbitrary, inflexible, rigid rule that nobody who is doing business with the Federal Government can work their men more than 40 hours a week.

I say we are not ready for this question, and I say we should not pass such a bill now when business is struggling toward solvency and recovery. We have a good many industries and we have various sections in this country working under entirely different conditions.

Now, let us consider the other provisions. I could talk an hour about this. It is an absolutely unfair proposition that we should have to vote on this bill with one-half an hour of debate on the side. If this bill passes, nobody can get a Government contract without going to Mme. Perkins, Her Excellency, the Secretary of Labor, and finding out what she

regards as the prevailing wages in the factories in this country. Employers will be subject to her arbitrary orders.

In my town the factories have all kinds of different wage scales, just as they have in yours. Some work on piecework, some on straight time, some have a bonus system, or a profit-sharing system, or one of the various other modern pay systems. There is no such thing as a prevailing rate of wages in the factories of this country or in any locality of this country.

They have tried to make this bill analogous to the Bacon-Davis Act. It is an entirely different problem. Under the Bacon-Davis Act anybody who receives a contract for a construction job must pay the prevailing wages in the particular district where a definite construction job is being done. This is a very easy thing to ascertain. In every district that I know anything about there is a prevailing wage for carpenters, bricklayers, electricians, and those engaged in all the rest of the building trades, but in factories there is not any such thing as a prevailing wage. There is not even a prevailing wage in the same factory, and there surely is no prevailing rate of wages in the same town or in the same locality.

This is an impracticable proposition, and if you pass this bill you put into the hands of the Secretary of Labor the arbitrary power to say to the people of this country what they must pay their employees; you fix a rigid and inflexible limit of 40 hours a week. Let us understand that. The bill will retard the recovery that has come since the Supreme Court decision abolished the N. R. A.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members should understand that this bill was only reported out of our committee after most careful consideration, taking, as the gentleman from New York has said, approximately 9 months, but the members of our committee were determined to prevent those things from being done with respect to Government contracts that all of us recognize as not being proper.

I do not believe there is anyone in this House who believes that child labor should be employed on Government contracts.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. There is no disputing those propositions with respect to convict labor, child labor, bid brokers, and insanitary and unsafe conditions. Let us get down to the meat in the coconut.

Mr. WALTER. I do not yield further. If there is any grave differences of opinion with respect to any portion of this bill it certainly comes with respect to the possibility, if you please, of the Secretary of Labor fixing wages. There is no Member of this House any more opposed to that idea than I am. I say to you frankly that I would not have voted to report such a bill, but there is nothing in this measure that gives to anyone in any executive branch any authority to fix wages. We have had no difficulty in determining what the prevailing rates of wages are under the Bacon-Davis Act. It has been a comparatively simple matter to go into each community in which Government buildings are being constructed, and determine what every particular artisan is paid in that community. The problem is the same here. There is no reason why we cannot determine what the prevailing minimum rate of wages is for any phase of work. It seems to me that the experience we have had in determining the prevailing rates of wages under the Bacon-Davis Act prove to us conclusively that there can be no difficulty on that score under this Act.

As far as the 40-hour week is concerned, in an endeavor to fix the number of hours that would meet with the approval of everyone, we secured from the Labor Department figures concerning the average weekly hours as they obtained on the 1st of February 1936, and in only one industry are the hours in excess of 40. In foundries and machine shops the average weekly hours are 40½; in sawmills, 38½; brick manufacturing plants, 37½; blast furnaces and rolling mills, 37½; automobiles, 32½; paper and pulp, 41 hours; slaughtering and meat packing, 39½; cotton goods manufacturing, 37; petroleum refining, 35; tires and inner tubes, 33; leather boots and shoes, 30; rubber, 39; rubber boots and shoes, 37; other rubber goods, 38½. In only one industry do the hours exceed 40. I cannot see why there should be objection to our fixing the hours, and the very reason why 40 hours was written into the bill was to eliminate the argument that we were giving to any executive branch the authority to fix hours. Hours have been fixed definitely in fact, and it leaves no discretion except in cases where an injustice might be done either to the manufacturer or to the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUFFY].

Mr. DUFFY of New York. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to serve on the subcommittee under Mr. HEALEY. During the summer period I asked the industries of Rochester to study the Walsh bill. They considered the matter from every angle. They approached it, not from an antagonistic point of view but to be helpful to our committee, in order to give to other communities the working conditions and hours and the wages that prevail in Rochester. Their chief protest to this bill is the power which it vests in Washington to determine through a Government contract what the prevailing wage and what the hours of labor shall be, for the Government contract cannot be separated from the other work in the factory. The industrial council represents some 50 different manufacturing plants in Rochester which pay an average weekly wage of over $30 and generally observe the 40-hour week.

I feel that we are not sensing our responsibility in this proposed legislation. It seems to me that this bill first should be submitted to every contracting agency of this Government for a report on the administrative difficulties and the additional cost that it would impose upon the Government before we attempt to legislate the bill. It applies to every department of the Government except the legislative and the judicial branches.

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

Mr. DUFFY of New York. I should like to say that at the hearings before the committee the only branches of the Government that appeared were the Army and the Navy, both opposing it, and a representative of the C. C. C. who wished to see such legislation enacted.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DUFFY of New York. For a correction, certainly.

Mr. HEALEY. I think the gentleman said that the Army and the Navy had opposed this bill. As I understand it, the Navy Department stated that it may be difficult of administration, and the Army offered no opposition whatsoever.

Mr. DUFFY of New York. The record, I think, will show otherwise. On a dollar basis this country is the most warlike nation in the world—a billion dollars for national defense.

On a manpower basis we are the most peaceful nation in the world in relation to population. If this bill is passed, I think it is going to increase the cost of national defense 10 to 20 percent, for you must remember that in a war vessel you have practically every item that would go into our largest metropolitan hotel. In an Army plant or post you have everything that goes into a community. Some of the agencies affected are the Tennessee Valley Authority, United States Shipping Board, Panama Railroad Co., the Electric Home and Farm Authority, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Prison Industries Corporation, and the Indian Service. This bill, with the exception of the limitation of $10,000, reaches out into all those different activities of the Government in the purchase of supplies.

Further, this legislation will defeat our efforts to balance the Budget, for I know of no measure before the Congress this year that will increase the current costs of Government more than this bill if it becomes a law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DUFFY of New York. I think this legislation should not be passed until the administrative difficulties in the bill are reviewed by all the contracting agencies of the Government and until there has been reported to the Congress just what the additional cost would be if we impose this legislation and responsibility upon the contracting agencies of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, this is another effort to find a solution to the most difficult problem of modern-day government. France just the other day approached this same question from a different angle. The new administration there has prepared a program of legislation calling for annual vacations with pay for workers in private industry, a general reduction in the work period, as well as other reforms affecting every enterprise in France. The Republican Party not so long ago sponsored the Bacon-Davis Act as their suggestion to improve existing economic conditions. It helped, but its influence is all too limited. Only a few weeks ago our railroad workers, in meeting with the railroad executives, developed a plan that, in my judgment, is one of the most progressive steps that has yet been taken in the field of labor relations. They agreed that any man transferred from one point on the railroad to another should be paid both his wage and his expenses. If his property depreciated in value because of the transfer, they would make up that loss to him. In other words, the railroad company absorbs the loss.

They also agreed to pay the worker a demotion wage if he is demoted to a job paying a lesser wage than the one he formerly occupied. They pay him a separation wage running for a period of 5 years if he is separated from the service under certain circumstances. This agreement between the employees and employers of our railroads blazes a new trail in the realm of labor conditions. The members of the 21 standard railroad organizations can be proud of their leaders. The United States Government, in shortening the hours of the postal employees and in extending the vacation period for other civil-service employees, continued that example which is spreading throughout every industrial nation in the world. It is the only way out. It presents the only practical solution. I know but little about the mechanics of this legislation. I did not serve upon the subcommittee that considered the measure nor the full committee that reported the bill to this House, but I am going to say to every Democrat and Republican in the Chamber this is another attack at the greatest problem we have to face in this industrial, machine age in which we live. It limits the day to one of 8 hours, the week to one of 40 hours. It prevents child labor and destroys the sweatshop. It will never be solved unless the Government adopts drastic means in the sphere in which we have complete control. Here the courts cannot invalidate the affirmative action of the Congress. Certainly we have control over the purchases and contracts made by the Federal Government. This measure is also a protection for legitimate industry. It is an attack upon home work and sweatshops, enemies of legitimate industry. Let us pass this bill and put an end to this cruel practice of exploiting our women and children. I believe it is a proper approach, in fact, the only approach to the question that we must solve, namely, the unemployment question, that vexes this and every other industrial nation on earth. [Applause.]

The machine will be a blessing to mankind when it relieves men, women, and children of the drudgery of the past and the enforced idleness and unemployment of the present. Pass this bill, shorten the hours of our workers, put an end to the life-destroying sweatshop, give the women who must work in industry the protection they so richly deserve. Above all, save our children, those precious citizens of tomorrow, of whom the Nazarene spoke when he spoke these divine words: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Judiciary Committee I have been one of those giving constant attention to this legislation for more than 10 months. Extensive hearings have been held. The Secretary of Labor, representatives from the Departments, William Green and other representatives of the American Federation of Labor, the National Manufacturers Association, as well as many other organizations and individuals appeared before the committee. Indeed the hearings cover two large printed volumes.

In order to vote intelligently on this matter, it is necessary to understand the genesis or background of the proposed legislation. In the latter part of the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, S. 3055, the Walsh bill, was introduced into the Senate. That bill came to the House in the closing days of the session. It was designated as one of the administration's must measures. The Judiciary Committee was hastily summoned, and it was stated frankly to the committee that the bill was on the program and that it must be enacted. After most careful consideration the committee placed the bill on the table and refused to report it favorably.

The Walter bill was then introduced, and an effort made to report that bill. However, a subcommittee was appointed to study the whole matter, and at the beginning of this session of Congress Mr. HEALEY, of Massachusetts, the chairman of the subcommittee, introduced what is known to the House as the Healey bill. Extensive hearings were held on the Healey bill, and weeks of consideration were given by the subcommittee, and by the full committee. After this mature deliberation, the bill was laid on the table, which ordinarily would dispose of the matter for the session.

There was no activity on the part of the committee in reference to the bill until after the defeat of the Frazier-Lemke bill. Suddenly the committee was convened, and the advice was given that some kind of a bill must be reported out this session in lieu of the Walsh-Healey bill. Again much time was given, and the pending measure is the result of the last deliberation.

Understand, the bill before us, S. 3055, is the Walsh bill. The committee, however, struck out everything in the Walsh bill and inserted as an amendment the bill which we are considering. This is of vital importance, because if this bill passes the House, it will go to the Senate, and unless the Senate accepts the House measure, the Walsh bill and the House bill will go to conference. And the conferees will be permitted to write a bill limited only by the Walsh bill and the House bill.

Let there be no misunderstanding that the Healey bill is not before the House. It is still on the Judiciary Committee table. Also, let there be no misunderstanding, the proponents of this legislation have never suggested the bill which we are considering. Their views are embodied in the Walsh bill. They would only accept the Healey bill, which is much milder, because its enactment would send the bill to conference and give an opportunity to have written into law the Walsh bill. What I am saying in this regard is fully substantiated by the printed hearings, copies of which are obtainable from the committee.

The bill before us is a milk-and-water proposition when compared with the Walsh bill. There are features in this bill to which no one objects. For instance, I cannot conceive of any informed person, in this day and age, favoring child labor, favoring so-called bid brokers, or favoring sweatshops. It is mere demagoguery to extol the virtues of a measure dealing with these evils, the real purpose of which is to regulate hours of labor and wages of American industry.

I will go as far as anybody in protecting child labor. I did this when as a member of the Judiciary Committee I took an active part in submitting to the country the pending child-labor amendment. And, parenthetically, let me state that that amendment does not prevent the employment of children under 18 years of age, but does give the Congress discretion to act in regard to the matter up to 18 years of age. Any legislator who would approve of the sweatshop methods

indulged in in a few instances, and almost entirely in our great cities, is unworthy to hold a seat in this body. If this bill would go no further than to dispose of those evils, that would be one thing. In my judgment the legislation dealing with these evils is being used as a vehicle and a smoke screen to put over the real purposes of the bill. A reading of the hearings on the Walsh and the Healey bills will convince anyone that my conclusions are correct.

There is no way whereby we may be assured that the conference committee will not agree upon substantially the Walsh bill, the terms of which make lawful, for Government contracts, all codes existing on May 26, 1935, the day before the N. R. A. decision. Those codes, however, have one advantage over the codes that are to be written by the Secretary of Labor under the pending bill. Under the N. R. A., the codes were presumably prepared by the industries and then approved by the President. We are here asked to let a Washington agency make all of the decisions and virtually write the codes.

Now, it may be said that terms of the Walsh bill will not be substituted. No one can give us such assurance. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] sincerely believes in this legislation and has worked tirelessly for its accomplishment. He is honest, capable, and clean, and his word is good, and he advised us in the committee that it would be impossible for him to give any assurance as to what might be done in the Senate or in the conference committee.

Now, as a matter of fact, Government contracts affect at least 75 percent of all industry. That is, any rules or regulations laid down for industries entering into contractual relations with the Government will of necessity be the rules and regulations under which approximately 75 percent of all our industry must operate, provided those industries enter into such contractual regulations as set up in this bill. Many of our industries depend much upon Government contracts at this time. In these days of Government spending and priming the pump with the taxpayers' money, it would be a genuine hardship on much of our industry to, by law, make it impossible for these industries to be open to Government contracts. Because of the extremes of the situation, there are those who evidently feel that now is the time to force through this thing. In short, the enactment of this law will of necessity prevent bids by many industries, if those industries are to continue in ordinary commercial lines. If, for instance, the Government advertises for Yale locks and the factory manufacturing these locks is operating under certain conditions and regulations satisfactory to everyone, and in compliance with all State laws and regulations; if those regulations do not happen to be in accord with the determinations made by the Secretary of Labor, then this manufacturer would be stopped from bidding, unless it was seen fit to comply with the Federal rules and regulations established for the operation of the plant. That is, there could be no bid unless a part of the factory should comply with these rules and regulations while the Government contract was being filled. Of course, a factory must be operated as a unit, and the result would be no Government bid.

This bill fixes an 8-hour day and a 40-hour maximum week in all of these industries. It permits the Secretary of Labor, Mme. Perkins, to determine what the prevailing minimum wages are in the locality in which the materials are to be manufactured or furnished. No formula is set up to be followed by the Secretary of Labor. It is fair to presume, therefore, that she will take into consideration such factors as she thinks advisable. There is no definition of the word "locality", although the committee spent much time on this word, because this is most important. If some of the proponents of this bill had their way, there would be a uniform wage for uniform factory work all over the United States. Others suggested that the country might be divided into zones and zone minimum-wage rates be set up; while others suggested various political subdivisions as the locality.

The Bacon-Davis Act deals with the construction of public buildings or works only. The prevailing wage in the community must be paid. Where there is a labor organization in the community, the wage fixed by that organization has been accepted by the Secretary of Labor as the prevailing wage. However, the task is not difficult, because the territory is limited to the town, city, or village where the construction is to take place. And it seems to me that this bill should at least contain further limitations, and not leave the entire United States as the locality—limited only by the discretion of the administering officer.

Let us not forget that the 8 hours a day and the 40 hours a week is the maximum. For instance, if one city is operating on a 30-hour base and another city is operating on a 44-hour base, and each city desires to bid on a Government contract, the Secretary will be required to compel compliance with the 40-hour law by the 44-hour-a-week city or industry. Yet, of course, she will not lengthen the hours in the 30-hour-week industry. Depend upon it the Secretary is not going to lengthen the day or the week in any instance under this bill. The question at once arises as to where the 30-hour-week employer will find himself so far as securing a Government contract under this law is concerned.

None of this legislation would have been proposed had it not been for the adverse decision of the United States Supreme Court in the National Recovery Administration case; when the codes were declared unconstitutional; and the regulatory hands of bureaus were taken off the shoulders of industry; and the planners and regimentators began to look about for some means whereby the Supreme Court ruling might be circumvented.

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

Mr. MICHENER. My time is too limited. If the gentleman will give me some more time, I will yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The Walsh bill was the method decided upon. Be not deceived, the real purpose and the real effect of this law, as it finally passes the Congress and is signed by the President, will be further regulation, regimentation, and hampering of business. One in high place a few months ago recognized that industry had stood about all regulation possible and promised a breathing spell in order that the patient might regain some vitality. The invalidating of the N. R. A. gave to business the most effective breathing spell it has had in the last 3 years. Indeed business is better. Industry is beginning to function, and it seems too bad that this breathing spell is to be ended, and that we are again to resort to the theories and the philosophy of those who would control our every act and deed from Washington.

I do not believe that this Congress wants to pass any legislation placing into the hands of any individual in Washington, whether it be the Secretary of Labor or anyone else, the right to arbitrarily fix hours and wages for the working people of this country. I do not believe that this body wants to delegate to any individual or department in Washington the right to control working conditions in all industries throughout the length and breadth of the land, provided those industries desire to share in Government contracts. I say frankly that if the original bills which the committee considered had been enacted without amendment, this would have happened.

It is easy and appealing to talk about insanitary working conditions in factories. No one has any sympathy with any such conditions. And be it to the credit of our people that practically every State in the Union has wholesome regulatory laws.

We want just as few inspectors as possible from Washington swarming about the country, snooping into everybody's business and telling the honest community businessman just what he must do.

I am a great believer in local government and in local responsibility. Leave to the locality everything that is possible and local responsibility in that community will as a rule do the job.

In conclusion, do not forget that in voting for this bill you are sending the original Walsh bill on its way. You are

driving the wedge. You are again placing industry in shackles. You are militating against many small industries in small communities. You are writing another chapter on the statute books the effect of which is to centralize industry. You are hampering instead of helping the recovery which is on the way, and which can never be effective so long as more attention is given, in legislation, to changing and reforming our system of government, than to utilizing the system that has proved so efficient in the past. Give industry a permanent breathing spell, remove the constant fear that legislation of this type makes necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to be able to vote for this bill. I have a telegram from the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, who seem much opposed to its passage. We realize businessmen do not wish to be too much harassed by legislation hastily enacted without opportunity for them to be heard.

It is said that the prevailing rate of wages is easily determined. A large contractor recently brought to my attention the case where, in excavating work needing the use of some piling, that because workmen had to use a saw and a hammer occasionally it was insisted the employees should be classed as carpenters, and in such a case it was most difficult to decide what really might be the prevailing rate of wage. Much trouble and extra expense was involved.

Dredging operations, for instance, have to wait upon weather and tides. In such matters it is difficult to adjust minimum hours each week. There are many features of this bill very harassing to business. I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts would explain what really are the fears of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, and other established concerns, who I thought would be glad to get rid of these fly-by-night contractors. But even under this bill you will have them, because those bidding on contracts will procure just enough equipment and qualify as legitimate operators.

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

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I think it is because they have not been informed or have not informed themselves of the provisions of this bill. I think the majority of them would be better off by its passage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 6 minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, literally, with no thought of endeavoring to take any political advantage if there is any on this situation, I am amazed that a measure of this character should be brought before the House and an attempt made to discuss it thoroughly in 30 minutes on a side. I have had considerable experience, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the discussion of important measures, and this is one of the most important and far-reaching measures I have ever encountered. It is literally impossible for the membership of this House to scratch more than the surface of this problem in a discussion which must be concluded within 1 hour. Now, let me say something in the 4 or 5 minutes I have in an endeavor to illustrate the ramifications of this matter. It applies to all persons who engage in contracts to supply articles, materials, or devices, or what not, for the Government. Let us look around the Chamber. The carpet on the floor is supplied by contract. The brass tacks around the backs of these seats, the brass edges along the steps, the linoleum on the floor of the steps, the leather in the seats, the woodwork of the furniture, the tables, the ink in the pen of the reporter who takes down these remarks, the paper upon which the bills of the House are printed, the paper which is used by the reporters in taking down the debates, the marble along that ballustrade, everything your eye sees in this room, practically speaking, is typical of what is furnished to the Government by contract. This bill affects every industry.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot yield in 6 minutes. If the leaders in charge of the bill will extend the debate to a reasonable time to afford real discussion of the bill I will yield, but I cannot yield in the short time allowed under this extraordinary rule.

Let us now go into an Army post and see the ramifications of the bill. Every pair of soldier shoes is made under Government contract, every pair of breeches, every tunic, every button on the clothes of the men, every campaign hat, every cap, every piece of leather, every saddle, every harness, the whole heating plant of the post, the whole telephone system of the post, are furnished under Government contract.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I decline to yield.

Mr. WALTER. I hope the gentleman will not misrepresent the matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not misrepresenting the matter. The things I am referring to are not usually purchaseable on the open market.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes; they are.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Army shoes are not purchasable on the open market. They are specialties. Neither are the uniforms, the buttons, the hats, caps, saddles, or harness; not one of them. You cannot buy a heating plant on the open market. You cannot buy a telephone system for an Army post on the open market. You cannot buy a fire-alarm system on the open market. They are all subject to particular specification, and being subject to specification, they fall under this code.

Go on board a battleship. Someone has said on the floor that the things used in a battleship are the things used practically by a city. It is the same at an Army post. I have not scratched the surface.

When you pass this bill its ramifications will reach into nine-tenths of the industries of the United States. Make no mistake about that. You cannot expect any one of these industries to divide its plant half for the Government side and half for the private contract side.

This is a measure to regiment the industries of the United States. It is brought here for that purpose. It is a substitute for the defunct N. R. A. It is regimentation of industry and it makes the Secretary of Labor the absolute dictator of all wages in the United States. She may fix the minimum wage in any locality and thereafter change it as she pleases from time to time.

That is the kind of measure that is presented to this House to be discussed in a half hour to the side. I protest. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CITRON].

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, on May 4, 1936, I introduced a bill giving the United States Government the right to reject bids from manufacturers who employ child and convict labor. The use of such labor is not only a humane and moral problem but an economic one, because decent manufacturers who do not use this kind of labor are under a handicap.

LIP SERVICE

Some employers say that they believe in abolishing child labor, but when actual steps are proposed to do this very thing, they are unwilling to have anything to do with it.

Why are certain officials of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut voicing their opposition to this bill? Is it because they are closely connected with the Republican Party and for that reason bending every effort to defeat President Roosevelt and the bills sponsored by this administration?

I do not believe these few officials represent the great majority of fair-minded manufacturers in Connecticut, most of whom are too decent to participate in obstructive politics.

That my bill is meritorious is shown by the following quotation from a letter of Mr. C. E. Eyanson, assistant to the

president of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, recently sent me:

I recognize the force of the argument that the enactment of a Federal law preventing the employment of children or convict labor in connection with Government contracts would bring the backward States into line and would thus eliminate a competitive situation that is not only unfair but is not to the best interests of the people involved. * * *

The people of Connecticut know I am right in this question. The manufacturers of Connecticut know it too, and they will not be deceived by a few officials who are playing Republican politics. Study the opposition to this measure and you will find it comes from some southern manufacturers who would be forced to raise their labor standards, from some Republicans, and from the Connecticut Manufacturers Association officials who have made a political issue out of sane and humanitarian legislation.

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, for many months a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, under the able guidance of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], has studied this whole subject of Government contracts. Finally, the Judiciary Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, considered the various bills concerning Government contracts, and after many days of labor has brought out this bill, the Healey bill, which is a substitute for the Walsh bill, S. 3055. This substitute contains the best suggestions of all the bills considered. It is a good bill, protecting the Government from bid brokers or "vest pocket" dealers and manufacturers who exploit labor and are otherwise unfair in their competitive practices.

THE PRESENT LAW AND HOW IT WORKS IN PRACTICE

Let us understand the present situation concerning Government purchases. Whenever the Government buys anything—except open-market purchases—it must ask for bids, and the lowest responsible bidder must be given the award. The Government has no choice; it must accept the lowest bid. "Responsible", it has been held, means only that the successful bidder must put up a bond guaranteeing to fulfill the contract.

(A) "VEST POCKET" DEALERS

There has come into existence a clique of bid brokers, "vest pocket" dealers, who are not bona-fide manufacturers or dealers and who always get in on the low bid. They then "farm" the bid out to various people who, in order to meet the opportunity for Government work, use sweatshops or child labor, paying wages that disgrace our country. What chance has the decent wage-paying manufacturer in my State against the fellow who pays children 50 cents per day, women 80 cents per day, and men $1.35 per day, and who in addition works his help 6 full days a week?

(B) "KICK-BACK" SYSTEM

Then there are some employers who use the "kick-back" system, by which they pay their employees the prevailing rate in a community and so show it on their books, but secretly force their employees to return part of the contents of the pay envelope.

Thus the present law works to the advantage of the antisocial employer who is enabled to make low estimates and obtain Government contracts through the slashing of wages or by working his employees for excessive hours. He is even permitted to employ child labor.

(C) TREND OF HOURS AND WAGES IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Chairman. In the fall of last year a study was made by the Government Contract Division of the National Recovery Administration of wage and hour trends among firms having Government contracts. Of the 3,507 firms, employing 1,515,486 people, 2,127, or 60.64 percent, had held hours constant, 505, or 14.4 percent, had increased hours 15 percent or more, and 804, or 22.93 percent, had added from 1 to 14 percent to the working period. One thousand eight hundred and twenty-one, or 51.92 percent, of the same group of employers were found to have maintained their wage levels, 635, or 18.11 percent, to have reduced wages 10 percent or more, and 845, or 24.09 percent, to have made cuts of from 1 to 9 percent.

(D) CHILD LABOR

A very recent survey by the Coordinator for Industrial Recovery disclosed 23,170 instances of departure from the standards established by the codes of fair competition.

These cases have multiplied as employment has increased. A chart prepared by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor shows that child labor varies directly with employment generally, and that the only period when child labor decreased was one of increasing adult employment.

In the 7 months following the Schecter decision, the number of certificates of employment issued in 107 cities of 50,000 or more for children between 14 and 15 years of age was greater by 55 percent than the same figure for the entire year 1934. In New York City nearly four times as many of these permits were granted to children of this age between September and December of 1935 than in the same period of the preceding year.

(E) HOME WORK—ANOTHER EVIL

The effectiveness of factory child labor as a method of competition is exceeded only by the device of farming out materials for industrial home work. The members of a whole family can usually be hired for about the same amount as a single factory worker can earn. Its prevalence in the industrial States of the East has been shown by numerous State and Federal investigations, and those who have been most concerned with it are the most earnest in their insistence that without Federal assistance the States are impotent.

It is up to Congress to pass the necessary legislation. Let me remind you that homework and child labor involve far more than cutthroat competition. A 10-year-old girl, one of many whom the Children's Bureau found, every day goes to school, free from the shadow of the factory. A splendid law, the one which requires it. Once home, however, what does she do? She works with her mother on artificial flowers until supper time, and then after supper until she goes to bed at 9, 10, or 11 o'clock. Her contribution to the family well-being is 6 cents an hour plus the faulty eyesight which has put her in a class for retarded children.

Another little girl of about the same age told an investigator of the National Child Labor Committee that she has been working every night since she was 7½ years old, that some nights she worked until midnight and that on Saturdays and Sundays she frequently worked all day. Her wages might run from 5 to 12 cents an hour. Women in Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Connecticut work 50 hours or more a week on articles for which they are receiving up to 10 cents an hour.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IN THE PAST TO REMEDY THESE ABUSES

These evils became so widespread that from time to time Congress has attempted to rectify them. In 1892 Congress passed an 8-hour law for contractors doing Government work upon public works. Since then Congress has passed another act, the Bacon-Davis Act, providing that bidders for public works and public buildings cannot pay less than the prevailing rate in the community.

THE PRESENT BILL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE INTERFERENCE WITH, OR REGULATION OF, LEGITIMATE BUSINESS

The bill before us is in substance an extension of the Bacon-Davis Act to all Government purchases amounting to over $10,000.

This bill is not a regulation of industry. It is preposterous for anyone to say it interferes with business. It merely says that before anyone can make money out of the Government, or dip his fingers in the Government till, he shall maintain certain standards. No one is compelled to bid upon Government business. This business is voluntarily sought.

The bill merely provides that the Government shall have the right to refuse the bids on all purchases over $10,000 to those (1) who employ child or convict labor; (2) who are not regular manufacturers or dealers; (3) who violate the sweatshop laws of their States; (4) who pay less than the prevailing rate of wages in their community, and (5) who work their employees over 40 hours per week or 8 hours per day without compensating them for the overtime.

(A) UNFAIR COMPETITION FOR GOVERNMENT BUSINESS BY LOW-WAGE-PAYING FIRMS

I frankly confess that I am worried about the textile industry of my State. I am worried because firms are moving to foreign fields, like Canada, or to other sections where they can take advantage of low-standard wages. Can the high-wage-paying manufacturer compete fairly with the low-wage-scale competitor without reducing his wages? I am worried about maintaining the high labor standards it has taken years to build up. It is not fair to have the Government foster a system which turns its business over to those who would break down our high American standards.

(B) NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION ADMITS ABUSES

Even the representative of the National Association of Manufacturers admitted these evils. Testifying before the Judiciary Committee, Mr. John Gall, associate counsel for this organization, said:

I am not here * * * to defend the use of child labor in the performance of a Government contract by a primary contractor. I am not here to defend the practice of bid peddling * * *.

REQUIRING STANDARDS FOR QUALITY OF MATERIALS IS TO PROTECT THE GOVERNMENT—AND REQUIRING THAT THE GOODS BE MANUFACTURED UNDER DECENT HEALTH STANDARDS AND SATISFACTORY LABOR RELATIONS IS ALSO A PROTECTIVE MEASURE

The Government can require certain standard specifications for materials. Since the Government has the power to accept a bid only if the bidder's goods are of a certain grade and quality, then the Government should be given the power to do business with those who manufacture under decent standards and conditions, because this is an added assurance of the desired quality. There is no question as to the constitutionality of this bill.

When goods are manufactured by child labor and under sweatshop conditions their quality is affected. When a manufacturer is making supplies and profits out of the Government by paying un-American wages his employees are dissatisfied. As a result, the Government is injured because cheaper quality goods are produced. Furthermore, dissatisfaction breeds labor troubles, causing the Government embarrassment, delays, and losses.

The reason we amended the law for public buildings and public works was to assure the Government better service, and that is the reason we should extend the Bacon-Davis Act to include the manufacture of supplies and goods for the Government.

GOVERNMENT IN MAKING CONTRACTS SHOULD BE NO DIFFERENT FROM ANY INDIVIDUAL

Certainly the power of the Government to make a contract is the same as that of a private individual. An individual has the right to demand certain requirements for obtaining the award of his contract but the Government has not such a right because it is limited in its business dealings to the lowest bidder.

THIS BILL WILL PROTECT THE DECENT MANUFACTURER FROM DISCRIMINATION

At present the decent manufacturer is discriminated against. This measure will end that discrimination. It will prevent the charge that can be asserted now that decent manufacturers are under a handicap. Shall they continue to be under a handicap?

PRINCIPAL CONTRACTORS ONLY RESPONSIBLE

Now this bill makes only the principal contractor responsible. This is proper, because he employs the labor and makes the agreement with the Government. He is not responsible for the actions of his subcontractor unless he has knowledge. That is a fair proposition.

BILL SHOULD PASS

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that this bill has been misrepresented and misunderstood by some. Anyone who reads it, and wants to protect the Government and decent manufacturers in maintaining our high labor standards and satisfactory service, is surely in favor of its passage. I hope that it becomes the law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendment for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That in any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all the foregoing being hereinafter designated as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included the following representations and stipulations:

(a) That the contractor is the manufacturer of or a regular dealer in the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment to be manufactured or used in the performance of the contract;

(b) That all persons employed by the contractor in the manufacture or furnishing of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment used in the performance of the contract will be paid, without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account, not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work or in the particular or similar industries or groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract;

(c) That no person employed by the contractor in the manufacture or furnishing of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment used in the performance of the contract shall be permitted to work in excess of 8 hours in any one day or in excess of 40 hours in any one week;

(d) That no person under 18 years of age and no convict labor will be employed by the contractor in the manufacture or production or furnishing of any of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment included in such contract; and

(e) That no part of such contract will be performed nor will any of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment to be manufactured or furnished under said contract be manufactured or fabricated in any plants, factories, buildings, or surroundings or under working conditions which are insanitary or hazardous or dangerous to the health and safety of employees engaged in the performance of said contract. Compliance with the safety, sanitary, and factory-inspection laws of the State in which the work or part thereof is to be performed shall be prima-facie evidence of compliance with this subsection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman from New York had to say concerning section 9, and I must take emphatic exception to what he said concerning the various articles and equipment that he mentioned. The gentleman wants us to believe that the ink and the paper and the linoleum and the seats and the seat tacks and what not in this very Chamber would have to come under the provisions of the the earlier portions of the bill, and that there would be the limitations and conditions exacted on those purchases as would be exacted on the purchase of uniforms and articles that go into the equipment of battleships.

If I read section 9 aright, and particularly the beginning thereof, I read that the very articles that the gentleman mentions could and would be purchased in the open market as anyone would purchase them, and that the Government would have the right to buy the tacks and the ink and the paper just exactly as you or I would buy them, because I read the language as follows:

This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment as may usually be bought in the open market.

These commonplace articles are bought in the open market. The Government would continue to buy them in the open market in open competition.

Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. WADSWORTH rose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Read on.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly. The rest of the section says, "Unless specially manufactured to conform to particular specifications." The articles mentioned are not such. The hearing indicated in no uncertain way exactly what I have indicated and has given my interpretation of how these goods may be purchased; and I say, with all due deference to the gentleman from New York, he is woefully in error.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Referring to that section, the language is:

This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment as may usually be bought in the open market unless specially manufactured to conform to particular specifications.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: In the first part of the bill you limit the measure to purchases of $10,000

or more, and under this language you intimate that it would apply to specially manufactured articles costing much less than $10,000. If this is different from the gentleman's construction of the language, why not leave out the words "unless specially manufactured to conform to particular specifications"?

Mr. CELLER. We must read the bill in its entirety, and you cannot lift one or two phrases out of the context without reference to the bill in its entirety.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. What objection would the gentleman have to leaving that out?

Mr. CELLER. You would destroy the symmetry of the bill if you took out those provisions. The committee has given infinite care to the wording of this bill, and it is hoped that such changes will not be attempted.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. May I ask the gentleman a further question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Did you promise in your committee before your vote was taken to vote out this bill, and if it was passed in the House, or if it went to the Senate, you would not agree to any amendment, but would stand for this bill as it is?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct in his assertion and the committee will abide by that declaration. Not only has the statement been made by committee members individually, but it has been made formally by the committee itself and the committee will stand by that arrangement.

I am somewhat chagrined at hearing what the gentleman from New York states and I believe the statement goes back to a rather reactionary period. We are in a new era, and, certainly, the Government should be the first to blaze the trail and hold aloft high the banner of fair and decent conditions for labor, and that is why we are irrevocably in favor of the bill and hope it will be passed. [Applause.]

The Department of Labor and the Federal and State agencies have been striving with might and main to improve the labor standards. Industry in general has not come forward voluntarily. The Government must now take definite forward steps. It does not coerce. It does not compel anyone in this bill to do anything. It says that if you want the advantage of a Government contract then you must comply with minimum labor standards—decent, forward-looking standards—not standards of a reactionary sweatshop period. There can be no home work, no child labor involved in these Government contracts.

Ofttimes, under present law curbstone brokers, fly-by-night contractors, get the contracts under the lowest-bidder conditions. All that is needed is a bond. A bond is easily procurable. As a result the successful bidder makes up the difference due to the low bid on labor. Labor pays the piper. Decent standards are broken down.

By this bill we disassociate the Government from vile antisocial conditions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK:

Page 21, line 9, after the word "for", insert the words "construction or for."

Page 21, line 15, after the word "be", insert the word "constructed."

Page 21, line 18, after the word "the", insert the word "construction."

Page 22, line 3, after the word "in", insert the words "the construction or."

Page 22, line 9, after the word "in", insert the words "the construction or."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered, in my opinion, is a perfecting amendment. It is rather difficult for me to reach the conclusion that in reporting this bill the committee overlooked this important field, and in offering the amendment it is offered from the angle of perfecting the bill in the direction in which it should receive consideration. This amendment I am offering for the American Federation of Labor, and I concur with them in the position they take. While I have been conferred with by the A. F. of L. in connection with offering the amendment, the amendment represents my own personal viewpoint.

Certainly, if we are to include the manufacture or furnishing of materials, we should also include the field of construction, as, for instance, the construction of naval vessels.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman think that the Bacon-Davis Act covers the very situation that he is now discussing?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think so. At least, my attitude is this, that there is a question in that respect, and certainly the insertion of this amendment in the bill will not in any way weaken it, but will strengthen it.

Mr. CONNERY. It does not cover it in the Bacon-Davis Act, because your hours are not covered, merely your prevailing rate of wages.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had that in mind when I answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Is it the gentleman's purpose to repeal that section of the Bacon-Davis Act which requires contractors on Government construction to obey the prevailing rates of wages and hours in the communities where the construction is done; to substitute for it the 40-hour week and the 8-hour day? Is that the purpose?

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose that I have in mind?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Yes. This does not apply to construction work. The Bacon-Davis Act does that. If this is a surreptitious amendment of the Bacon-Davis Act, we ought to understand it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of the amendment that I have in mind is to have the bill apply to construction as well as manufacturing and furnishing of material. There is no reason why that should not be done. I listened with a great deal of interest to the very fine speech made in opposition by my distinguished friend, whom I greatly admire, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I recognize his opposition and his viewpoint, and I honestly differ with him in his opposition to this bill. I think the subcommittee has done a wonderful job, and the full committee has done a meritorious work in reporting the bill to the House. My colleague [Mr. HEALEY], chairman of the subcommittee, has worked hard, and is entitled to the greatest of credit. We have ten to eleven million people unemployed. It is a problem which faces the American people. It is a problem arising out of mass production. We have to meet that problem, and one of the ways of doing it is the shorter work week. Every great step forward in the past has been met by opposition, honest opposition in some cases, but opposition that closes its eyes to the existing facts and necessities; and as time went on, it was realized by experience that the arguments of fears advanced to the passage of necessary and progressive legislation were groundless. I predict that the same arguments advanced against this bill will be found groundless after the bill becomes a law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a 5-day work week for Federal employees. Already we have a 40-hour work week for postal employees. While we might dislike our economic law creating the problems that exist, these problems are here. Nevertheless, the fact remains that we are forced to the realization that economic law has produced mass production, out of which serious problems have arisen. We must meet the problems arising out of mass production. We must meet the problem of involuntary unemployment, and the shorter work week is one of

the means of meeting those problems. It is not the sole solution, but it is one of the solutions. We must solve the greater distribution of earning power; we must try to create more purchasing power in order that the mass-production era we are in might operate successfully. We must try to meet the problem of consumption and distribution. That is the problem that confronts us. We have to meet the problem and decide it in a manner which inures to the benefit of those of today and to the benefit of generations yet to come.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Does the gentleman realize that the provisions of this act do not apply to Government agencies which are engaged in competition with private enterprise?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is only a minor matter, if it is so.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Well, it is so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Later I am going to introduce an amendment at the request of the Department of Justice, which is acceptable to labor, which will clarify the situation the gentleman has in mind. This is a broad field. Forty years ago the 8-hour day came about in this country as a result of Congress passing the 8-hour law for Federal employees. We applied it also to those who received contracts from the Federal Government. What is wrong with a bill of this kind? The exigencies of the times require it, the circumstances demand it, and we should pass this legislation in order to partially meet the great problem of unemployment that confronts us. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. In line 9, page 21, as I understand it, the gentleman's amendment provides for the insertion of the word "construction" after the word "the."

Mr. McCORMACK. That is on line 9, page 21?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the word "for" and before the word "the" put in the words "construction or for", so that it will read "for construction or for manufacture or furnishing of material", and the other amendments are to carry out that same purpose.

Mr. MICHENER. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have enough regard for my own position to not take up too much of the gentleman's time.

Mr. MICHENER. I may be in error.

I am trying to get some information as to just what this means. As I understand the amendment, it would in no way affect the construction of public buildings or other structures covered by the Bacon-Davis law. I just wanted to be clear about this matter. There is some question, but it seems to me that the Bacon-Davis law covers but one thing; that is, the construction of public buildings in given localities. That being true, the workability of the present law cannot in any way be compared with the Bacon-Davis law, because the Bacon-Davis law covers one building in a locality. The prevailing wage is determined by the locality or community, under the Bacon-Davis law, which means the village or city. The committee spent a lot of time over the words "location", "community", "city", "town", "State", or what not. The language used is "location."

Mr. McCORMACK. Is my friend asking me a question?

Mr. MICHENER. No. I finished with the gentleman, who is always courteous and well-informed.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman's amendment says "for construction or for manufacture."

Mr. MICHENER. If it says "for construction or manufacture", it would mean the manufacture of material.

Mr. CONNERY. No; it does not mean that at all.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman represents the Federation of Labor and probably knows more about this than I do. Does the gentleman say this means the construction of public buildings?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Then this does intend to cover public buildings?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes. The Davis-Bacon law puts it on the prevailing rate of wages. This also puts them on the 40-hour week.

Mr. MICHENER. If this law conflicts with the Bacon-Davis law, then that part of the Bacon-Davis law will be repealed by the enactment of this law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand the purpose of the alleged perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], what he wishes to do is to put into this bill the construction of buildings or permanent property of the Government. Is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Naval vessels, for instance.

Mr. CHANDLER. We have that under the law now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have you got naval vessels?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes. We have the 8-hour day.

Mr. McCORMACK. The 40-hour week? Have you got the 40-hour week?

Mr. CHANDLER. No. The 8-hour day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then that answers the question.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. This would apply more to any construction. The Walsh bill which passed last session of Congress applied not only to public buildings, but to public works. This puts them on a 40-hour week.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct; but this is not a public-works proposition. The Bacon-Davis law is a public-works law, and you have the prevailing-wage principle which applies here. You do not have the hour limits, it is true. Now, the proper place to handle the question of hours is by amending the Bacon-Davis law. Do not amend this law, which relates to an entirely different subject, is not intended to meet that situation, and it is not drawn to meet that situation. This is not the place for it. We went over this subject with people who are most interested in it, with representatives from the Department of Labor, and if they wanted it put in this bill, they never told us, who worked on this bill in the committee, anything about it. This amendment ought to be voted down. It will bring confusion. It will put the entire bill into a situation where it would not be workable, with all due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHANDLER. With pleasure.

Mr. CONNERY. It merely amplifies the Bacon-Davis law, saying "this construction", as in the Bacon-Davis law, only the 40-hour week goes in, too.

Mr. CHANDLER. You cannot amplify the Bacon-Davis law by connecting it up with this act. There is no disposition to defeat the purposes of the Bacon-Davis Act here. We are trying to deal with a different branch of the subject, where the property being worked on is not localized. We are trying to improve the contracts for the manufacture of articles or equipment for the Government. You are thinking of a condition where property is localized and where local conditions are easily determined.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHANDLER. With pleasure.

Mr. CONNERY. One of the worst troubles we have is in the shipyards. We had an investigation of the shipyards, and the most flagrant instances of bad hours and cheap wages were in the shipyards. This amendment will protect them against that.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is not the bill for that purpose, I submit.

You have an 8-hour law applicable to all Government construction now except the manufacture of armor plate, and so forth. The place for such amendments is in those bills. I do not think this can be made germane. It really will do this bill a tremendous amount of harm.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down. I am for this bill.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not understand that the present law provides for an 8-hour day and a 5-day week.

Mr. CHANDLER. No, it does not; but the gentleman will find that that is covered in several Federal statutes relating to the employment of individuals by the Government.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am trying to get information. Under the existing law they can work 6 days a week.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. But under the pending bill it would be limited to 40 hours a week.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; we must bring in a bill that will meet that situation.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Answering the gentleman from Wisconsin, I may say his supposition is correct, but as a matter of practice, they work 40 hours.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, the four fundamental concepts on which the superstructure of the economic prosperity of our Nation is dependent are: First, production; second, distribution; third, exchange; and fourth, consumption.

Through technological inventions and mechanical developments, the trained and scientific minds of the peoples of the world have subjugated the forces of nature to serve the will of man. These great mechanical contrivances, contraptions, and marvels of machinery have solved for the people of our Republic everything that embraces and appertains to mass production, distribution, and exchange. The weak link in the chain of our economic structure is the principle of distribution which has thus far defied and baffled the master minds of economic philosophy. If we could solve the problem of distribution as we have that of mass production, unemployment and all the accompanying evils that go with economic depressions would be relegated to the ashes of time. All economists agree that the national symptoms, that arise through the sickness involved in the collapse of distribution, are due to the lack of the purchasing and consuming power of the great masses of the American people.

The Walsh-Healey bill which we are now debating on the floor of this House, in my humble opinion, is a powerful weapon that will help to restore the consuming and purchasing power of the working people of our Nation. This great humanitarian bill is the Magna Carta—the emancipation proclamation of the toiling laboring classes since the Supreme Court declared the N. R. A. unconstitutional. It will serve as a model for all industry, the great commercial and business organizations to emulate.

This measure stands for three great humane principles. First, it demands the establishment of minimum wages. Why is this subject so important? Let me tell you.

There are three kinds of wages: First, we have starvation wages, which will not keep body and soul together; second, we have living wages, which just about keep body and soul united; third, we have saving wages, which should be the great American living standard that should make it possible for the American workingman of today to save in days of prosperity and affluence for days of adversity and misfortune. [Applause.] That is the kind of doctrine that both Mr. Landon, the Republican nominee for President, and the genial, gracious leader of Democracy, President Roosevelt, should dedicate and consecrate their activities to accomplish for the benefit of our American people. [Applause.]

The Walsh-Healey bill makes it mandatory for all agencies that deal with the United States Government to adopt the prevailing wages in the respective localities in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract.

The Walsh-Healey bill will prevent the exploitation of the American workingman by many industrialists of our country who can only live and thrive through the exploitation of labor. This great humanitarian measure will prevent the Government of the United States from being particeps criminis and a contributing factor in the exploitation of its citizens whose interest we here, as Members of the House of Representatives, have sworn to protect.

Mr. Chairman, this splendid measure further provides for the adoption of the principle of maximum hours. The workweek within the last two generations has dropped from 80, 72, 66, 58, 54, 48, 40 to 30 hours. President Van Buren ordered the 10-hour day for Government navy yards in 1840, and ever since the hours of Government workers have been better than the hours of those employed by private industry. This applies to postal and District of Columbia employees. The acts of 1868, 1892, and 1912 blazed a pioneer trail which led to the 8-hour day for Federal employees. Most of the States have followed. So, in advocating regulation of working hours, we are merely using a trend already well established as a weapon to combat unemployment. The wage boards of the Department of Labor will determine not only minimum wages but also the maximum workweek in the number of hours for any given industry. The principle that must guide them is to spread available work equally over all workers attached to a given industry—employed or unemployed. Enforcement and compliance will be secured by adequate provision for publicity, and, if that fails, fines that will deter chiselers from exploiting their workers.

We have today almost 10,000,000 people unemployed. The perfection, development, and elaboration of technological machinery has dislocated the economic working conditions throughout the Nation. It is necessary to diminish the hours of labor in order to divide the work between the millions of unemployed without subtracting from the wages of the working people, in order to protect their consuming and purchasing power, upon which the prosperity of our Nation is dependent. This measure in the Walsh-Healey bill safeguards this great ideal.

The third principle involved in the philosophy of this remarkable bill is the principle of the elimination of child labor.

Children under 16 years of age should not be found in the mills, in the mines, in the factories, in the looms. Their frail bodies should hallow the great temples of democracy. That is our schools and colleges. The welfare of our Nation is dependent upon the education, the culture, and the civilization of the flower of its youth, upon whose happiness, prosperity, and success is dependent the future welfare of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the tragedy of the American working people is the man or woman who is willing to work at anything, but unfortunately finds no place to toil to support those who are dependent upon him. The true American is opposed to relief in any shape or manner. The dole is obnoxious to his ideals of American citizenship. The American workers demand that the Government through its economic philosophy will make it possible for them to work in the quarry of labor so that they may be self-supporting and self-respecting. What are we doing for the toilers ground down through economic unemployment? Perhaps it might be interesting for you to know the background and the history of unemployment throughout the ages and what the different nations of ancient, medieval, and modern times have done to overcome the tragedy of unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, the streamline is a symbol of speed. Since the World War America has, figuratively speaking, streamlined her entire industrial system. We are too close to this development to comprehend its magnitude. It is comparable to the sudden burst of energy which within 20 years after the Battle of Waterloo made Great Britain the steel and textile center of the world. Today, in America, our automobile industry dramatically leads a mass-production movement in comparison with which the industrial revolution

in England pales into insignificance. The British industrial revolution involved millions of dollars and affected thousands of men. Our industrial development involves billions of capital investments and affects millions of workers. But we recognize the essential similarity of the two eras: Then, as now, the machine displaces men. Then, as now, the challenge of mass unemployment presses for solution. Our streamlined train is hurtling through space at a new high. Where are we bound for? Is there danger of immediate derailment? Even the most selfish motives compel our attention. On this train we are all passengers.

WORLD HISTORY OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Let us turn initially for guidance and counsel to the pages of recorded history. The Bible never disappoints us. We hear Amos and Isaiah unleash the whirlwind of their wrath against poverty, suffering, and unemployment. No more scathing indictment of social injustice was ever uttered or penned by man. We find Joseph in the role of an economic expert, expounding the theory of the business cycle to Pharaoh—the 7 fat years, then the 7 lean years.

Turning the pages of ancient history, our attention is arrested by the Phoenicians, those "Yankees of the East." Their enterprise merits the appellation. They carried their outposts into Lebanon, Greece, and the northern part of Italy, which they called Venetia, or Venice. They founded Carthage, in Africa. In frail barks known as triremes they navigated the Mediterranean as far west as the British Isles, where they explored the mines, producing iron and tin, the latter to be sent back to Phoenicia and, with copper, converted into bronze. Their answer to the problem of a crowded homeland poor in natural resources was: Migrate to better land and colonize. Thus the Phoenicians met the problem of unemployment.

The lesson of the Phoenicians was not lost on the Hellenic civilization. We find the ancient Greeks settling in what we now know as Sicily, establishing there a great center of commerce, the city of Syracuse. They colonized Asia Minor. The homeland of Greece was drained of its surplus population.

The Roman Empire was confronted with the problem of unemployment at a very early stage of its history. The arch enemy of Rome was Carthage. Their bitter economic rivalry could have but one issue, "Carttago delanda est"—Carthage must be destroyed. Rome solved the problem by war—not one but three wars—and reduced Carthage to ashes. Rome thus furnished a brilliant example of what may be termed the direct method of removing obstacles to empire. The Roman Legions solved the unemployment problem. They planted their flag in Spain, Belgium, Britain, in the Balkan States, which are now known as Rumania, Bulgaria, and Serbia, in Hungary, Asia Minor, and on the northern coast of Africa. The civil population was ever ready to follow the flag into new regions where employment, economic security, and profitable labor were assured.

Time does not permit of an extended examination into the history of unemployment after the fall of the Roman Empire in the year 476 A. D. The Dark Ages, feudalism, which bound the serf to a plot of ground, but at least gave him economic security, the Crusades drafting great numbers of unemployed into religious armies, all are illuminating in their effect on the problem of unemployment.

The growth of cities and the development of craft guilds signalized the break-down of the feudal system.

In time with the development of free towns as centers of commerce and manufacture it became possible for serfs to escape from their lords' domains and become free citizens. A worker could better his position in these towns. There were specialized artisans. Shoemakers, for example, made only shoes; tailors specialized in making clothes. And a surplus of each man's specialized product was exchanged for parts of other surpluses. Those workers engaged in making the same product organized themselves into craft guilds, which took over the function of buying and selling as well as regulating the type and quantity of goods to be produced. It is interesting to note that the guilds fostered monopoly by limiting membership to master craftsmen. The number of master craftsmen was restricted by rules which required young men first to serve periods of apprenticeship and journeymanship over a term of years before they might qualify as master craftsmen. Hours and wages were subject to strict regulation by the craft guild. The relation between the master craftsman and his journeymen and apprentices was intimate and friendly; there was no antagonism. They all belonged to the same class, and every provident young journeyman had a reasonably good opportunity to eventually go into business for himself as a master craftsman.

The craft guilds, however, had been shorn of most of their power when Elizabeth acceded to the throne in England. They were supplanted by craft work done at home, combined with farm labor in the rural sections. In this period we must also note the rise of another system of production which foreshadowed the problems that were to become acute under modern capitalism. Under this system a master craftsman or any man who had sufficient means, although he had no special knowledge of any particular trade, might set up a business establishment larger than those formerly existing. He would superintend the manufacture of a given product. The work, of course, was still done by hand, but there were more workers and there was division of labor—that is, specialization in some degree. Unlike the guild system, the workers did not own their own tools, nor had they any control over the disposition of what they produced. The owner of the business disposed of its output as he saw fit. The seeds of economic class division and the opposition of labor and capital were sown. The system that I have been describing to you is often referred to as the "cottage" system.

During the Renaissance period in England, about the middle of the fourteenth century, the great plague known as the "black death" swept over Europe and killed more than half of the British working population. There was a resultant scarcity in the labor market. The workers tried to get higher wages, but the governing classes brought about the passage of legislation which made work compulsory at wages fixed by statute. If a man refused to accept these conditions, which were fixed by law, he was subject to penalty of imprisonment for conspiracy. A philosophic justification of this choice morsel of legalized oppression was not wanting. The mercantile economists asserted that the State had the power to exercise complete control over economic affairs in order to increase its national prestige. The influence of this doctrine may be traced to modern times, where it took the form of conspiracy and restraint-of-trade legislation. Even more important is the attitude of judicial condemnation with reference to any collective action on the part of workingmen to get higher wages, or to improve the conditions under which they worked.

Special attention must be given to the era of discovery and exploration which opened after the Saracens took Constantinople in 1453. In those days ice as a means of preserving food was unknown. Europeans had to obtain the spices of the East for this purpose. After the Turks took Constantinople, rich caravans and ships enroute to India were an easy prey to Mohammedans. A new route to India must be found. The rest is familiar history. The discovery of America, the gradual absorption by the New World of the unemployed of the old. Colonization once more appeared to be the solution.

The famous period in England's history between 1760 and 1830 is too well known to require any comment. It is sufficient to state that the industrial revolution intensified the problems of unemployment and labor under the factory system. The farm was deserted for the factory. Oliver Goldsmith, in the Deserted Village, sounded the warning:

> Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Thus the poet summarized the results of the industrial revolution in England. If I told you that 12 percent of its population were rich and comfortable, while 88 percent of its inhabitants were in abject poverty; if I told you that the new system had conferred upon man the blessings of child labor, low wages, long hours, industrial accidents, and disease—panics as a normal recurrence in the economic

cycle—you would not have the picture as vividly before you as Goldsmith painted it in those five words: "Wealth accumulates and men decay."

After the Franco-Prussian War, from 1870 to the inception of the World War in 1914, the industrial nations of the world, spurred on by the mass-production possibilities of the factory system, reached out into Africa, Asia, and Australia for markets. England obtained from her colonies raw materials, converted them into manufactured goods. These finished products were, in turn, exported to the colonies. The colonies were not permitted to manufacture. Just supply the raw materials and buy the finished product. That is why America in 1776 was 98 percent agricultural and 2 percent industrial. In the period from 1870 to 1914 there was less unemployment than in any other period of the world's history—and this despite the fact that the population of Europe doubled in the nineteenth century, and the population of the United States more than doubled.

UNITED STATES

We may state, somewhat arbitrarily, that the Civil War marks the beginning of our industrial development.

A few figures will suffice to convey some idea of our growth in the 45-year period from 1869 to 1914. The number of wage earners increased from two to seven million men. Wages increased from six hundred million to over four billion. Coal mined, from about 33,000,000 net tons to about 513,000,000 net tons. Petroleum from 4,000,000 to 265,000,000 barrels. Active cotton spindles from seven to thirty million. Railroad track mileage from 53,000 to 250,000 miles. Millions of laborers were needed to tend the looms, mine coal, and build railroads. Great tidal waves of humanity rolled across the Atlantic. The large corporations fostered immigration by agreeing to furnish jobs to those who would come here from Europe to work in our factories and mines. Our merchant adventurers were not paying so much attention to efficiency. There were mechanical improvements and new machines, but the trend was to secure more labor rather than to increase its productivity.

The mass-production movement was lashed to a furious tempo by the World War. By 1925, a worker turned out more than three times as many rubber tires than in 1914. Productivity of labor in the automobile industry increased almost threefold. In steel works and rolling mills, in the manufacture of cement, in oil refining, the increase in productivity between 1914 and 1925 is amazing. We are now in the throes of this second industrial revolution, and no man may say what the ultimate effect on the social structure may be. But we may assert that the mechanization of industry is seemingly compatible with mass unemployment on a scale never before known to man. Our historical survey emphasizes the magnitude of the problem, and the need of some immediate solution.

NUMBERS OF UNEMPLOYED

If we are to propose a solution for unemployment we must first define the term. The definition used by the United States Bureau of Census in making its enumeration on April 1, 1930, will answer our purpose. An unemployed person is one who has lost his job and who is able and willing to work. This definition excludes the sick, the aged, the injured, mental defectives, strikers, and those who do not want to work. While we recognize the fact that each of these groups presents a definite social problem, we shall gain nothing but confusion by lumping them all together under the heading "unemployed."

If you enjoy statistical games try to guess how many people are unemployed in the United States today. Leading economists and statisticians differ widely in their estimates. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Weather Bureau warns dirigibles, airplanes, and hydroplanes of the approach of impending storms, cyclones, and tornadoes. This advanced information warns the pilot to pursue a different course to escape inevitable destruction. Then why should we not have statistics in our own Government that will give us an adequate and truthful picture of the total of our unemployed. We may agree with Prof. Paul H. Douglas that "the American statistics on unemployment are the worst of any industrial country in the world."

Nations which, like Great Britain, administer a system of unemployment insurance, can and do obtain accurate figures from month to month, the jobless register at employment exchanges furnishing data for reliable periodic statements as to the number of unemployed. The best we can do in this country is to tabulate the results of the censuses and estimates, and even the figures obtained in this way leave no doubt as to the seriousness of the problem. For example, the number of unemployed at any one given time from 1890 to 1933 varies from 1,000,000 to 13,000,000. The complete enumeration taken by the United States Bureau of the Census in April 1930 showed 3,267,000 unemployed and irregularly employed. In January 1931, a sampling count was taken in 19 of the largest cities scattered all over the United States. It showed about 6,300,000 unemployed and irregularly employed, or an average of 20 percent. But the army of unemployed in a whole year is very much larger than the number of unemployed on any particular day. To illustrate, on April 1, 1930—before the depression had made much headway—of the 2,429,062 jobless workers, 85 percent had been idle more than 2 weeks, 70 percent more than 4 weeks, 55 percent over 8 weeks, 40 percent over 13 weeks, 14 percent over 26 weeks, and 3.3 percent over 1 year. If we had available monthly unemployment reports like those issued in Great Britain, we would realize even more clearly the bitter truth. Insecurity stalks the land, a Frankenstein monster that menaces the life of every workingman.

THE CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

One would hardly expect to find romance in the census reports, yet we can find in them an absorbing record of the rise and decline of certain industries: Phonographs supplanted by radios; buttons and hooks and eyes by zippers; bicycles, carriages, wagons, horse blankets, saddlery, harness, and whips by automobiles; wooden boxes by corrugated boxes; brick and cement; paper wrappers by cellophane; wood by Bakelite and Masonite; leather by fabrikoid; cotton and wool by silk and rayon; grandmother's red flannels are with us no more.

These census reports show graphically the plight of the farmer. In prosperous times people buy not more farm staples but luxuries. Nor do farmers derive much benefit from the use of cottonseed for oils or cellulose for rayon. These farm waste products displace lard, cotton, and wool, which are also farm products. Farm labor has been especially hard hit by the loss of markets for certain products.

Declining industry, then, increases unemployment. True, the displaced men may ultimately be absorbed in new industries, but "ultimately" may mean one, two, six, or a dozen years. Meanwhile hardship and suffering are the lot of the worker who has had to make way for the march of time.

The census tells us another story of equal interest. It tells us how the South now lords it over New England in cotton-textile production; how the boot and shoe industry has migrated westward from the same New England; how West Virginia wrested supremacy in soft-coal mining from Pennsylvania; how Texas and Arkansas passed the older States of Dixie in cotton raising. These trends mean abandoned mills, mines, and acreage unplowed. Possibly they have resulted in no net increase in unemployment; industries usually move to regions where there is a plentiful surplus of labor. But the sectional unemployment that results is widespread and appalling from the standpoint of human and social cost.

Since 1923 there has been work for about 450,000 miners, leaving an unnecessary surplus of 250,000 men. In the field of communications, the dial telephone reduced available jobs in the Bell system by more than 69,400. Similarly the teletypewriter and multiplex lines reduced employment by 8,500 jobs, or 50 percent. Let me give you a few more examples garnered from other industries. A big steam shovel can do as much excavating as 300 laborers. One-man trolleys have eliminated conductors on many street railways. Calculating machines, automatic check writers—they can

write 7,500 an hour—coin-changing machines, sound apparatus in motion-picture theaters, automatic cigar- and cigarette-making machines—these and similar labor-saving devices put hundreds of thousands out of work.

Now there is a school of economists who believe that in the long run improved technique does not cause any net increase in unemployment. I do not consider it necessary to discuss this theory pro and con, because even its proponents admit that technological advances cause much temporary idleness and suffering.

Let us turn now to the familiar conception of the business cycle—the seven fat years and seven lean years. What are the basic causes of the regular recurrence of boom and depression periods? Economists have not been able to isolate them, nor are they in agreement as to the why and wherefore of these cycles. One explanation has already been discussed—the idea of overproduction, or as some call it, underconsumption. When purchasing power does not keep pace with production, stocks are bound to pile up. These must be liquidated, and a period of depression ensues.

Overproduction is coupled with too great an expansion of credit during prosperity. Any marked increase in money or credit is reflected in rising prices. Rising prices act as a further stimulus to increased business operations. But banks cannot expand credit indefinitely. When they stop, liquidation is forced. Prices drop. We have the vicious spiral of deflation.

Any sudden withdrawal of the available supply of capital will cause an increase in unemployment. When Hoover announced a moratorium in 1931 foreign capital took sudden flight. The loss of twelve billions in war debts had already induced a financial anemia. Now, the patient lost more blood, and business was faced with the threat of additional taxation to balance these losses. Consequently unemployment increased over 4 percent between July and September of that year.

Money and credit must also be considered from an international aspect. If the United States and France accumulate too much gold, the purchasing power of other nations is adversely affected. Having an excess of investment funds, what do we do with them? We loan the money to other countries—to Germany, to Austria—then set up tariff barriers so high as to render difficult, if not impossible, the repayment of the loans. Our prosperity depends in part on our export trade. Tariff barriers, like the Hawley-Smoot tariff, tend to diminish, if not to destroy, that trade. We cannot sell foreign nations unless we buy from them. These are economic truisms.

The problem of interest is a great contributing factor in the causation of unemployment. Interest on money lent is another penalization of business. When business is good and money dear 6 percent on loans may be good practice. When business is bad and money cheap 1 to 2 percent is the most that should be charged for commercial loans. The difference between 6 per cent and 1 percent may be, and often is, the difference between success and failure in a small business and in a large corporation.

This practical fact was known in the days of Moses, for in Deuteronomy 23: 19–20, it is set forth:

> Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother, usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury. Unto a stranger thou mayest lend on usury; but unto thy brother (brethren) thou shalt not lend upon usury.

Usury meant interest in the language of that day, and it varied with the stranger to the utmost that could be extorted in bargaining and the need of the stranger.

Depositors are all strangers to a bank, as one may know who has applied for a loan from a bank. Brothers bringing deposits; strangers seeking a loan. What is needed are some flexible provisions authorized by law that will meet this condition and reduce the amount of usurious interest.

Flexible interest adapted to the state of affairs of business in the Nation will reduce unemployment, since businessmen who hesitate to borrow from a bank at 6 percent, since they can scarcely make that net profit on their wares, would not hesitate to borrow at 1 percent, thereby assuring for themselves, instead of the bank, a profit of 5 percent on their output, and thus employ many more workingmen who are on relief and the dole.

One of the most important provocative factors in the causation of unemployment is the gross inequality of income, which results in inadequate purchasing power, and is a major factor in unemployment. And, therefore, I am about to propose to you measures which contemplate a redistribution of our national income.

REMEDIES

Unemployment may be solved by compulsory regulation of wages and hours of work on a Nation-wide scale. Our own attempt to secure minimum-wage standards under N. R. A. was by no means a radically new departure. New Zealand passed the first minimum-wage law in 1894. The State of Victoria, in Australia, passed a similar law in 1896. These laws provided for arbitration boards with power to fix minimum wages in certain low-wage industries. Great Britain adopted this as a model for the Trade Boards Act of 1909, enacted to raise the wages of sweated labor. This law was amended so as to apply to all industries where wages may be unduly low. In principle, the minimum wage has been adopted by some 16 countries in all, including France, Switzerland, Spain, Czechoslovakia, the Argentine, and Canada.

Our own attempts to legislate minimum-wage codes have been frustrated by the Supreme Court. Massachusetts passed the first domestic law in 1912. By 1923, 17 States had minimum-wage acts on their statute books. It was in 1923 that the Supreme Court by a 5 to 3 decision in the famous case of Atkins against Children's Hospital held that the mandatory Minimum Wage Act of the District of Columbia was unconstitutional. This looked very much like a blow below the belt, as that same august tribunal had only 6 years earlier approved the Oregon statute. To explain the change in position, Mr. Justice Sutherland called attention to the woman's suffrage amendment which had been passed in the interim. This, he argued, raised the status and strengthened the bargaining power of women. Mr. Chief Justice Taft and Mr. Justice Holmes pointed out, in a dissenting opinion, that the nineteenth amendment did not make women the physical equals of men. Two later Supreme Court decisions concerning Arizona and Arkansas laws delivered the coup de grace to this kind of legislation. At present some 16 States have minimum-wage laws in operation, but for the most part their application is limited to minors. New York, in 1933, passed a law declaring it to be against public policy for any employer to pay women or minors a wage which is either less than the fair and reasonable value of services rendered or less than sufficient to meet the ultimate cost of living necessary to health.

Unfortunately the Supreme Court about a fortnight ago, by a vote of 5 to 4, declared the minimum-wage law of the State of New York, that would protect women and children from being exploited, unconstitutional.

The minimum-wage law in this bill can fix wages, depending upon what the local community in that particular section where the contract is taken pays for similar work. This bill provides for the Secretary of Labor to investigate conditions and force living wages where the industry does not pay them.

A living wage means, of course, not merely a subsistence wage but one which assures normal needs and reasonable comfort. Wage boards, on which employers, employees, and the public are represented, should be empowered to make studies of specific industries and fix minimum wages for each, the findings of such boards to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, when the United States had its real beginning in 1789, it was faced with the problem

of unemployment in the settled sections of the Atlantic coast. The purchase of Florida from Spain, Louisiana from France, the absorption of Texas and the territory wrested from Mexico opened up vast mileage for migration from the East to the Mississippi Valley, Florida, the Southwest, and the California coast. Frontiers were everywhere ready for the plow and the scythe. Today in the United States there are no more physical frontiers.

Canada has millions of acres of unused land. Vast expanses of rich agricultural and mineral resources of territories of promise and performance, if it were settled as proportionately as is the United States. That was the reason I introduced a few weeks ago House Concurrent Resolution 49 to determine the practicability of a union between the United States and Canada. The migration of Americans to Canada, after a fusion of the two nations, would help solve our problem of unemployment. Since migration in ancient, medieval, and modern times has been the great cure for the treatment of unemployment, perhaps it would solve the problem of the 10,000,000 unemployed in the United States. Canada, with proper financial backing, available from the United States, could support a population three to four times its present density. Population is essential to Canada's future growth, as essential as was the increased population by progeny and immigration to the growth of the United States. From such a union I can see nothing but good to come to both nations. Canada would benefit and so would the United States by such a union. Neither country would forego any rights of nationality any more than did the Territories of the United States when they were granted the status of States, or the Republic of Texas, when, of its own volition, it asked to be included in the roster of the States of the Union. American hours of labor, American wages, would be transferred to Canada to the benefit of that splendid nation. The ethics, the thoughts, the language, and the art and literature of the United States and Canada are practically the same. The original source of population was the same. In fact, in Canada there are today the descendants of the loyalists who declined to join the American Revolution and removed to Canada to show their devotion to the English throne. All that is past, and the United States and Canada are like two brothers, twins almost, I might say—the two arms of democracy in the North American Continent, that would make Alaska, Canada, and the United States the greatest Anglo-Saxon civilization in the world.

Mr. Chairman, several of my predecessors in the debate upon this measure have declared the Walsh-Healey bill unconstitutional. They have criticized it as a small N. R. A. As a physician and surgeon, interested in the welfare of my fellow men and desirous of bettering the conditions under which they live, I believe this to be a most humane and progressive measure that will reflect great credit upon the Seventy-fourth Congress for having enacted it into law.

The Constitution, as interpreted by our distinguished and venerable Supreme Court, you say, stands in our way. We of this Congress are not a sovereign constituent body, like the British Parliament. We cannot transgress the constitutional limitations of the power vested in us; but the people of the United States is still sovereign, and the Constitution can be amended as provided by our forbears through the instrumentality of law. If the Supreme Court of the United States violates the spirit of that great document ordained to establish justice and promote the general welfare; if the Supreme Court misinterprets the sacred trust imposed upon them by the founding fathers to interpret their words so that the living may enjoy a life more abundant, then we, their offspring, have a solemn duty to lawfully change such laws. In the name of those who have laid down their lives and died upon the different battlefields of our Nation, in the name of those whose mortal remains even hallow the soil of foreign countries, I, as a Representative of the Fourteenth Congressional District of New York, appeal to that forceful and final arbiter of the destinies of the American people, and to you, the Members of this historic forum, to support this great and humane measure. By voting for this bill you will emancipate the working classes of our people, the backbone of our Nation, through the establishment of minimum wages, maximum hours, the abolition of child labor, and the forced labor of criminals, or those who are compelled to work under insanitary, hazardous, and dangerous conditions that may affect and destroy their health and their well-being. Thus you will invoke the blessings of a grateful and contented working class for having brought happiness into their homes and contentment to their hearts. [Applause.]

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the carpet on the floor and the tacks and various other articles of furniture which were pointed out so dramatically by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], I call attention to the language of the bill, which is absolutely clear and understandable. The provisions of this bill "shall not apply to articles that may usually be bought in the open market."

There was some reference made to the shoes and the clothing that the soldiers and the C. C. C. boys wear, which the Government buys in such large quantities. Let me just read to you from the hearings the testimony of Col. Clifford L. Corbin, of the office of Quartermaster General, in reference to shoes:

Mr. HEALEY. You would want to make stipulations in the contract establishing decent hours in carrying out Government contracts?

Colonel CORBIN. Yes, sir. This was a shoe contract I have referred to.

Mr. HEALEY. A contract for the purchase of shoes.

Colonel CORBIN. Yes, sir; a contract for 750,000 pairs of shoes for the Civilian Conservation Corps. All of it went to one man, who bid lower due to the fact that he had poorer working conditions than the trade in general. The situation is such that the other shoe manufacturers are becoming discouraged in bidding on a Government contract for shoes. The price differential was only about 2 or 3 cents per pair.

Mr. HEALEY. The practical result was the establishment of a monopoly in the making of shoes in this particular firm. They secured a monopoly of the Government shoe business.

Colonel CORBIN. Yes, sir; it prevents competition. Now, the serious point is that shoes constitute a very important article in time of emergency or in time of war, and it is important to have a number of large firms who have experience in army-shoe contracts.

Under the existing law, in this particular case, one firm which works its employees longer and pays less has a virtual monopoly in the supplying of shoes to the United States Government. I want to say to the gentleman that only last week in Cleveland his convention went on record for a minimum wage within the Constitution, and his candidate for President, dissatisfied with that platform, went to the extremity of pledging himself for a minimum wage by way of a constitutional amendment, if that were necessary.

We can legitimately and constitutionally provide in our own Government contracts for decent working conditions, which every forward-looking man and woman believes should be established under present economic conditions. We have the right, under the decisions which have been rendered, to require that these conditions be lived up to in our public contracts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I do not blame the gentleman for talking beside the point, because adequate discussion has not been permitted on the main question. The amendment now before the House, however, seeks to extend the provisions of this bill to the territory now covered by the Bacon-Davis Act. Does the gentleman favor that particular amendment? He has not mentioned the subject in his very powerful speech.

Mr. HEALEY. As the gentleman knows, I am in favor of the passage of this bill.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. As it is?

Mr. HEALEY. As it is.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. And he is not in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEALEY. I hope the bill will be passed without substantial change.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is one of the most eloquent Members of this House; and when he speaks we all listen with great attention and, indeed, with reverence for his fine ability. In addition to that, personally he is a fine gentleman in every respect. I always listen to him with great interest.

I hope that everything he said in that speech, everything that he mentioned, is true. I hope that this bill does affect nine-tenths of the industries of the United States, because if it does it will force into line many employers who have been exploiting little children, who have been exploiting women, and who have been exploiting the great masses of the workers of the United States. It will force them to pay decent wages and run decent hours and give decent living conditions to the people of this Nation.

We tried that in the N. R. A. In the Healey bill you have not any of the faults of the N. R. A. You have not any codes which are being written and controlled by the big moneyed interests of the country; for instance, Mr. Clay Williams, of the Tobacco Trust, and other big moneyed men. You have not codes written by the big manufacturers of the United States. In the Healey bill, pending before us tonight, there is a break for labor, there is a break for the working men and women of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill does extend to nine-tenths of the industries of the United States, I repeat. I hope that we may stop them from working these little children in mills. I hope that we may stop such conditions as stated to me by a man who came into my office within the past 3 months. He told me that he worked 107 hours and received $11. Last week in Lynn, Mass., I asked a man working in a Standard Oil station how many hours he worked. He said "56." I said, "What do you get?" He said, "$22 a week." That is what he has received since the N. R. A. went out of existence.

Therefore, I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks of my friend from New York are true. I hope the Congress will put into effect the 40-hour week and set an example to the Nation, as we did in the days gone by when we came down from a 12-hour day to a 10-hour day, from a 10-hour day to an 8-hour day, and now to a 40-hour week, with decent wages and decent living conditions, and give the people of the United States their place in the sun; stop little children from having their lives ruined in the factories, and prevent women from dying ahead of their time on account of the exploitation of merciless employers. Give the American people a break!

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the Seventy-first Congress I introduced the first 40-hour-week bill ever introduced here, and in April 1930 I made a speech in favor of it. At that time we had between five and six million people unemployed in our country and we had 26,000,000 working over 48 hours a week. I asked then for a 40-hour week in order to set an example, and if that had been put into effect 6 years ago we would not be in the condition we are today. I am pleased that at last they have brought in the 40-hour bill which I advocated and introduced 6 years ago. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. That is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. I should like to say to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that we appropriated $4,800,000,000 for relief in the United States and we have now appropriated another billion and a half dollars, and who is going to pay for it? The taxpayers of the United States. And I may say to my friend from New York that Robert Johnson, of Johnson & Johnson, a multimillionaire, with factories all over the Nation, has put his factories on a 30-hour basis—a 5-day week and a 6-hour day. He sent his general manager to me here in Washington and said, "We would much rather put people to work at decent, living wages than to pay taxes for just keeping their body and soul together on relief." So let the gentleman from New York take his choice between paying for relief to keep simply body and soul together or giving the decent, living wages to the American people which they ought to have. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hands several pay envelopes which were sent to me by Mr. Francis Gorman, vice president of the United Textile Workers of America.

One of these envelopes belongs to John Smith—I am using a fictitious name in order to protect the worker—and is from Samoset Cotton Mills, dated May 22, 1936:

Earned pay	$8.00
U. tax	.08
Amount enclosed	7.92

On the reverse side it is stated:

Notice.—Save your pay envelopes. This is your receipt against any charges on your account. Samoset Cotton Mills.

This was for 50 hours' work—filled 50 batteries on 13 fillings.

Now, I am going to read to you the next one, giving the name as Ann Jones, which is fictitious.

Earned pay	$5.40
U. tax	.05
Advances	1.00
Amount enclosed	4.35

Forty-two hours' work.

I have here another envelope of the same company:

Earned pay	$7.00
Rents	.65
U. tax	.07

I cannot make out the writing with respect to the other two items, but there are deductions of 35 cents and 65 cents, leaving the amount enclosed as $5.28.

I have several other envelopes, but I shall not read them as I have not the time. They reveal the same wages.

I do not know whether these mills sell any uniforms or any other articles to the Government of the United States or not.

Mr. CONNERY. What is the tax?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not understand what that tax is for. Perhaps it may be a pay-roll tax. It gives you an idea of who pays for social insurance under the law we passed last year. The important thing is you have here from 42 hours to 52 hours a week and you have such salaries as $7.92, $4.35, $5.28, and in one case the worker had earned pay $1.60, advances $1.30, and another advance of 30 cents, and at the bottom of the envelope "XXX."

Mr. O'MALLEY. In what State is that mill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not know. Our Governor informed me it is located in the South. This was sent to me by Mr. Francis Gorman, who is the vice president of the United Textile Workers of America.

Let me give you another specific instance—and I now refer to the Vermont Marble Co. The Vermont Marble Co. sold the marble of which the United States Supreme Court Building was built. I am reading part of the testimony which was adduced at a public hearing conducted under the auspices

of prominent citizens from various New England States, headed by Mr. Rockwell Kent, famous American, whose ancestry dates back to Revolutionary days. They had a Mrs. Mereau on the stand. She was the wife of one of the workers. Mr. Polier was the attorney for the committee and asked the following questions:

Mr. POLIER. Mrs. Mereau, where do you live?
Mrs. MEREAU. In Danby.
Mr. POLIER. How many in your family?
Mrs. MEREAU. Five.
Mr. POLIER. What are their ages?
Mrs. MEREAU. My oldest is 10; my youngest is 1 year old.
Mr. POLIER. Your husband works for the Vermont Marble Co.?
Mrs. MEREAU. Yes.
Mr. POLIER. What is his job?
Mrs. MEREAU. Jackhammer runner.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute to complete the reading of this very important evidence of wage slavery.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIER. What is a jackhammer runner? What does he do?
Mrs. MEREAU. He operates the drill.
Mr. POLIER. What were his wages before the strike?
Mrs. MEREAU. About $13.75 a week.
Mr. POLIER. How much of that was left after deductions for rent, light, and so forth?
Mrs. MEREAU. He brought home $1.50; some weeks one of these yellow papers.

I am sorry I have not the time to go into the testimony further, but getting a yellow paper means that the worker owed the company money after deducting his wages for items of rent, light, water, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike exceedingly to disagree with gentlemen on my side of this Committee, but I submit that companies such as the Vermont Marble Co. should not be permitted to benefit by contracts financed by the Government of the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I reserve the right to object. Does the gentleman mean to close debate on the section and all amendments thereto, or merely debate upon the amendment? There are several other legitimate amendments to be offered.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I shall submit for the information of the House the following letter from the Champion Pants Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, which has been selling to the Army, to show what has happened since the N. R. A. codes were declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court:

NEW YORK, *May 18, 1936.*

As an employer of approximately 400 people, I am taking the liberty of giving you some information relative to my business, and also relative to the present earnings of people who are today working on Government contracts.

During the N. R. A., this company bid and was awarded five different contracts by the War Department, to furnish clothing for both the National Guard and the C. C. C. On practically all of these contracts, all the contractor was asked to furnish was the necessary labor to cut and manufacture these various garments. I am going to take the liberty of quoting you prices for which the War Department, Quartermaster Corps, at Philadelphia has awarded contracts for the furnishing of labor necessary in the manufacturing of trousers and breeches from materials supplied by the War Department. I make an issue of the term "from materials supplied by the War Department" to try to show to you that the differences in prices for which the War Department has made these purchases has been only a variation in the prices paid to labor between the period of the N. R. A. and the present period.

For instance, in May of 1935, the War Department, Quartermaster Corps, at Philadelphia, issued various awards for the manufacture of cotton khaki trousers for the C. C. C., at an average price of 94 cents per pair. Last week, an award was made for the manufacture of identically the same item with the same conditions, for 38 cents per pair.

Item 2. An award for shirts to be manufactured from materials furnished by the War Department during the N. R. A. period brought an average price of 60 cents per shirt. The last award made approximately 2 months ago, was given out at the price of 19 cents per shirt.

Item 3. During the N. R. A. period, the War Department, Philadelphia Quartermaster Corps, paid this company 78 cents per pair for the manufacture of woolen breeches for the National Guard, from materials furnished by the War Department. The last award made in March of this year was made for a price less than 54 cents per pair.

These are only a few of various items for which the War Department is issuing numerous contracts. In all cases the ratio of prices paid for these products is about the same as those few instances which I have mentioned above.

As practically all these contracts are for labor alone, one can easily understand where the large variation in these various prices enters. Labor is just being paid so much less, and the result has been that the prices for which the War Department has awarded these contracts have been published in the various trade papers, and the result in many instances has been that these low prices have set a so-called standard price for the manufacture of similar articles which are in turn manufactured for various civilian corporations and organizations. The keen, unrestricted, competitive bidding has, in my opinion, been one of the main reasons why labor is earning half the money that they made 18 months ago.

I am writing you this letter more in the interests of the people who are working for me and with whom I come in contact daily than for any other reason. Since the going out of the N. R. A. labor's earnings in the clothing industry have alarmingly declined, and I maintain that unrestricted Government bidding is one of the main reasons for this. The facts and prices I have mentioned above of the awards of various contracts can easily be verified. I would willingly furnish any additional information I may have on this subject.

I understand that the bill relative to what I have written you has been referred to the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House, of which you are chairman. I sincerely hope and trust that your committee will report this bill favorably, and help to a great extent to eliminate today's unfavorable condition.

Very truly yours,

CHAMPION PANTS MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
MAURICE NEINKEN.

I say this Government ought to set the example of refusing to buy a single thing from any maunfacturer who pays his employees starvation wages, from any manufacturer who operates a sweatshop. The Government ought to set the same example in respect to material purchases that it sets for industry by the Postal Service and other governmental agencies, where hours and wages are on a living basis. I think the American taxpayers do not want to build buildings at the expense of workers receiving starvation wages or to buy materials manufactured at prices which affect the very lifeblood of little children. I do not see how anybody with any decency would want us to refuse to pass a law that would prevent this Government from buying from sweatshop concerns for all time. I hope this bill will pass. I hope, as my colleague said, that it affects 99 percent of the businesses of the country, and that no business that operates under sweatshop and exploitation methods can continue to sell a single dollar's worth of goods to the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCCORMACK) there were—ayes 27, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Pages 21 and 22, strike out all of subsections (b) and (c) of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the contractor shall give his employees the full and free right of collective bargaining."

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, despite all the heroics and forensics that we have listened to in the last few minutes, there is not a single man in this House or

anywhere else who is in favor of the exploitation or the persecution of little children. There is no controversy about most of the first few sections of the bill. Everybody is in agreement that we should not have convict labor, child labor, bid brokers, or sweatshops, and all of this oratory that we have been listening to recently is entirely beside the point. There is no issue about those sections, except that there are a number here who doubt the advisability of the provision that nobody shall be permitted to work who is under 18 years of age. There are literally thousands of boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 18 who earn a little money in the vacation time, on Saturday afternoons, and in their spare time earning a little money to help support their families or to put themselves through college.

There are some who do not think that is a very wicked thing. However, I am not prepared to oppose the bill on that ground, but the controversial issue in this bill is contained in subsections (b) and (c), that fix the arbitrary limit of 40 hours for a week's work in any factory in the United States doing business with the Government, no matter where it is, no matter what the nature of the industry is, and the other provision which permits the Secretary of Labor to arbitrarily fix the prevailing wages in factories—an impossible task. I have talked to friends of mine who are active in organized labor, and I am offering this amendment at the suggestion of practical, sensible, humane, intelligent representatives of labor. All labor asks or expects is that it shall be protected against the abuses, which are outlawed in the sections that I have mentioned, plus recognition of collective bargaining in the different communities where Government work is done. That is a practical proposition, an intelligent proposition. It is a proposition acceptable to labor leaders, and with that amendment there could be no possible objection to this bill. I ask you to give it your serious thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This bill, as it is written, has the unqualified endorsement of organized labor. They are satisfied with the provisions of that section, without change. Therefore I would ask those Members of the House who are anxious to get a bill through that will accomplish the objectives which this bill will accomplish, to vote down this amendment and keep this particular section intact.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again report the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK of New York) there were—ayes 19 and noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 22, line 8, after the word "under", strike out "eighteen" and insert "sixteen."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I assume that this amendment is doomed to defeat. I offer it, however, in entire good faith and in the firm belief that the bill as amended will do serious injury to a great many youths of this land—not children, but youths—who either directly or indirectly will be denied employment if this bill should pass in its present form.

Forty-six of the forty-eight States in the Union today have child-labor laws. I have never been able to understand how the child-labor question has suddenly become a national question. I had occasion to study the child-labor laws at the time the pending child-labor amendment was submitted to the States of the Union back in 1923 or 1924—13 years ago. It is still pending, 38 States having rejected it. They rejected it because they already have adequate child-labor laws, with two or three exceptions. The State of New York, for example, has had adequate child-labor laws for 30 years. The State of Massachusetts has had an excellent law for years, and most of the States have.

Mr. CONNERY. Did the gentleman say 38 States had rejected it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Thirty-eight State legislatures at one time or another have rejected the child-labor amendment. Some have changed back and forth. However, that is not the question. The State of New York has recently raised its restrictions from 14 years to 16 years with respect to compulsory school attendance. Many other States, step by step, are improving their laws year by year. Instead of denouncing the situation in this country we ought to be proud of the progress that has been made by the States in the last 15 or 20 years, in the elimination of child labor.

There is a group of people between the ages of 16 and 18 who are not children. They are youths. I may remind you, for example, referring to the extraordinary abilities of youth—not childhood but of youth—that in the Union Army at the end of the Civil War there were 800,000 soldiers in their sixteenth year; that youths of 17 have crowded the Army, doing the work of men. True, war is cruel and I am not advocating anything like that in connection with industry.

But I plead for the boy of 17, perfectly competent to do light work from time to time, whether it be in the factory or on the farm, who is trying to get together a little money to enable him to go to college. This bill says, inferentially, to him, "No; you shall not." Thousands of boys of 16½ and 17 and 17½ earn a little money to help their mothers. They may not work 6 days a week or anything like 40 hours a week. They may only work a few hours a week, but indirectly this bill says to those boys, "No; you shall not."

I happen to know something about the canning industry. It is a seasonal industry. Canning factories will fall under the provisions of this bill because they sell to the Government canned sweet corn, canned tomatoes, canned peas, and various other canned vegetables. They employ countless youths in the canning season. Under this bill, they must deny them employment, if they furnish goods to the Government.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot. My time is limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the first place, I should like to state that no agricultural products are included within the terms of this bill at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman read section 9 about that? Agricultural products are not included, but the processor is included, and the canner is a processor. Now read it.

Mr. CHANDLER. That may be.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You people do not know how far your bill goes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, yes; we do. We know how far it goes; and we are here for the purpose of preventing your people from keeping little children at work in the factories of this country. That is true. I submit this amendment was a matter of very long and serious discussion. It is one that we talked over a long time. If there is any real merit in this bill, it is in leading the way to a better day in industry in this country. If any hardships are going to be worked, the Secretary of Labor has a right to modify any contract so as to permit the employment of child labor. They talk about child labor, but do not do anything about it.

Eight or nine of the States of this Union have 16 years as the minimum age; and, as far as I can tell from the report of the Department of Labor, New York has a minimum age of 14 for employment outside of school hours in nonfactory occupations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Department of Labor is behind the times. The Legislature of New York passed a law this year raising the age limit to 16.

Mr. CHANDLER. Thirty-five States of the Union still have 14 years as the minimum age. One State, I think, has no minimum age.

This amendment should be defeated. The welfare of working boys and girls of America will be promoted by its defeat. The real merit of this bill lies in the fact that it is intended to lead the way to better days in the business and industrial life of the Nation. No hard and fast or invariable rules have been laid down in the measure. If hardships are being worked, the Secretary of Labor is empowered to modify any of the requirements of the bill. We are really setting up guideposts to the way of industrial peace and harmony.

When we think of children in industry we should not think only of boys, but also of girls, who, when they once drop their school work and go into the factories and shops and bend over the machines and work tables, are starting a life tenure.

I appeal to you in the interest of the health of the children of America to vote against this amendment. The boys and girls who are just 16 are not fully developed physically, and beginning their life work at 16 years of age means the placing of permanent strains on their bodies when they are not ready to bear them, and that means premature age and disability before their usefulness should end.

I appeal to you in behalf of the boys and girls, who should be permitted to continue in school until they are 18 years of age, and thereby be better fitted to take their stands and do their parts in the work of the world. To give our children better educations is to give them better understandings of our national problems and to better fit them to meet their responsibilities as citizens and also improve their chances of success in life. Ignorance never made a good workman.

Recently, in his speech before the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland, the President said:

> We in your Government are seeking to extend the school age in every State in the Union, and to make it easier for boys and girls to stay in school. Work out for yourselves what would happen if all the boys and girls of 14 and 15 and 16 and 17, who are now working in industry, found it possible to stay in school until they were at least 18 years old. How many jobs would that give to the young people of the Nation who have been graduated from high school and college? And how much better equipped would be these youngsters, who are now at work, if they could stay in school to the completion of their education?

So, the provision in the bill is also designed to aid employment, not only by giving jobs to grown-ups with family responsibilities but by raising the standard of education and thereby raising the standards of both quality and quantity production in industry. The problems of employer and employee will be more readily solved if there is more thorough preparation for one's life work.

It has been argued that parents need the help of their children as joint breadwinners, but I have confidence that the parents of the boys and girls of today and tomorrow will meet the responsibilities placed upon them by this bill. Necessity is the mother of invention. By fixing the minimum age for child labor at 18 years, we simply withdraw the temptation to send boys and girls into factories before they are physically and mentally ready to go. Boys and girls are not employed in factories because they are better workmen. It is because they are cheaper workmen and are paid less. The world so often overlooks that, in the impressionable years and in the formative periods of life, our viewpoints can be molded by the artificial light of a factory or under the stress and strain and sweat of labor.

We talk much about child labor and inveigh against it, but we do not do much about it. Now is the time to take a bold step and make a courageous stand. All of us who have worked hard on this bill believe that this is one of the high lights of it, and those of you who oppose this measure will find in this provision its redeeming feature. Let us all therefore vote down this amendment and I believe in my heart that future generations in America will rise up and call you blessed.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would the gentleman object to exempting seasonal employment during summer vacations?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Secretary of Labor has the right to exempt them under this bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, she can change this law?

Mr. CHANDLER. She has the right to modify the terms of contracts where it would work a hardship; yes. We are not trying to make it impossible to work out modifications of this law. As I said, this is a great forward step in the right direction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The minimum age in the N. R. A. bill was 16 years, and that was bad enough. I want to give you an illustration. In my home city, which is not as large as New York—25,000 people—there was working for the Postal Telegraph Co. a boy who lacked 5 months of being 16 years old. He was the breadwinner of the family. His mother was a widow, sick and bedridden. He was one of the ablest employees the Postal Telegraph Co. had in its office. This was told me by the manager of the Postal Telegraph Co. He said: "Why, Mr. BLANTON, this is one of the finest boys I have in my service, and I have got to discharge him because the law says he must be 16." The boy was around in my office with tears in his eyes because he was going to have to put his mother on relief.

I wired Gen. Hugh Johnson and asked him to make an exception in this boy's case. I gave him all the facts. I got a wire in reply, signed Hugh Johnson, but which afterward General Johnson said was sent without his knowledge by a subordinate, that the law was like that of the Medes and the Persians, there could be no exception to it; that this boy would have to do like everybody else in his situation—give up his job.

Then I wired the President of the United States, and I said, "Mr. President, here are the facts." And I told him about the boy being the breadwinner of the family. Immediately came a telegram exempting the boy from that law, and he was allowed to work on. But suppose I could not have gotten the ear of the President, that family would have had to have gone on relief and it would have embittered a splendid, fine young American who was glad to be the breadwinner of his family.

I was the main breadwinner of a family when I was 10 years old.

I have been the main breadwinner of a family ever since I was 10 years old, and I am proud of it. The proudest moments of my life were when I was a young boy working for my loved ones. That is the best thing you can do for an American boy. Talk about raising him in idleness. You will have him stealing automobiles. You will have him breaking into stores. You will have him become lazy and irresponsible. I do not want to do that for the American boys of this Nation.

Let us put this down to 16 years at least. It is a good amendment, and I may say to the gentleman from New York he is doing a great service if he can get his amendment passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not often intrude my thoughts upon this body. Many times I sit back and listen to the debate, letting things go by, when possibly I might have said something or done something which might have prevented an injustice being done.

As I have listened to the distinguished gentleman from New York and those who followed him I felt the urge to say that unnecessary something. I think the gentleman from New York is eminently correct in the position he is taking and in offering this amendment. He is many times correct,

even though he sits on the wrong side of the aisle. The fact of the matter is I think the Republicans—and it is not my duty to tell them what to do—could have done much better than they possibly did out there the other day if they had selected the gentleman from New York as their standard bearer. [Applause.]

It seems like I started something. I am glad I did not start it before the convention.

I call attention to the fact that many of the greatest men in this country, the leaders in industry, in finance, and in politics, were men who started out at the age of 15, 16, or 17 years to make their own way in this world. History is replete with instances of men who have amounted to something in this world who started earning their own way and supporting their families before they were 16 years of age.

May I say I think we would make a great mistake if we did not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Let us give the boys a chance. I dare say if a census was taken of the Members of this House tonight it would be found that possibly a majority of the membership had contributed to their own educational endeavors by working their way through college before they were 18 years of age. Let us not cut off the opportunity to the deserving youth of our Nation to get an education and amount to something.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we are all very much interested in the self-made young man, but how many are mindful today of what the speed-up system in industry has done to the man when he reaches 40 years of age? How many are mindful of the fact that there are certain industries in this country that take no cognizance of a man when he reaches the age of 40? He is discharged. After a lay-off he is not recalled. He is left at home; he has his family on his hands, and his son goes to work at the age of 18, taking precedence over the father in the home.

Get this in your minds. The spirit of letting a man out of his position because he cannot follow the speed-up of the motor and of the system of manufacturing today is one of the worst things going on in industry in this country. It is the wrecker of the home. It deals to the worker the body blow depriving him of the pay envelope, of the position to which he has given the best years of his life. His right to support his family is denied. It causes disrespect for the head of the family and I think we ought to do a bit of thinking on this floor and in this chamber with regard to the man who is the head of a family, rather than comparing him with the youth who is just starting out at the age of 16.

One has an obligation. He has the obligation of home ties. He has the obligation of educating his children. He has a contract to pay upon his home. He has his family to support. He finds himself out in the cold because of discrimination at the early age of 40. Why, they have the nerve to ask you today when applying for a position, whether or not you have a college education. When you reach the age of 40, 15 years after leaving the college door, 15 years after you have said farewell to your alma mater, you are supposed to be through. Tell me how can anyone accomplish the results that are necessary in life in this short duration of time?

I think the President's speech at Baltimore, wherein he made reference to this curtailment at both ends of the working period of life, in order that people may have an opportunity to provide for their families, ought to be in the mind of those of you who are about to vote on this legislation.

As a Representative from a great industrial district I am concerned with the workers' welfare. I am concerned in his morale; I am concerned in the preservation of his initiative; and the discrimination against men of 40 and over brings to the mind of the worker in the best age of his manhood a constant worry as to the safety of his position, which worry and anxiety places the gnawing worm of fear upon his future economic status. The discrimination on the part of industry against those of an age in the neighborhood of 40 is one of the most unjust acts of modern industrial progress. It is un-American, it is inhuman and has not an ounce of sportsmanship in its make-up. Let us hope that the passage of this legislation will in some way assist in a correction. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNERY: Page 22, line 8, after the word "no", insert "male."

Page 22, line 8, after the word "under", strike out "18" and insert "16."

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to have this law allow men at 16 years of age to work, but not women at 16 years of age.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will that be the effect of the gentleman's amendment to my amendment?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; I do not want women to work under 18, but I am willing to have men work at 16, because I agree with the views expressed by the gentleman that a young man of 17 years of age, particularly in the position outlined by the gentleman from Texas of having a widowed mother with the various things that may come up, should be entitled to go to work, if necessary to support, for instance, a widowed mother.

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

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that insofar as I may do so, I am pleased to accept his amendment to my amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Wadsworth amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 22, line 8, after the word "age", insert: "*Provided, however,* That the minimum age provided by State law where the contract is to be performed shall apply if under 18 years of age."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. It merely provides that if the contract is to be performed in a State where the minimum age is under 18 the State law will prevail. I think this is fair. If, however, it is feared that some States might have a law with a minimum too low, I shall gladly accept an amendment or offer it myself that no minimum shall be less than 15 or 16, whichever the committee prefers.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to know whether the gentleman means that where there is a State law of 14 years the State law would apply?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it is up to the State. If that State wants to provide that, let them go ahead and do it. Certainly 14 would be low in many lines of work, but under certain conditions and certain types of work I can imagine a case where it would be justified. Such cases would likely represent the exception rather than the rule. If abused, we could change the law.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Then the gentleman would permit the Government to buy certain things from his State, where the minimum is 16 years, while in another State, where 18 years is the limit, such conditions would not be permitted to apply.

Mr. PATMAN. Let the State law apply, and recognize the right of the State in that respect. However, if we think a State might abuse this privilege, we may insert a minimum that will be recognized, as I stated in the beginning.

Mr. BOILEAU. Some States have a minimum as low as 12 or 13 years.

Mr. PATMAN. In order to take care of such cases, we should probably amend our proposal and insert a minimum that will be recognized. If we do that, however, I presume it would be well to vote this substitute down and vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], which provides for 16 years. This amendment or substitute was offered for the purpose of discussion, in the hope that we could leave as much power to the States in this respect as possible consistent with safety.

Mr. BOILEAU. How about a State that does not have any such requirement?

Mr. PATMAN. Then the provisions of this bill would apply.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MALLEY. How would the manufacturers in my State, for instance, be able to compete on these contracts, where the age limit is higher than in many of the other States?

Mr. PATMAN. That would be up to the State. I have never considered that a State would change its laws to avoid this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman in favor of the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I expect to vote for the bill, whether this amendment is adopted or not. If my substitute is not looked upon favorably—and I have a feeling it is not—I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman think the amendment would vitiate the purposes of the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I think this is simply leaving it up to each State to fix its own minimum. If they want to fix it at 20, they can do it under this amendment, or at least according to my way of thinking; but let each State fix its own minimum-age requirements, so long as that minimum age is not too low.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is existing law, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. No; if this bill passes, it will not be existing law.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman is correct in his philosophy, applying the same principle of permitting the States to control in the matter, why would not the gentleman permit State control as to the hours, rather than pass a 40-hour measure here? The gentleman is entirely inconsistent.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not dealing with hours; only with age.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; we are dealing with hours in this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I mean we are not dealing with hours in this amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman states he is in favor of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. We are dealing here with the question of age.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does not the amendment which the gentleman has proposed place a premium upon the State that would exploit its children as against the States that would protect them?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not think the States would do that; anyway, if they should attempt to exploit their children, we could stop it immediately.

Mr. KELLER. What would the gentleman do under his amendment in a State where they had no minimum age?

Mr. PATMAN. Where there is no State law, this act would apply; the minimum age will be 18 unless the amendment of the gentleman from New York prevails; in that event it will be 16.

Mr. KELLER. How about a minimum age of 14?

Mr. PATMAN. But where the States have elected to pass a law of their own, the State law would be given recognition, unless Congress believed the minimum age so fixed was too low.

Mr. KELLER. In other words, if there were a law permitting a 10-year-old child to work, the gentleman would agree to that?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I do not know of any State that has such a minimum age. Personally I certainly would be opposed to that, and I do not think the States would have a law that would permit children of that age to work in the industries affected by this bill; if so, we should guard against any such abuse.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONNERY.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment to cover the proposition I suggested in respect to women. As the amendment read, it would apply only to men and would leave out women entirely. They could work them at 12 years of age. I want to fix it so that they cannot work women under 18 years of age. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be changed in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be modified as indicated and the Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 8, after the word "no", insert the word "male" and strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteen", and after the word "age" in the same line insert "and no female person under eighteen years of age".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were, ayes 99, noes 31.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were, ayes 103, noes 29.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That any breach or violation of any of the representations and stipulations in any contract for the purposes set forth in section 1 hereof shall render the party responsible therefor liable to the United States of America for liquidated damages, in addition to damages for any other breach of such contract, the sum of $10 per day for each person under 18 years of age or each convict laborer knowingly employed in the performance of such contract, and a sum equal to the amount of any deductions, rebates, refunds, or underpayment of wages due to any employee engaged in the performance of such contract; and, in addition, the agency of the United States entering into such contract shall have the right to cancel same and to make open-market purchases or enter into other contracts for the completion of the original contract, charging any additional cost to the original contractor. Any sums of money due to the United States of America by reason of any violation of any of the representations and stipulations of said contract set forth in section 1 hereof may be withheld from any amounts due on any such contracts or may be recovered in suits brought in the name of the United States of America by the Attorney General thereof. All sums withheld or recovered as deductions, rebates, refunds, or underpayments of wages shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary of Labor, directly to the employees who have been paid less than minimum rates of pay as set forth in such contracts and on whose account such sums were withheld or recovered: *Provided*, That no claims by employees for such payments shall be entertained unless made within 1 year from the date of actual notice to the contractor of the withholding or recovery of such sums by the United States of America.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all agencies of the United States containing the names of persons or firms found by the Secretary of Labor to have breached any of the agreements or representations required by this act. Unless the Secretary of Labor otherwise recommends no contracts shall be awarded to such persons or firms or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such persons or firms have a controlling interest until 3 years have elapsed from the date the Secretary of Labor determines such breach to have occurred.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: Page 23, line 5, after the word "each" insert the word "male" and strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteen", and after the word "or" insert "each female person under 18 years of age."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to administer the provisions of this Act and to utilize such Federal officers and employees and, with the consent of the State, such State and local officers and employees as he may find necessary to assist in the administration of this act and to prescribe rules and regulations with respect thereto. The Secretary shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1923, and administrative officer, and such attorneys and experts, and shall appoint such other employees with regard to existing laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, as he may from time to time find necessary for the administration of this act. The Secretary of Labor or his authorized representatives shall have power to make investigations and findings as herein provided, and prosecute any inquiry necessary to his functions in any part of the United States. The Secretary of Labor shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. Upon his own motion or on application of any person affected by any ruling of any agency of the United States in relation to any proposal or contract involving any of the provisions of this act, and on complaint of a breach or violation of any representation or stipulation as herein provided, the Secretary of Labor, or an impartial representative designated by him, shall have the power to hold hearings and to issue orders requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence under oath. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of contumacy, failure, or refusal of any person to obey such an order, any district court of the United States or of any Territory or possession, or the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on, or within the jurisdiction of which said person who is guilty of contumacy, failure, or refusal is found, or resides or transacts business, upon the application by the Secretary of Labor or representative designated by him, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before him or representative designated by him, to produce evidence if, as, and when so ordered, and to give testimony relating to the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof; and shall make findings of fact after notice and hearing, which findings shall be conclusive upon all agencies of the United States, and if supported by the preponderance of the evidence shall be conclusive in any court of the United States; and the Secretary of Labor or authorized representative shall have the power, and is hereby authorized, to make such decisions, based upon findings of fact, as are deemed to be necessary to enforce the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. Upon a written finding by the head of the contracting agency or department that the inclusion in the proposal or contract of the representations or stipulations set forth in section 1 will seriously impair the conduct of Government business, the Secretary of Labor shall make exceptions in specific cases or otherwise when justice or public interest will be served thereby. Upon the joint recommendation of the contracting agency and the contractor, the Secretary of Labor may modify the terms of an existing contract respecting minimum rates of pay and maximum hours of labor as he may find necessary and proper in the public interest or to prevent injustice and undue hardship. The Secretary of Labor may provide reasonable limitations and may make rules and regulations allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions to and from any or all provisions of this act respecting minimum rates of pay and maximum hours of labor or the extent of the application of this act to contractors, as hereinbefore described. Whenever the Secretary of Labor shall permit an increase in the maximum hours of labor stipulated in the contract, he shall set a rate of pay for any overtime, which rate shall be not less than one and one-half times the basic hourly rate received by any employee affected.

SEC. 7. Whenever used in this act, the word "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to modify or amend title III of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved May 3, 1933 (commonly known as the Buy American Act), nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to modify or amend the act entitled "An act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1931 (commonly known as the Bacon-Davis Act), as amended from time to time, nor the labor provisions of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1033, as extended, or of section 7 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, approved April 8, 1935.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCORMACK: Page 28, after line 14, change the period to a semicolon and insert "nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to modify or amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the diversification of employment of Federal prisoners, for their training, schooling in trade and occupations, and for other purposes, approved May 27, 1930, as amended, and supplemented by the act approved June 23, 1934.'"

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is no objection to this amendment.

Mr. HEALEY. We have no objection to this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions. These questions apply more particularly to the first section of the bill than to this section, but in the course of the debate no one has disclosed whether or not the prevailing minimum wage is to be determined before a contract is entered into or afterward?

Mr. HEALEY. The prevailing minimum wage will be determined, presumably, before a contract is entered into. In other words, the Secretary of Labor will have to conduct an investigation, hold hearings, and take whatever steps are necessary to determine the prevailing wage, before the wage provisions of this bill become effective under section 11. Until that is determined, no minimum-wage provision will be included in a contract.

Mr. BIERMANN. Then all bidders will be bidding on the basis of the same wage? They will know in advance of their bids what the wages will cost them?

Mr. HEALEY. The Secretary of Labor will have schedules and information which may be furnished to any person interested in bidding on a contract.

Mr. BIERMANN. I should like to ask one more question. In a small point such as we have in northeastern Iowa, say a town of 4,500, who is going into that town and say what is the prevailing wage?

Mr. HEALEY. The prevailing wage will be determined for the general locality. It will be, as I have stated, by investigation and hearing.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. This act shall not apply to purchases of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment as may usually be bought in the open market unless specially manufactured to conform to particular specifications; nor shall this act apply to perishables, including dairy and nursery products, or to agricultural or farm products, processed for first sale by the original producers; nor to any contracts made by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purchase of agricultural commodities or the products thereof. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to carriage of freight or personnel by vessel, airplane, bus, truck, express, or railway line where published tariff rates are in effect or to common carriers subject to the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: On page 28, line 19, after the word "dairy", insert a comma and the word "livestock."

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, in the opinion of members of the committee livestock comes under the category of perishables; and in order that no undue hardship may be imposed upon this industry, the committee requests that this amendment be passed so that livestock will be placed in the same category as other perishables.

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

Mr. HEALEY. With pleasure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to ask the gentleman if any provision is in this bill, or if any thought has been given to the question of floor stocks which will have been processed 6 months ago, and will be on the floor when this bill becomes operative?

Mr. HEALEY. I will say that the provisions of this bill will not apply to goods of that type.

Mr. CHANDLER. If you have floor stocks, they are in the open market and already available, and it does not apply at all.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I should like to ask the gentleman how he considers this language in line 20 on page 28, "it shall not apply to agricultural or farm products, processed for first sale by the original producers"? Producers of what? Of agricultural or farm products?

Mr. HEALEY. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Does the gentleman mean that the only cases in which this shall not apply are cases in which agricultural or farm products are processed for first sale by the original producer, which is the farmer? I think the language needs clarification.

Mr. HEALEY. I think perhaps the committee may offer an amendment to correct the present punctuation, which may satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Presumably what the gentleman means is that farm products processed, for instance, by a miller, processed for first sale by a miller or a packer, as the case may be, and not the original producer.

Mr. HEALEY. The intention of the committee, I believe, is as the gentleman has stated it.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Can we rely on the gentleman to offer an amendment to clarify that language?

Mr. HEALEY. You may.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not presume the United States Government buys any farm products——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] has expired.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to carry on the colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota.

I do not presume the United States Government buys any farm products that are not processed, except perishables. Perishables are definitely exempted. So are dairy products, livestock, and nursery products. I cannot think of any other farm products that the United States Government buys.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin understands my question. The question is not whether or not farm products are processed by the farmer, as I understand it. Farm products are to be exempted if processed by anybody whatsoever, in the hands of the original processor.

Mr. BOILEAU. I did not understand the gentleman's position.

I should like to call one other matter to the attention of the committee, and that is with reference to the amendment that was recently adopted changing the age limit from 18 to 16, so far as male children are concerned. After all, they are children at that tender age. I submit that this House made a very grave and serious mistake in adopting that amendment.

I call the attention of the Members of this House to the so-called anti-child-labor-amendment to the Constitution now pending before the State legislatures. The resolution has passed this House and has been submitted to the State legislatures. A number of States already have ratified it. It requires the ratification of only a few other States before it becomes an amendment to the Constitution. This proposed constitutional amendment fixes the minimum age at 18 year, not 16, for children; and the adoption of this amendment to this bill by this Congress will give encouragement to those who are trying to defeat that constitutional amendment. You will hear the cry in those State legislatures during the coming year or two that even Congress has changed its mind with reference to the child-labor amendment and they will point to the action taken here. [Applause.]

I submit to the membership of this House, and particularly to those who are friendly to the child-labor amendment to the Constitution, that we have made a serious mistake. Our action here today will encourage those who are exploiting labor and put off the day when we shall have a real anti-child-labor amendment to the Constitution.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that when the child-labor amendment came up for consideration there was a great question in the American Federation of Labor as to whether the age should be 16 or 18. The passage of this law by this Congress will not in any way interfere with the States if they wish to make the age limit 18.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would remind the gentleman that that question was decided years ago. I submit that we could have performed a great service by voting down this particular amendment to this bill today. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McREYNOLDS: Page 28, line 17, after the word "market", strike out "unless specially manufactured to conform to particular specifications."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The purpose of this amendment is more for clarification than anything else. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether the committee will accept this amendment?

Mr. HEALEY. I think the committee can accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. With that statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts I have nothing to say except to congratulate the House because it will be a House bill that goes to the Senate and that will come back from the conference, and that for one time we have forced the Senate to take it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 28, line 15, after the word "purchases", insert "of works of art or."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment if adopted would make the first line of section 9 read:

This act shall not apply to purchases of works of art or such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment—

And so forth.

I think the purpose of the amendment must be perfectly clear. It is not offered in a controversial spirit at all. I assume the committee did not desire to impose a 40-hour week or an 8-hour day or a minimum wage upon artists. The Government occasionally makes an agreement with a

great sculptor to furnish a statue in connection with a memorial or public building, or perhaps makes an agreement for a painting. It would seem to me to be the height of absurdity to say to the sculptor, "You shall not work on your statue more than 40 hours a week or more than 8 hours a day; and if you employ some assistants in your studio, they shall be subject to the wage and hour provisions of this law." It is outside the field of industry.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HEALEY. The provisions of this act do not affect personal or professional services, and, in my judgment, the type of work referred to by the gentleman is performed by a professional person. The amendment he offers would relate more to professional services, whereas this bill applies to labor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill does apply to articles furnished to the Government by contract, and a statue or a painting is an article. I see nothing controversial about it.

Mr. HEALEY. If the gentleman feels it may be affected by the terms of this bill, I think perhaps it might merit the serious consideration of the Committee, but, in my judgment, this would be termed a professional service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But an article is sold to the Government.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The term "work of art" would apply to a piece of sculpture that is manufactured commercially by thousands of people. If the gentleman would add the words "not of a commercial nature", I think his amendment would be more in the spirit in which he describes it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason why we should make any exception in reference to artists. If the Government lets a contract for a splendid building and an artist paints the pictures on the wall or does some sculptural work, it seems to me there is no more reason why he should be permitted to work 10, 12, or 14 hours a day or why he should be permitted to have his assistants, his attendants, and the people whom he employs work 10, 12, or 14 hours a day any more than the house painter, the bricklayer, or carpenter. The other persons employed on the building are entitled to just as much consideration as the artist. Of course, the artist may be more aesthetic. He may do just a little different type of work. He may feel he belongs to an excepted or a preferred class, and if he wants to work 10, 12, or 14 hours in order to finish the job and go on to some other job that he should be entitled to this preference; but it seems to me the artist on a Government building, the apprentices to the artists, and his assistants stand in exactly the same position as the bricklayer or the carpenter, the contractor, and all persons working on a similar building.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan if he actually thinks it would have been contrary to good public policy to have permitted Daniel French to have worked more than 40 hours a week on the Lincoln statue in the Lincoln Memorial?

Mr. MICHENER. Possibly not; but by the same token it might not have been wise a few years ago to have prevented children 10 or 12 years old from working. Today it is wise. We are faced with present working conditions, and there is a surplus of artists. Today we are doing a lot of boondoggling to furnish employment for artists, and still the gentleman comes here and wants us to permit the few artists who have jobs to work 10, 12, or 14 hours a day. Of course, I know the gentleman is not in sympathy with this boondoggling proposition, and he is interested in these artists. If this bill becomes a law, there should be no exception.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLENBOGEN to the amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: At the end of the amendment insert "not of a commercial nature."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ELLENBOGEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 28, line 20, after the word "products" insert "or to petroleum and oil-field products."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will accept this amendment, and I will state the reasons why. In Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, California, and other States many farms have been turned into oil fields. They have thereon little wells which have ceased to be producers, except pumpers, and many produce 10 or 15 or 20 barrels a day. Boys and young men earn their livelihood and support their families by driving trucks, by being tool dressers, and performing other services around these little oil fields. There are literally armies of them. Those little oil fields are situated all over my part of the country, and they are also in Louisiana, Oklahoma, and other States.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman favor the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. If my amendment with reference to petroleum is adopted, I would think it were less objectionable.

Mr. CELLER. And if we do not agree to the amendment, will the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I cannot support it. The Supreme Court will declare it to be unconstitutional. In counties in west Texas there is farm after farm laying idle. The land has not been worked for several years. Instead of working that farm land the boys are working in these little oil fields, and they are making a living as tool dressers, truck drivers, and so forth.

Mr. CITRON. To whom are they selling these products?

Mr. BLANTON. They are sold like all other oil products. The very business they are engaged in is the one thing that keeps the price of gasoline down in that country.

Mr. CITRON. Does the gentleman realize that this bill only applies to Government contracts?

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the Government enter into contracts in buying gas and oil?

Mr. CITRON. And only involves purchases of over $10,000?

Mr. BLANTON. The Government is one of the largest purchasers of gasoline in the country.

Mr. CITRON. And if we do this for the gentleman's section of the country, we will have to do it for the coal mines and silver mines and for the manufacturers in someone else's State and for the clothing manufacturers in Pennsylvania and for the sweatshops and the chiselers everywhere in the country.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the use of putting a whole army of boys who are making an honest living out of business?

Mr. CITRON. Who is proposing to put them out of business?

Mr. BLANTON. You are proposing to do that by this bill just as the last N. R. A. put them out.

Mr. CITRON. This is not an N. R. A. bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I consider this another N. R. A. bill in the miniature.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 9 of the bill, in order that I may offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN: On page 28, line 20, strike out the comma after the word "products."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute committee amendment, as amended by the Committee.

The substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee rises under the rule.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3055) to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts, loans, or grants by the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 549, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, and that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 48 and 52, and the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 to the bill (H. R. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending 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 amendment numbered 48.

AMENDMENT NUMBERED 49

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and agree thereto.

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: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Payments Under Merchant Marine Act Contracts: For payments under contracts entered into by the Postmaster-General prior to March 4, 1933, or any modification thereof, under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 891–891x), $26,500,000, of which $4,500,000 is an estimated amount representing the equivalent poundage-rate cost of transportation of the mail carried on vessels under such contracts and $22,000,000 is an estimated amount representing additional assistance toward the development of the American merchant marine: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be paid on contract numbered 56 to the Seatrain Company."; and the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN J. BOYLAN,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
CLARENCE J. McLEOD,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
FREDERICK STEIWER,
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 amendments nos. 48 and 52 of the Senate and the amendment of the House to amendment no. 49 of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10919), "Making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended and agreed upon as to such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On nos. 48 and 49, relating to transportation of foreign mail (exclusive of such mail carried under Merchant Marine Act contracts): Appropriates $9,717,500, as proposed by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, instead of $14,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $9,450,000, as proposed by the House bill.

On no. 52: Restores the appropriation of $26,500,000 carried by the House bill and stricken out by the Senate, carrying out contracts under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, with a modification of the text so as to indicate what portion of the appropriation is an estimated amount representing the equivalent poundage-rate cost of transportation of the mail carried on vessels under such contracts and what portion is an estimated amount representing additional assistance toward the development of the American merchant marine.

LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN J. BOYLAN,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JOHN TABER,
CLARENCE J. McLEOD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

PURCHASE OF LAND BY SCAPPOOSE, OREG.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9654) to authorize the purchase by the city of Scappoose, Oreg., of a certain tract of public land revested in the United States under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9654, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments thereto. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out all after "patent" down to and including "thereof", in line 5.

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after *"Provided"* down to and including "bid", in line 9, and insert, "That before patent issues the city of Scappoose shall pay to the United States the appraised price for the timber on the said lands, the money so paid to be deposited in the Oregon and California land-grant fund for distribution in the manner provided by section 10 of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO CLACKAMAS COUNTY, OREG.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9485) to convey certain lands to Clackamas County, Oreg., for public-park purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9485, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the

Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out all after *"Provided"* down to and including "bid", in line 10, and insert "That before patent issues Clackamas County shall pay to the United States the appraised price for the timber on the said lands, the money so paid to be deposited in the Oregon & California land-grant fund for distribution in the manner provided by section 10 of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

WELFARE OF AMERICAN SEAMEN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 8597) to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States and to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto and promote safety at sea and maintain discipline on shipboard, and for other purposes", for present consideration and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8597), to amend section 13 of the Act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An Act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 13 of the Act of March 4, 1915, be amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 13. (a) That no vessel of one hundred tons gross and upward, except those navigating rivers exclusively and the smaller inland lakes and except as provided in section 1 of this Act, shall be permitted to depart from any port of the United States unless she has on board a crew not less than 75 per centum of which, in each department thereof, are able to understand any order given by the officers of such vessel, nor unless 65 per centum of her deck crew, exclusive of licensed officers and apprentices, are of a rating not less than able seamen. Every person shall be rated an able seaman, and qualified for service as such on the seas, who is nineteen years of age or upward, and has had at least three years' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes, on a vessel or vessels to which this section applies, including decked fishing vessels, and vessels in United States Government service; and every person shall be rated an able seaman, and qualified to serve as such on the Great Lakes and on the smaller lakes, bays, or sounds who is nineteen years of age or upward and has had at least eighteen months' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes or on the smaller lakes, bays, or sounds, on a vessel or vessels to which this section applies, including decked fishing vessels and vessels in the United States Government service; and graduates of school ships approved by and conducted under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce may be rated able seamen after twelve months' service at sea after graduation: *Provided,* That no boy shall be shipped on any vessel to which this section applies unless he meets the physical qualifications contained in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and that no boy shall be placed on the lookout or at the wheel except for the purpose of learning, and that in narrow and crowded waters or in low visibility none below the rating of able seaman shall be permitted at the wheel: *Provided further,* That no deck boy shall be held qualified to fill the place of ordinary seaman until he has had at least six months' service as deck boy: *Provided further,* That upon examination, under rules prescribed by the Department of Commerce as to eyesight, hearing, and physical condition, such persons or graduates are found to be competent: *Provided further,* That upon examination, under rules prescribed by the Department of Commerce as to eyesight, hearing, physical condition, and knowledge of the duties of seamanship, a person found competent may be rated as able seaman after having served on deck twelve months at sea or on the Great Lakes, but seamen examined and rated able seamen under this proviso shall not in any case compose more than one-fourth of the number of able seamen required by this section to be shipped or employed upon any vessel.

"'(b) Application may be made to any board of local inspectors for a certificate of service as able seaman, and upon proof being made to said board by affidavit and examination, under rules approved by the Secretary of Commerce, showing the nationality and age of the applicant, the vessel or vessels on which he has had service, that he is skilled in the work usually performed by able seamen, and that he is entitled to such certificate under the provisions of this section, the board of local inspectors shall issue to said applicant a certificate of service as able seaman, which shall be retained by him and be accepted as prima-facie evidence of his rating as an able seaman.

"'(c) Each board of local inspectors shall keep a complete record of all certificates of service issued by them and to whom issued and shall keep on file the affidavits and records of examinations upon which said certificates are issued.

"'(d) The collector of customs may, upon his own motion, and shall, upon the sworn information of any reputable citizen of the United States setting forth that this section is not being complied with, cause a muster of the crew of any vessel to be made to determine the fact, at which muster said reputable citizen must be present; and no clearance shall be given to any vessel failing to comply with the provisions of this section: *Provided,* That the collector of customs shall not be required to cause such muster of the crew to be made unless said sworn information has been filed with him for at least six hours before the vessel departs, or is scheduled to depart: *Provided further,* That any person that shall knowingly make a false affidavit for such purpose shall be deemed guilty of perjury and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, within the discretion of the court. Any violation of any provision of this section by the owner, master, or officer in charge of the vessel shall subject the owner of such vessel to a penalty of not less than $100 and not more than $500: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and nothing herein shall be held or construed to prevent the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, from making rules and regulations authorized by law as to vessels excluded from the operation of this section: *And provided further,* That no certificate of service as able seaman shall be issued by any board of local inspectors until after examination of the applicant therefor, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, as to his efficiency, and upon proof, as a result of such examination, that he has been trained in and is acquainted with the duties entitling him to such rating. No seaman shall be considered an 'able seaman' within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the manning of vessels unless he is in possession of such certificate issued by the board of local inspectors. All certificates as 'able seaman' and 'lifeboatman' issued by the several boards of local inspectors or other Federal officers prior to the passage of this act shall, within six months thereafter, be surrendered to such boards of local inspectors for cancelation, and there shall be issued in lieu thereof to all able seamen and lifeboatmen found qualified by such examination new certificates as required by law: *Provided,* That if due to inability on the part of the Department of Commerce to carry out the provisions of this subsection with regard to all seamen, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his discretion, extend the time for a period not to exceed three months. Such new certificates shall be stamped with the seal of the board of local inspectors, placed partially over the signature of the applicant for such certificate; and there shall be attached thereto a photograph of the applicant. Any other safeguards which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Commerce, may be necessary and advisable to establish the authenticity of the certificate, are hereby authorized.

"'(e) No vessel to which this section applies may be navigated unless all of the complement in her engine department above the rating of coal passer or wiper and below the rating of licensed officer shall be holders of a certificate of service as a qualified member of the engine department. The local inspectors of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation shall, upon application and examination as to competence and physical condition, as prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, issue such a certificate of service. An applicant for such rating shall produce to such inspectors definite proof of at least six months' service at sea in a rating at least equal to that of coal passer or wiper in the engine department of vessels required by this Act to have such certificated men.

"'(f) As to the certificates of service or efficiency, the Secretary shall promulgate rules covering the form, contents, and manner of issuance, which shall include a provision that copies of these and all documents pertaining thereto be filed in the local offices and in the central office in Washington.

"'(g) That the boards of local inspectors of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation shall, without examination (except food handlers who must be free from communicable disease), issue to all members of the crews of merchant vessels of the United States (except licensed officers), certificates of service for ratings other than as able seaman or a qualified member of the engine department, which certificates shall authorize them to serve in the capacities specified in such certificates: *Provided,* That such certificates shall not issue before oath has been taken before one of the said inspectors that the applicant therefor will

faithfully and honestly perform all the duties required of him by law, and carry out the lawful orders of his superior officers on shipboard and, in the case of a radio operator, shall produce to the local inspectors his unexpired license issued by the Federal Communications Commission to act in that capacity: *And provided further*, That when a certificate has been revoked or suspended under the provisions of subsection (h) of this section, a new certificate shall not be issued until a board of local inspectors shall determine that the issue of such new certificate is compatible with the requirements of good discipline and safety at sea.

"'(h) That all certificates of service or efficiency issued by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation shall be subject to suspension or revocation on the same grounds and in the same manner and with like procedure as is provided in the case of suspension or revocation of licenses of officers under the provisions of section 4450 of the Revised Statutes.

"'(i) It shall be unlawful to employ any person, or for any person to serve aboard any merchant vessel of the United States below the rating of licensed officer, who has not a certificate of service issued by a board of local inspectors, and anyone violating this section shall be liable to a penalty of $100 for each offense.

"'(j) This section is not to amend or repeal any of the provisions of chapter 3 of title 47, United States Code—Telegraphs, Telephones, and Radio Telegraphs.

"'(k) Nothing herein shall be construed to impose, sanction, or permit any condition of involuntary servitude nor to prevent any seaman from leaving the service of any vessel when in a safe harbor to the same extent and with like effect as under the provisions of existing law.

"'(l) This section shall take effect six months after the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That if it is found impracticable on the part of the Department of Commerce to furnish the certificates herein provided, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his discretion, extend the effective date for a period not exceeding three months.'

"SEC. 2. That section 2 of the Act of March 4, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. That in all merchant vessels of the United States of more than one hundred tons gross, excepting those navigating rivers, harbors, lakes (other than Great Lakes), bays, sounds, bayous, and canals, exclusively, the licensed officers and sailors, coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders shall, while at sea, be divided into at least three watches, which shall be kept on duty successively for the performance of ordinary work incident to the sailing and management of the vessel. The seamen shall not be shipped to work alternately in the fireroom and on deck, nor shall those shipped for deck duty be required to work in the fireroom, or vice versa; nor shall any licensed officer or seaman in the deck or engine department be required to work more than eight hours in one day; but these provisions shall not limit either the authority of the master or other officer or the obedience of the seamen when in the judgment of the master or other officer the whole or any part of the crew are needed for maneuvering, shifting berth, mooring, or unmooring, the vessel or the performance of work necessary for the safety of the vessel, her passengers, crew, and cargo, or for the saving of life aboard other vessels in jeopardy, or when in port or at sea, from requiring the whole or any part of the crew to participate in the performance of fire, lifeboat, or other drills. While such vessel is in a safe harbor no seaman shall be required to do any unnecessary work on Sundays or the following-named days: New Year's Day, the Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day, but this shall not prevent the dispatch of a vessel on regular schedule or when ready to proceed on her voyage. And at all times while such vessel is in a safe harbor, eight hours, inclusive of the anchor watch, shall constitute a day's work. Whenever the master of any vessel shall fail to comply with this section and the regulation issued thereunder, the owner shall be liable to a penalty not to exceed $500, and the seaman shall be entitled to discharge from such vessel and to receive the wages earned. But this section shall not apply to vessels engaged in salvage operations: *Provided*, That in all tugs and barges subject to this section when engaged on a voyage of less than six hundred miles, the licensed officers and members of crews other than coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders may, while at sea, be divided into not less than two watches, but nothing in this proviso shall be construed as repealing any part of section 4463 of the Revised Statutes. This section shall take effect six months after the enactment of this Act.'

"SEC. 3. Section 4551 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 643) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4551. (a) Every seaman upon a merchant vessel of the United States of the burden of one hundred gross tons or upward, except vessels employed exclusively in trade on the navigable rivers of the United States, shall be furnished with a book, to be known as a 'continuous discharge book', which shall be retained by him and which shall contain the signature of the seaman to whom it is so furnished and a statement of his nationality, age, personal description, photograph, and home address. Such books shall be in such form and issued by the shipping commissioners and collectors and deputy collectors of customs at ports where no shipping commissioners have been appointed in such manner as the Director of Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine. Any person, corporation, or association, other than a shipping commissioner, or collector or deputy collector of customs, who shall issue or cause to be issued any such book or imitation thereof, or any person, other than the real owner, who uses or endeavors to use any such book, or who makes any statement or endorsement in any such book not herein authorized, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be imprisoned not less than one month nor more than three months, in the discretion of the court.

"'(b) Upon the discharge of any seaman and the payment of his wages, the shipping commissioner shall enter in the continuous discharge book of such seaman the name of the vessel, the nature of the voyage (foreign or coastwise), the class of which the vessel belongs (steam, motor, sail, or barge), the date and place of the shipment and of the discharge of such seaman, and the rating then held by such seaman. Whenever a seaman is discharged in any collection district where no shipping commissioner has been appointed, the master of the vessel shall perform the duties of such commissioner and shall make the proper entries in such continuous discharge book; and when the seamen are not required by law to be signed on and discharged before a shipping commissioner, the master shall make such proper entries in the discharge book. Any master who fails to make such entries shall be fined the sum of $50 for each such offense. This subsection shall take effect as to vessels engaged in foreign and intercoastal voyages six months after the enactment of this Act and as to all other vessels within one year after the enactment of this Act.

"'(c) There shall be maintained in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in Washington a record of every discharge book and certificate issued under the provisions of this Act, together with the name and address of the seaman to whom it is issued, his next of kin, and a certified copy of all discharge entries in such book, which copy shall be forwarded to such Bureau by the shipping commission or person duly authorized to act as such before whom such holder is discharged.

"'(d) In case of the loss of a book by shipwreck or other casualty the seaman shall be supplied with another discharge book, in which shall be entered all data contained in the last book so far as this may be available from copies of records kept by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation; in other cases of loss the seaman may obtain a duplicate of such book containing the same entries upon payment of a sum equivalent to the cost thereof to the Government, to be determined from time to time by the Secretary of Commerce.'

"SEC. 4. (a) The local inspectors of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation shall inspect the crew quarters of every American vessel at least once in each month, or at such times as such vessel shall enter an American port, and shall satisfy themselves that such quarters are of the size required by law or regulations issued thereunder, are properly ventilated and in a clean and sanitary condition, and are equipped with the proper plumbing and mechanical appliances required by law or regulations issued thereunder, and that such plumbing and mechanical appliances are in good working order and condition.

"(b) Whenever it shall be found that the crew quarters of any such vessel are not of the size required by law or regulations issued thereunder or are not properly ventilated or are not in a clean and sanitary condition or are not equipped with the proper plumbing and mechanical appliances required by law or regulations issued thereunder, or that such plumbing and mechanical appliances are not in good working order and condition, the appropriate board of local inspectors shall withdraw the certificate of inspection of such vessel and refuse to reissue the same until such improper conditions have been corrected; and the master or other licensed officer of such vessel who shall have willfully or negligently permitted such vessel to be in such improper condition shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $500.

"(c) This section shall take effect ninety days after the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 5. (a) From and after the enactment of this Act all licensed officers and pilots of vessels of the United States shall be citizens of the United States, native-born, or completely naturalized.

"(b) From and after six months after the enactment of this Act upon each departure of any such vessel from a port of the United States, 75 per centum of the crew, excluding licensed officers, shall be citizens of the United States, native-born, or completely naturalized, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall, upon investigation, ascertain that qualified citizen seamen are not available, when, under such conditions, he may reduce the above percentages.

"(c) If any vessel while on a foreign voyage is for any reason deprived of the services of any member of the crew, such position or vacancy caused by the promotion of another to such position may be supplied by a person other than defined in paragraph (a) and (b) until the first call of such vessel at a port in the United States where such replacements can be obtained.

"(d) The owner, agent, or officer of any such vessel, who shall employ any person in violation of the provisions of this section, shall be subject to a penalty of $500 for each offense.

"SEC. 6. That any person who (1) shall receive or have in his possession any certificate, license, or document issued to vessels or officers or seamen by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation or by any officer or employee of the United States authorized by law to represent such Bureau, to which he is not lawfully entitled, with intent unlawfully to use the same; or (2) shall use or exhibit or attempt to use or exhibit any such certificate, license, or document to which he is not lawfully entitled; or (3) without lawful authority shall alter or change, or attempt to change, any such

certificate, license, or document by addition, interpolation, deletion, or erasure; or (4) shall forge, counterfeit, or steal, or shall attempt to forge, counterfeit, or steal, any such certificate, license, or document; or (5) shall unlawfully have in his possession or knowingly use any such altered, changed, forged, counterfeit, or stolen certificate, license, or document; or (6) shall print or manufacture, or cause to be printed or manufactured, any blank form of such certificate, license, or document without first obtaining the authority of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation; or (7) shall have in his possession without lawful excuse, and with intent unlawfully to use the same, any blank form of such certificate, license, or document; or (8) shall in any manner transfer, or cause to be so transferred, or negotiate such transfer of, any blank form of such certificate, license, or document, or any such altered, changed, forged, counterfeit, or stolen certificate, license, or document, or any such certificate, license, or document to which the party transferring or receiving the same is not lawfully entitled; or (9) shall aid or abet the perpetration of any of the foregoing acts shall for each offense, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of Commerce shall enforce this Act as to all vessels of the United States subject to the provisions of this Act through collectors of customs and other Government officers acting under the direction of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, and shall make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 8. No provision of this Act and no amendment made by this Act shall apply to fishing or whaling vessels or yachts: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of law herein amended shall continue in effect insofar as they are applicable to said vessels or yachts with like force and effect as if this Act had not been passed.

"SEC. 9. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of the provisions thereof, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
WILLIAM I. SIROVICH,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH,
RICHARD J. WELCH,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROYAL S. COPELAND,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
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 bill (H. R. 8597) to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea"; to maintain discipline on shipboard; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and substituted for the matter struck out the provisions of the Senate bill. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment. The House conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment which inserts in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate a substitute which has been agreed upon by the conferees.

The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed upon by the conferees are noted in the following discussion, except for clerical amendments and incidental changes made necessary to harmonize various provisions affected by the agreement reached.

SECTION 1

Section 1 of the House bill and the Senate amendment amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915. The Senate amendment combined sections 1 and 2 and struck out section 3 of the House bill. The amendment rewrote those sections of the House bill with a few changes. Section 3, which was stricken out, permitted the Secretary of Commerce to make necessary rules and regulations, and this is taken care of in other provisions of the amendment.

Where the House bill referred to naval vessels or Coast Guard vessels as vessels on which sailors might qualify as able seamen, the Senate amendment changed the language to read "and vessels in United States Government service." This was accepted in the amendment agreed upon.

Where the House provision permitted graduates of school ships to be rated able seamen after 12 months' service at sea, the Senate inserted "after graduation", and the House managers accepted the change.

The Senate inserted a provision that no boy shall be shipped on any vessel to which the section applies unless he is physically qualified to join the Navy. The Senate managers agree to the provision in the amendment which proposes that no boy shall be shipped on any vessel to which this section applies unless he meets the physical qualifications contained in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce.

The Senate provided that no deck boy shall be held qualified to fill the place of ordinary seaman until he has had at least 6 months' service as deck boy, and the House managers agree.

The Senate provided that upon a muster of the crew, upon the sworn information of any reputable citizen of the United States that this section is not being complied with, such reputable citizen must be present, and the House agrees.

The Senate provided that if due to inability on the part of the Department of Commerce to carry out, within 6 months, the provisions relative to the surrender of former certificates of seamen and the issuance of new certificates, the Secretary of Commerce may extend the time for a period not to exceed 3 months. The House managers agree.

The Senate inserted provisions prohibiting any vessel subject to the section from being navigated unless all of the complement in the engine department above the rating of coal passer or wiper shall be holders of certificates of service as a qualified member of the engine department, with provisions for issuance of such certificates and qualifications, promulgation of rules therefor, and filing of copies in the local offices of the inspectors and in the central office in Washington. The House managers agree.

The House provisions required the boards of local inspectors without examination to issue to pursers, radio operators, electricians and chief and assistant stewards certificates of service in their respective capacities. The Senate struck out the designated classes and required the issuance without examination (except food handlers, who must be free from communicable disease) to all members of the crew except licensed officers of certificates of service for ratings other than as able seamen or a qualified member of the engine department, which certificates should authorize the holders to serve in the capacities specified in such certificates. The House managers agree.

The House bill provided for investigation and trial of certificate holders in cases involving incompetency, negligence, misconduct, or breach of discipline threatening the safety of a vessel or its passengers. The Senate changed this provision so as to make all certificates of service or efficiency subject to suspension or revocation on the same grounds and in the same manner and with like procedure as in the case of suspension or revocation of licenses of officers. The House managers agree.

The House bill made it unlawful to employ any person, or for any person to serve as purser, radio operator, or chief or assistant steward who did not have a certificate of service issued by a board of local inspectors. The Senate amended this provision so as to prohibit any person aboard any merchant vessel of the United States below the rating of licensed officer to serve without such certificate. The House managers agree.

The Senate inserted a clause providing that nothing in the section should be construed to impose, sanction or permit any condition of involuntary servitude nor to impair, restrict, or limit the right of any seaman to leave the service of any vessel when in a safe harbor. The managers on the part of the Senate and House agree to this provision with a change so as to provide that nothing contained in the section should be construed to impose, sanction, or permit any condition of involuntary servitude nor to prevent any seaman from leaving the service of any vessel when in a safe harbor to the same extent and with like effect as under the provisions of existing law.

The House bill made its section 2 take effect 3 months after its enactment. The Senate amendment makes this provision apply to its section 1 which contains sections 1 and 2 of the House bill. The amendment changes 3 months to 6 months after its enactment with right to further extension of not to exceed 3 months if it should be impracticable to furnish the certificates within the shorter time. The House managers agree.

SECTION 2

Section 2 of the Senate amendment was not in the original House bill, H. R. 8597, but it was in section 802 of H. R. 8555, the ship subsidy bill, and contains only a few minor changes from section 802 as passed by the House as a part of the subsidy bill. The changes proposed by the Senate appear in the amendment as agreed upon except (a) that fishing or whaling vessels or yachts are eliminated from the section because of the new section 8 in the amendment which exempts those vessels, and (b) that the exemption is made to apply also to vessels engaged in salvage operations, with a proviso that as to tugs and barges subject to this section when engaged on a voyage of less than 600 miles the provisions of existing law shall take effect and shall be continued as to this class of vessel. This section is made to take effect 6 months after the enactment of this act.

SECTION 3

Subsections (a) and (b) of this section are almost identical with section 803 of H. R. 8555, the ship subsidy bill, as it passed the House. There are a few minor changes which are agreed to. The amendment agreed to also fixes the time when subsection (b) shall take effect as 6 months as to vessels engaged in foreign and intercoastal voyages and 1 year as to all other vessels.

Subsections (c) and (d) provide, first, for the maintenance in Washington of copies of the data in the continuous discharge books, and, second, for the issuance of duplicates in case of the loss of the books. These subsections are agreed to.

SECTION 4

This section in the Senate amendment was new matter and is inserted in the amendment agreed to. The section provides for the inspection of crew quarters and the enforcement of laws and regulations applicable thereto. There is added by the managers on the part of the Senate and House respectively a provision making the section effective 90 days after the enactment of this act.

SECTION 5

This section is new matter inserted by the Senate and requires 75 percent of the crew in each department to be citizens of the United States, native-born or completely naturalized, in addition to the licensed officers who are required now to be American citizens. The new matter required an increase of 5 percent annually until the percentage should be 90 percent. The amendment as agreed upon requires 75 percent of the crew to be native-born or completely naturalized.

The Senate amendment permitted the Secretary of Commerce to reduce the percentage if such citizen seamen were not available, and the amendment agreed to changes the word "such" to "qualified."

SECTION 6

This section is new matter inserted by the Senate and contains penal provision. It is agreed to except that the provision against altering or changing, or attempting to change any certificate, license, or document is amended to permit the alteration or change to be made by anyone with lawful authority to make the alteration or change.

SECTION 8

This section is inserted by the managers on the part of the Senate and the House and exempts yachts, fishing and whaling vessels from the provisions of the act, but continues in full force and effect all provisions of existing law. This change is made because of many exemptions of vessels of these classes in various statutes of such a character and so complex as to require a complete study of the laws applicable to these vessels. This study is to be undertaken. Further, the method of operation, the character of service, and the terms of employment are such as to require separate consideration and special legislation particularly adapted to these vessels and to yachts. The Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation proposed to undertake the necessary study at once.

SECTION 9

This section is the separability clause found in many laws and is agreed to.

SECTION 10

The section authorizes necessary appropriations and is agreed to.

S. O. BLAND,
WILLIAM I. SIROVICH,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH,
RICHARD J. WELCH,
Managers on the part of the House.

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

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does this conference report provide for the continuous discharge book?

Mr. BLAND. The continuous discharge book was in the bill as it originally passed the House and in it as it passed the Senate and it is in the bill now.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RIGHT-OF-WAY OVER CERTAIN LANDS IN SOLANO COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10356) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey a right-of-way over certain lands situated in Solano County, Calif., to the State of California for State highway purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 13 to 25, inclusive, and lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 3, and insert:

"SEC. 2. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy or his duly authorized representative any emergencies exist which justifies it, he may assume exclusive control and management of said road and may then in his discretion prohibit, limit, or regulate traffic thereon.

"The easement referred to in section 1 hereof is granted to the State of California and accepted by it with the distinct reservation that the Secretary of the Navy may, in behalf of the United States, at any time he deems its interests so warrant, reacquire the said easement by eminent domain or otherwise, the amount of just compensation in such case to be paid therefor not to exceed the cost to the State of California of any improvements placed upon the property referred to in section 1 subsequently to the date of approval of this act."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DARDEN (at the request of Mr. ROBERTSON) on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. KNUTE HILL, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION 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. 5368. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8442. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes; and

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.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1794. 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. 2119. An act for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. C. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard, and/or the widows of such of them as may be deceased;

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

S. 2712. An act to amend section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935;

S. 4552. An act to extend the retirement privilege to the Director, Assistant Directors, inspectors, and special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

S. 4622. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Alabama State Bridge Corporation to construct, maintain, and operate bridges across the Tennessee, Tombigbee, Warrior, Alabama, and Coosa Rivers within the State of Alabama", approved May 26, 1928;

S. 4737. An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes; 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, amended, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

TAXATION

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is now considering the fourteenth tax bill that has been introduced and passed since the Roosevelt administration came into office. I should like to emphasize this fact for the purpose of clarifying the record. The Roosevelt administration has rightly acquired the reputation of being the most extravagant spender of public moneys in the peace-time history of this or any other country. I should like to emphasize that in addition to being a reckless spender, this administration

has the doubtful distinction of having been a reckless imposer of tax after tax.

It is indeed an extraordinary performance, Mr. Speaker. In 1932, when Mr. Roosevelt was seeking votes, he promised the people that taxes would be reduced if he were elected. He gave the country the impression that he fully understood the true nature of tax burdens. Let me quote from a speech he made at Pittsburgh October 19, 1932:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. * * * If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and, hence, in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or (as now) in broad cessation of employment. * * * Our people and our business cannot carry its excessive burdens of taxation. * * *

He said in Sioux City on September 29, 1932:

I shall use this position of high responsibility to discuss up and down the country, at all seasons, at all times, the duty of reducing taxes, of increasing the efficiency of Government, of cutting out the underbrush around our governmental structure, of getting the most public service for every dollar paid by taxation. This I pledge you, and nothing I have said in the campaign transcends in importance this covenant with the taxpayers of this country.

But what has happened? The estimated tax receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, will be very nearly three times as much as they were in 1933. Here are the figures, all taken from official sources:

Year ending June 30—	*Tax receipts*
1933	$1,855,174,208
1934	2,954,038,131
1935	3,621,043,062
1936 (estimated)	4,228,036,000
1937 (estimated)	5,494,114,000

And here is a list of the laws involving increased taxation that have been passed during the Roosevelt administration:

Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.
National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933.
Nonintoxicating Liquor Tax Act of 1933.
Railroad Retirement Act of 1934.
Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934.
Revenue Act of 1934.
Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935 (Guffey bill).
Liquor-taxing acts of 1934.
Revenue Act of 1935.
Social Security Act of 1935.
Railroad Retirement Act of 1935.
Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act of 1935.
Potato Control Act of 1935.
Revenue Act of 1936.

This imposing list does not represent the end. It represents merely the beginning of the taxes that will have to be imposed if Government spending continues at anything like the present rate. Even the President's own supporters recognize this fact, for the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, when they signed their report on the 1936 revenue bill, said: "This (the pending tax bill) will take care of the President's request until the next session of Congress, which can then act more intelligently in the light of conditions then existing."

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, which should be clarified and emphasized for the sake of the record. The Democratic platform of 1932 pledged itself to balancing the Budget with "revenue raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay." Mr. Roosevelt himself repeatedly stated that he was "against taxes on food and clothing, whose burden is actually shifted to the consumers of these necessities of life on a per-capita basis rather than on the basis of the relative size of personal income."

No more bitter joke has ever been played on the American people than that which the Roosevelt administration has perpetrated in the carrying out of this pledge. I do not make this accusation on the basis of figures compiled in a spirit of partisanship. I make it on the basis of the Treasury's own figures and the admission of the President himself. Mr. Robert Jackson, Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department, told the Senate Committee on Finance August 6, 1935:

In 1930 we find that those taxes bearing most heavily on the well-to-do contributed * * * 68.2 percent of its (the National Government's) total internal-revenue and customs receipts, while miscellanous taxes and customs receipts, bearing most heavily upon the consumer, contributed only * * * 31.8 percent of such receipts. * * *

In 1935 the taxes based on ability to pay contributed 38.7 percent of the internal-revenue and customs receipts * * * there has been an increase in the proportion of revenues contributed by taxes based on consumption to 61.3 percent.

Mr. Roosevelt, in that famous letter to Mr. Roy W. Howard, in which he announced to the businessmen of the United States that he was mercifully granting them a "breathing spell", wrote only last September:

What is known as consumers' taxes, namely, the invisible taxes paid by people in every walk of life, fall relatively much more heavily upon the poor man than on the rich man. In 1929 consumers' taxes represented only 30 percent of the national revenue. Today they are 60 percent.

If that is what the New Deal means by helping the "forgotten man", if that is the kind of more abundant life that comes from new dealism, I, for one, Mr. President, will freely admit my preference for those much-maligned times which the President once referred to as the "horse and buggy" period.

INVESTIGATION OF FARM MACHINERY PRICES

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include therein a copy of the resolution I have introduced to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 630

Joint resolution to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery.

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Trade Commission be, and it is hereby, directed under the authority of and in pursuance of the act entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914, as amended, to investigate and report to the Congress the facts relating to—

(a) Whether any corporation engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery, of whatever kind and description is, or within the past 3 years has been, violating any of the antitrust acts of the United States, and the nature, extent, and effects of any such violation;

(b) The existence and effect of any contract, agreement, combination, or conspiracy in unlawful restraint of trade and the existence of any unfair methods of trade or competition in connection with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of said agricultural implements and machinery;

(c) Whether and to what extent methods of price fixing, price maintenance, and price discrimination in violation of the antitrust acts exist in connection with the manufacture, sale, and distribution of said agricultural implements and machinery;

(d) Any developments and tendencies in the direction of monopoly and concentration of ownership or control of the means of the manufacture, sale, or distribution of said agricultural implements and machinery;

(e) The existence of any combination to restrict or control the manufacture or supply of agricultural implements or machinery or to raise or control the price thereof, or to restrict credit in the sale thereof;

(f) Whether and to what extent the present prices of agricultural implements and machinery are due to any violations of any of the antitrust laws;

(g) Whether and to what extent costs and profits of any corporation engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery have been affected, enhanced, or maintained by unlawful combinations, agreements, or understandings, or any other violations of the antitrust laws, and whether and to what extent costs and profits of any such corporations have been misstated or misrepresented to conceal or promote violations of the antitrust laws;

(h) The extent of concentration of control of manufacture and distribution of such equipment in the hands of particular manufacturers, and the basis thereof;

(i) The costs, prices, and profits of manufacturers and distributors of agricultural implements and machinery;

(j) The distribution methods and dealer price spreads of margins entering into prices paid by farmers for agricultural machinery and equipment;

(k) The facts regarding the relative price movements of farm machinery and farm products since 1914;

(l) The facts regarding the relative price movements of farm machinery and implements and some of the machinery and implements of somewhat comparable material and labor;

(m) Any other pertinent facts regarding the present prices of agricultural implements and machinery, and the cause thereof; and

(n) What measures, legislative or otherwise, in the opinion of the Commission, are needed to correct conditions in the farm-implement industry adversely affecting the interest of farmers.

The purpose of this resolution is apparent from its title. It involves no appropriation of money. The Federal Trade Commission has all facilities necessary to make a complete investigation and report on each of the 12 points set forth in the resolution. This is a fact-finding investigation to produce sufficient data to enable Congress to enact such legislation as may be necessary.

The need for such an investigation is apparent to every farmer in the United States and to every layman who has studied the agricultural situation. For many years the price of farm machinery has been entirely out of line with the prices that farmers were receiving for their products. Is there any reason why an implement company in the Middle West should charge a farmer more for a two-row cultivator than it would charge a South American farmer for the same identical piece of machinery? The cultivator sent to South America must be transported by rail and water to one of our seaports and reshipped by boat to South America. Duty must be paid on it there, and then it must be shipped by rail or other conveyance to the South American farmer. In spite of the increased transportation costs and duty, there have been cases where the South American paid less money than the farmer who lived right outside the gates of the factory. That is making the American farmer pay for our export trade.

Our domestic farm-machinery market is and has been protected by a high-tariff barrier which excludes foreign competition. Our domestic market is and has been controlled by a virtual monopoly which forces up the prices demanded of our farmers. These two factors leave our farmers without any protection.

This resolution will produce the facts. That is all we want. Such facts will enable us to formulate logical, clear, and just legislation preventing discrimination and radiation and providing economic equality for our farmers.

EXPORTS OF AUTOMOBILES INCREASED THROUGH RECIPROCITY TREATIES

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, in 1932, when we were desperately striving to lift ourselves out of the state of economic collapse, I frequently in speeches propounded this question: "What can be done in the way of trade-reciprocity arrangements as preached by President McKinley to open foreign markets to the American automobile?"

It seemed to me then that the revival of the automobile industry would lift our whole economic level, and particularly would it cure the unemployment troubles of the Sixteenth Ohio Congressional District, where so many of the larger factories are suppliers of material for automobile manufacture.

Further study of the export possibilities of this industry prompted me to make the following statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1934:

> To me there seems to be an important opportunity, in any reciprocity arrangements that are undertaken, to benefit our economic status by giving to the American automobile industry—the most efficient of our present-day manufacturing units—the chance to sell the transportation that, to my mind, will be bought during the next decade or so as never before in foreign countries, especially in the undeveloped parts of the world. My study convinces me that the motor-car industry for the next 5 or 10 years will determine the industrial prosperity of the United States. It has taken the lead in the present revival of business, and it was the one industry that fought to the bitter end the overwhelming forces of the depression. It, therefore, deserves, by reason of its tested efficiency, the aid of the American Government in its conquest of the automobile markets of the world, and I believe it can do the job if we will but help scale down the prohibitive tariffs and quota arrangements in foreign countries that make its competitive opportunities less favorable.

The Roosevelt administration has since moved to capture additional markets for the American automobile, and what is more it has succeeded in doing so. Under its policy of negotiating reciprocal-trade agreements begun in 1934 the tariff duties imposed against American cars in 10 countries have been reduced or frozen at the present rates.

The results are seen in the accelerated flow of American cars into export trade. In 1935 there were 565,000 units shipped abroad, an increase of 32 percent over 1934. The total value of this 1935 foreign trade was $239,000,000. It might be well to note that automobiles and their parts constitute 10 percent of our entire export trade, and in volume second only to raw cotton among all of our exports.

It is important to note the expansion of shipments to countries that have by reciprocal arrangements agreed to concessions in tariff rates.

Cuba, with whom a treaty was concluded effective September 3, 1934, bought from the United States, during the first year under the treaty, automobiles and parts valued at $3,275,652, as compared to a total purchase amounting to $1,381,158 in the preceding year of high tariff rates.

Belgium, whose agreement was effective May 1, 1935, bought of the United States in the first year thereafter automobiles valued at 251,201 francs as against a purchase amounting to 124,660 francs in the previous year.

Sweden, whose treaty became effective August 5, 1935, purchased from the United States in the first year $2,050,545 as against $1,300,315 in the previous year.

Haiti, whose treaty was effective June 3, 1935, bought in her first year automobiles valued at $140,219 as against a value of $104,684 for similar purchases in the preceding year.

In other countries affected by reciprocal treaties the time of their existence is too short to measure the result upon trade of reduced duties.

The nature of the benefits to our automobile export trade carried in 10 of the 14 trade treaties so far executed may be summarized as follows:

Cuba agreed to a reduction of 50 percent in the duty on the cheaper automobiles and reduced the duty on higher priced cars by amounts ranging from 12½ to 31 percent; on trucks the reductions ranged from 6 to 12½ percent; on chassis an average of about 25 percent; and on parts, accessories, and motorcycles, roughly 12 percent.

Brazil agreed to reduce the duties on passenger automobiles, trucks, chassis, parts, accessories, and so forth, by 20 percent, and agreed not to increase the duty on motorcycles.

Belgium agreed to reduce the duty on passenger automobiles by 15 percent, and on parts—including engines and accessories—by amounts ranging from 65 to 85 percent.

Haiti agreed not to increase the former rates of duty—averaging about 15 percent—on automobiles, busses, trucks, and accessories during the life of the agreement.

Sweden also "bound" the import duties—ranging from 14 to 20 percent—on automobiles, chassis, parts, and so forth.

Canada reduced the tariff on cheaper automobiles by 12 percent and on more expensive cars by 25 percent; on engines by about 9 percent; and on busses, chassis, motorcycles, and so forth, by 25 to 30 percent.

The Netherlands agreed not to increase the duties on imports—into the Netherlands or the Netherland Indies—on automobiles and automotive products.

Colombia conceded reductions in the duties on automobiles, trucks, busses, parts, and so forth, ranging from 20 to 50 percent.

Switzerland agreed to double its quota on the importation of American automobiles; that is, 4.812 units will now be admitted annually—instead of 2,406—on which the import duty has been "bound."

Honduras agreed to continue to permit American automobiles, trucks, and busses to enter the country free during the life of the agreement.

JOE BYRNS, OUR SPEAKER AND OUR FRIEND

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to pay tribute to the late Speaker, JOE BYRNS.

JOE BYRNS was our colleague and my friend. I have known him for 6 years in the House of Representatives, and during that time I did not know of him doing an unmanly or ungentlemanly deed. I never heard him say one word that

anyone could take offense at, because it was unbecoming a real man. JOE BYRNS was honest, conscientious, able, and capable; JOE BYRNS was attentive to the duties of his office—he was a great Speaker and a good man.

If there was any Member of the House he had occasion to discipline for being unduly zealous in remarking on the New Deal and the Democratic Party I probably am the one, yet with all the disturbance to the harmony and good order caused by Members trying to gain recognition he was always kind and considerate. JOE BYRNS as presiding officer was calm, deliberate, and displayed tact and resourcefulness. He was my friend. He was just and fair.

Many times the late Speaker was compelled to count for a quorum, and if he found the membership short of a quorum by only two he pronounced it so and ordered a call of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we all loved him; we admired him; we shall miss him from our midst. Mr. Speaker, you now are trying to fill his place. We only ask you to emulate him and we can ask no more of you. We realize that JOE BYRNS' services are over for his constituents, for his State, and for his country, but his memory will ever live in the hearts of all the people who knew him. He will be missed at the Capitol in Washington and by all. But while we cannot see him, yet we know he has gone home to Heaven where his work and labors are over, where all is peace, happiness, and contentment. We hope some day to join him.

We learned to know and admire his dear wife and we all know what a great loss she has sustained, and our prayers go up to Almighty God to comfort and protect her.

Morning and evening star;
Then comes the call to go;
A friend moves on and then a little while
And we must sail also.
Let's have no tears or mourning at the shore
When we put out to sea;
The tides that ebb and flow will waft us o'er,
And there will surely be
A joyous welcome from our friends who wait
On that blest shore;
And we will join them in that blissful state
To part no more.

THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS WRECKED THE DAIRYMEN

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House will search in vain to find a historical parallel for the sectionalism which has resulted in grave economic injury to the 4,000,000 American dairymen. The President of the United States, the Members of this House and Senate, Secretary of State Hull, and Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, have by their affirmative acts of the past 2 years justified this charge. The story of King George the Third's treatment of the American colonists actually pales into insignificance in comparison with the wrongs inflicted on this soil-conserving group of husbandmen by this administration. The economic persecution of the Poles under the old Russian regime, brutal as it was, does not equal in savagery the methods by which the dairymen have been ground down and their difficult condition aggravated by the leaders of this Democratic administration.

The President preaches his good-neighbor policy for the rest of the world. In the United States he applies the doctrine only to States where Democratic majorities are probable. These areas are the beneficiaries of the lunatic spending policy of the administration with the money that has been taken from anti-New Deal localities where the leanings of the people are Republican. The President has treated the dairying States like captured provinces and has turned loose on them a group of nitwit carpetbaggers a thousand times more vicious and anti-social than the post Civil War patriots who plucked what was left of the fallen Confederacy.

Permit me to review briefly the President's betrayal of this great branch of agriculture.

In April 1933 we passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which included dairy products. The Secretary of Agriculture in administering this act has done nothing to alleviate the condition of the dairymen but in fact aggravated it. Secretary Wallace seems to have an abiding fear for the wheat, corn, and cotton farmer. He never understood the problems of the dairymen and delegated their situation to Messrs. Tugwell, Izekiel, Frank, and Beam. All of these gentlemen are admirers of the present regime in Russia. They started out with the theory that milk should be nationalized and then sought to fix the price of fluid milk in the various milk sheds of the country based on the fluctuating price of butter in the Chicago market. I was familiar with the situation that developed at that time and my conclusions on it are borne out by the articles written by Mr. George N. Peek, which are now appearing in the Saturday Evening Post. These articles furnish full and complete corroboration of the theory that men with communistic leanings were in command in the dairy section of the A. A. A.

In any event these economic playboys, who did not know one end of the cow from the other, started out with the obvious initial purpose of depressing the price of fluid milk, regardless of transportation and production costs. Time went on and the A. A. A. was torpedoed and sunk by the United States Supreme Court. The dairymen then had a period of peace, but it was short-lived.

In December of 1935 the President negotiated a trade-agreement treaty with Canada, and the dairymen were again placed on the defensive. This treaty was made pursuant to the Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934. Under this act the President was authorized to enter into trade agreements with foreign nations, and he might do so without the concurrence of the Senate and House. Never under a limited monarchy, and certainly not under any existing form of popular government, was any such power delegated to the Executive. Under this power and by virtue of these treaties the pattern of America, as regards industry and agriculture, is being changed. Neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives have any part in the making of these trade agreements, which, to my mind, spell certain disaster to the future of America. It is my belief that the statute in question is unconstitutional, and that the Supreme Court will so find when the pending cases are reached.

Under this Canadian treaty which went into effect on January 1, 1936, the duty was reduced on Cheddar cheese—which is the common American type—2 cents a pound and 27 percent ad valorem, and Canada was given a quota on cream and cattle. The result of this cut of the tariff on cheese is now apparent.

In March 1935, under the old tariff schedule, Canadian exports of cheese to the United States amounted to 14,700 pounds.

In March 1936 Canadian exports of cheese to the United States amounted to 1,525,000 pounds.

In the first quarter of this year cheese exports from Canada increased to 3,327,895 pounds, compared with 349,000 pounds in the corresponding first quarter of last year, an increase of 851 percent.

In the other trade agreements the effect of this tariff policy is no less disastrous to the dairymen. In the treaties with France, Finland, and Switzerland, the duties on dairy products have been lowered from 20 to 35 percent. Production costs in all these other countries, including Canada, are not more than one-half of what they are in America, so that the cheese market of America is now being flooded with these imports.

I have stated that this treaty went into effect on January 1, 1936. At the present rate of imports it will drive American cheese from the market. It has already compelled a reduction of price which spells near ruin to the American cheese maker. It should be borne in mind that milk is a commodity which can readily be shifted from fluid milk to butter or cheese. For this reason I have always contended that the dairymen of New York have a common cause with the dairymen from Wisconsin and Minnesota and Iowa. The American dairymen are being driven out of the cheese market by this Canadian competition, and will be forced into butter production or will go into the fluid-milk field.

From every angle the outlook is most disastrous for the dairyman, whether he is dealing in fluid milk, butter, or cheese.

I have introduced a resolution in the House today requesting the President to cancel this tariff arrangement on cheese, and I am inserting a copy herein:

[House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 2d sess.]

Resolved, etc.—

Whereas pursuant to the Tariff Agreement Act of 1934 the President of the United States entered in a tariff agreement with Canada of date November 18, 1935, and effective January 1, 1936, whereby the tariff on cheese was reduced 2 cents per pound and 27 percent ad valorem, and a quota given to Canada on cream and cattle; and

Whereas the importations of cheese into the United States from Canada have gone from 349,000 pounds in the first quarter of 1935 to 3,327,895 pounds for the corresponding quarter of 1936 resulting in a disastrous loss to the American dairyman; and

Whereas at the time of the promulgation of said treaty the President stated that the public might have every assurance that Canada and the United States would join in correcting any inequalities in case it developed that any such inequalities resulted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives respectfully request and urge the President of the United States that the provisions of said treaty, so far as they relate to cheese, cream, and cattle, be canceled, annulled, and abrogated.

I do not believe the President will abrogate this treaty for obvious reasons. There are two men in the administration whom the distinguished President holds in awe. One of them is Secretary Hull, who negotiated this nefarious treaty, and the other is Professor Tugwell, of the Resettlement Administration. Secretary Hull does not now nor ever did believe in a protective tariff. He is an economic internationalist, first, last, and always. Professor Tugwell is also an internationalist, but with a Russian tinge, and has boondoggled away $290,000,000 of the people's money in communistic experiments.

I repeat that the administration and the President are partisans so far as the dairymen are concerned. They fully realize that the dairymen live largely in the Republican States and the Farley type of mind that dominates the administration is not much concerned about the economic and political needs and demands of groups with a Republican viewpoint. In fact, I definitely charge the administration's executive and legislative branches with political bias in connection with the dairymen. I shall later give you definite and concrete examples of this.

On January 28 of this year a meeting of House Members representing dairy constituencies was called for the purpose of adopting a program for the relief of the dairymen. Some 73 Members from dairy districts in the country attended the meeting and their approach to the solution of these questions was honestly nonpartisan. This meeting passed a resolution which carries in it a program of legislation intended to give aid to the dairymen. This nonpartisan group, through its executive committee, has had repeated meetings for the purpose of promoting this program, but has been blocked at every turn by the administration-controlled leaders and committees of the House. Let me give you the history of these partisan performances.

(a) We sought to obtain a provision in the Soil Conservation Act to protect dairymen by requiring that any land taken out of production of other basic crops should not be used for pasture or forage to increase production of dairy products. This was what happened under the A. A. A. The majority leaders in the House fought this program bitterly and defeated it, despite the fact that the South has received more than a billion and a half dollars from the Federal Treasury in various types of handouts and the northern and eastern portions of the country, while paying the shot, have received practically nothing.

(b) We sought the extension of the Lenroot-Taber Act—which prohibits the importation of cream and milk into the United States—to all dairy products unless such products have been produced by dairy herds under official tests for bovine tuberculosis. The Democratic-controlled committee of the House refused to give us a hearing on this bill, although more than $300,000,000 has been spent by the State and Federal Governments for the eradication of tuberculosis in the United States.

(c) We sought an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to provide that such agreements should be ratified by the Senate of the United States. The Democratic leadership of the Ways and Means Committee of the House refused to give us a hearing on this proposition, despite the fact that every other nation with whom these treaties have been made, whether European, South American, or otherwise, require the ratification of the treaties by their legislative assemblies.

(d) We sought to obtain proper appropriations for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis and Bang's disease. The Democratic controlled House committee denied us this modest request, and the current appropriation is inadequate for the carrying forward of the present program for disease control. We asked for an additional $11,000,000 for this purpose, and were given three and a half. We got that amount only after a savage and protracted struggle.

(e) We sought to obtain an additional excise tax on foreign fats and oils. Again the Democratic chairman of the Ways and Means Committee refused to even give us a hearing on this proposition.

(f) We sought to obtain an additional 5-cent tax on all oleomargarine manufactured in the United States. This proposition did not even reach the hearing stage in the Agricultural Committee as the cotton-oil group, who are interested in butter substitutes, were in command.

The President promised agriculture, in the campaign of 1932, that he would not lower the tariff on agricultural products. In his Baltimore speech of October 1932, the President said:

> I know of no effective excessive high duties on foreign products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program.

This pledge went overboard like every other Presidential and Democratic promise to the people.

Secretary Hull and Secretary Wallace by their policies have not only abandoned any attempt to export American agricultural products but they have in fact by their precept and example encouraged the importation of crops grown on foreign soils. From the beginning this Republic has been self-contained in an agricultural way. By reason of the application of the Wallace doctrine of scarcity whereby 9,000,000 pigs were slaughtered for fertilizer and 35,000,000 acres of crops were plowed under we are now importing great quantities of agricultural products. These imports having found the trail to the American market are now and will continue to be a menace to American agriculture and the maintenance of a proper price structure for our farmers.

I found a powerful editorial in the May 15, 1936, National Union Farmer, an authoritative farm publication condemning these administrative policies and showing the amount of these agricultural imports for the year 1935. It is as follows:

FARM IMPORTS ALARMING

Under the theory that we are producing a surplus of farm products, the farmers in this country were induced to take around 30,000,000 acres of farm land out of production, so as to produce less. After 3 years, they found they were providing an abundant American market for foreign-farm products.

Foreign imports for the year 1935 and the percentage of increase over 1934 tell the story of what happened. Some 202,000,000 pounds of wool were imported, an increase of 85 percent, representing wool from 25,000,000 foreign sheep; some 17,500,000 bushels of flax, an increase of 24 percent, representing flax from 1,750,000 acres of foreign land; 27,400,000 bushels of wheat, an increase of 255 percent, this wheat representing 1,830,000 acres of foreign land; 42,200,000 bushels of corn, an increase of 1,361 percent, representing more than 1,000,000 acres of corn land; 9,600,000 bushels of rye, an increase of 27 percent, representing 640,000 acres of foreign land; 364,623 head of cattle, an increase of 532 percent; 166,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil, an increase of 1,720 percent over 1934. There was imported in 1935, 22,674,000 pounds of butter, an increase of 1,948 percent over 1934.

The total dairy imports for 1935, in terms of milk, amounted to 1,116,000,000 pounds. At 4,000 pounds of milk per year for the average cow, the dairy farmers of this country gave away to 279,000 head of foreign cows. These cattle consumed feed and pasture from several hundred thousand acres of land. Surely a governmental program in which our domestic market was given to foreign farmers can be of no benefit to American agriculture.

Under the absurd and fatal practices of the Secretaries Wallace and Hull the American wheat, corn, and dairy farmer

has been sold down the river. The corn, wheat, and cotton farmers have been given an annual bonus from the Federal Government of $500,000,000, but they have lost a large part of the American market and all the foreign market.

With the prices for farm products what they are, the farm income of American farmers should have been at least $8,000,000,000 in 1935. It amounted to $5,000,000,000 in 1935, and will remain at that figure or go lower unless the psychopathic performances of Secretary Hull and Secretary Wallace are thrown in the discard by the voters of America.

This can only be accomplished by the election of a Republican House and a Republican President. It can be accomplished by the election of Governor Landon to the Presidency and backing him up with a Republican majority in the next House. The Republican national platform on which Governor Landon is running contains the following declarations on the American farmer and more particularly the dairyman:

Our paramount objective is to protect and foster the family type of farm, traditional in American life, and to promote policies which will bring about an adjustment of agriculture to meet the needs of domestic and foreign markets. As an emergency measure during the agricultural depression, Federal benefit payments or grants-in-aid when administered within the means of the Federal Government are consistent with a balanced Budget.

That an agricultural policy be pursued for the protection and restoration of the land resources, designed to bring about such a balance between soil-building and soil-depleting crops as will permanently insure productivity, with reasonable benefits to cooperating farmers on family-type farms, but so regulated as to eliminate the New Deal's destructive policy toward the dairy and livestock industries.

To protect the American farmer against the importation of all livestock, dairy and agricultural products, substitutes therefor, and derivatives therefrom, which will depress American farm prices.

To provide effective quarantine against imported livestock, dairy and other farm products from countries which do not impose health and sanitary regulations fully equal to those required of our own producers.

We will repeal the present reciprocal trade agreement law. It is futile and dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage earner and the farmer.

With this platform as its compass the incoming Republican administration under Governor Landon will end the period of fatal experimentation and sectional Government and return to a sane national policy whereby all of America may go full steam ahead in the way Providence intended. I am assuming, of course, that the dairymen and, indeed, all farmers wish to free themselves from the burden of the partisan crackpots and theorists who are now in command and are destroying American agriculture. The issue is, of course, in the hands of the people of America. I have faith in their judgment and, based on that faith, I predict the overwhelming election of Landon and Knox, thus insuring permanency to our free institutions and prosperity to the American farmer and American worker in industry. [Applause.]

WILLIAM B. OLIVER

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker—

What might have been we know 'tis not;
What must be must be borne;
But what hath been shall ne'er be forgot—
Not in the days to come.

We are sent here by our people to represent them. Here, we meet Members from the North, the East, the South, and the West. We associate with one another. We observe in our daily routine the outstanding and varied traits and characteristics of our colleagues. From this association we learn to admire and respect them. In all fields of human endeavor, however, there are outstanding men, men who rise above the ordinary, and who indelibly impress us with their particular gifts of mind and person.

The friendships we make in the House through association with our colleagues is really the only permanent and lasting value that we derive from serving in Congress.

Today I should like to pay a little tribute to one of these outstanding men—our friend and colleague WILLIAM B. OLIVER, of Alabama.

To our great sorrow, he has determined to retire from Congress at the end of the present session, after serving the people of his district in an outstanding manner as their Representative from the Sixth District of Alabama for the past 22 years.

Mr. OLIVER is a native of Eutaw, Ala., where he received his early education. He later attended the University of Alabama, where he received degrees from both the college of arts and sciences and the school of law. He also received the honorary degree of LL. D. from the University of Alabama and the National Law School, of Washington, D. C. He also attended that great university founded by the third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson—the University of Virginia.

In his early manhood WILLIAM B. OLIVER moved to Tuscaloosa, Ala., and entered the practice of law. From 1898 to 1909 he was solicitor for the sixth judicial circuit of Alabama. He resigned the office of solicitor in 1909 to accept the post as dean of the law school of the University of Alabama, and resigned the deanship in 1913 to become a candidate for Congress.

During his long and continuous service in the House he has been an important member of the Appropriations Committee, and for the past 4 years has served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations—State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor.

As a new Member I can distinctly recall the favorable impression made upon me by Mr. OLIVER. After observing him daily for a few months I formed the opinion that to me he typified in his person all the splendid attributes of a southern gentleman. Qualities of his mind so ably demonstrated in his discussion of matters under consideration by the House attracted everyone. In addition he possessed the rare gift of eloquence in such a marked degree that whenever he addressed the House the benches were filled.

I know we all regret his decision to end his service in Congress. For him goes out our every good wish that he may enjoy the fruits of his busy life for many, many years in his beloved Southland, and that these years may be filled with peace, consolation, and happiness. An old friend has penned the following lines as a further tribute to him:

PASSING OF THE OLD LANDMARKS

Tho we've many noble statesmen
In our Congress Halls today,
Honored for their faithful service,
Time's decree all must obey.
Yet when one of these immortals
Hears the still, small voice, to cross
O'er the Great Divide, the Congress,
And the Nation, feels the loss.

We lose, likewise, when a statesman,
That up thru the years has wrought
Nobly for our common country—
As a trusted statesman ought—
Fails to offer for election
To succeed himself again;
And methinks we just as deeply
Feel the loss that we sustain.

In these "latter days" of danger,
On the rolling seas of fate,
Statesmen, ruled by sacred honor,
Should direct our Ship of State—
In these old landmarks this virtue
Kept them faithful, firm, and just—
And the lives they lived were sermons,
From the text, "In God We Trust."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

THE PREVENTION OF PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during this administration legislation has been enacted directly beneficial to various classes and occupations—the farmer, laborer, home owner, soldiers, and others.

While the small merchant has benefited in a general way by this distribution of purchasing power among his patrons, no direct aid will benefit him so much as the passage of the Robinson-Patman bill to prevent price discrimination. The mail-order house and the chain store have gradually but surely so far encroached on the average merchant that the

day of his final destruction could be plainly seen in the next few years.

He could not compete with these prices because he was discriminated against in making his purchases. Now, he may purchase a small quantity at the same price as a mail-order house purchases by the million-dollar purchases, when this law becomes effective.

Wholesalers will be able to make purchases on terms of quality the country over. This law does not fix a price but prevents a discrimination between customers, and it was this discrimination that was squeezing to death the independent merchant. The giant monopolies, the chain stores, and mail-order houses were gaining such headway until eventually they would have it all, and then the few giants left would devour each other until only a few of them controlled it all.

Then is when the people would feel the pinch—as soon as they got complete control and laid low all competition the people would be at their mercy on prices.

We need the independent merchant and must do something to protect him from the giant oppressors who are slowly but surely putting him out of business. Much false propaganda has been used to defeat this bill. The merchant has been told that he could not sell one article for 15 cents and two for a quarter, and a lot of other "hooey" of this kind, to try to get a misinformed opposition to the bill. But there are none so foolish as not to know who it is that opposes the measure and who is intended to be benefited. It is for the protection and preservation of the independent merchant, large or small. They are taxpayers of their communities and the ones who keep the home fires burning in their respective communities. This is the first legislation that ever took notice of his precarious condition and attempts to give him a new lease on life.

HOUSING BILL

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill that Senator WAGNER introduced in the Senate and which seeks to alleviate existing housing conditions in the United States deserves the careful study and consideration of this House. This bill, a very intelligent piece of legislation, states the following purposes in its preamble:

There exists in urban and rural communities throughout the United States slums, blighted areas, or unsafe, unsanitary, or overcrowded dwellings, or a combination of these conditions, accompanied and aggravated by an acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of families of low income.

These conditions are inimical to the general welfare of the Nation by (a) encouraging the spread of disease and lowering the level of health, morale, and vitality of large portions of the American people; (b) increasing the hazards of fire, accidents, and natural calamities; (c) subjecting the moral standards of the young to bad influences; (d) increasing the violation of the criminal laws of the United States and of the several States; (e) impairing industrial and agricultural productive efficiency; (f) lowering the standards of living of large portions of the American people; (g) necessitating a vast and extraordinary expenditure of public funds, Federal, State, and local, for crime prevention, punishment and correction, fire prevention, public health, service, and relief.

The failure to remedy the acute dwelling shortage has also produced stagnation of business activity in the construction, durable goods and allied industries, thus impeding business activity throughout the Nation and resulting in widespread and prolonged unemployment, with its injurious effects upon the general welfare of the Nation.

Private industry alone has been and now is unable to overcome the obstacles in the way of relieving the shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and the several States and their political subdivisions have been, and now are, unable adequately to aid in remedying this condition without financial assistance.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to promote the general welfare of the Nation by employing its funds and credit, as provided in this act, to assist the several States and their political subdivisions to alleviate unemployment, and to remedy the unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions, and the acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income that are injurious to the health, safety, and morals of the citizens of the Nation.

Since the World War there has also been a potential demand for new housing; and particularly since the slump in real estate during the depression, a condition of affairs had come to exist which makes it necessary to build more and more houses for the benefit of our people.

That is shown by comparison of the best available data on housing needs in 1920, the year when the post-war housing shortage was greatest, and 1936.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics data show that only about one-sixth as much new housing was built from 1930 to 1935 as in the period from 1921 to 1930 although the increase in the number of families, according to normal population trends, should have been 88 percent of the average rate from 1920 to 1930.

How much new construction can be expected on the basis of the present potential demand? On the assumption that the housing slump will have been offset by new building during the next 10 years and that housing will be maintained equivalent to the 1929 standards, it is estimated 760,000 new dwellings will be the average annual construction from 1936 to 1945. Construction forecast for this year is 300,000 units.

What factors contribute to the present potential demand for housing?

Housing officials give the following explanation:

First. Widespread "double-up" of families.

As soon as they are financially able to make the change, many families which have lived together since 1929 will seek separate quarters. This was shown by the real-property inventory of the Commerce Department, covering one-seventh of the urban population. It was found that 7 percent of all the families canvassed reported that they were living with other families but desired to take up separate quarters as soon as they could afford them.

Second. The large marriage reserve.

After 1929 the marriage rate dropped sharply. Census figures show that this postponement of marriages is offset in times of returning prosperity by a rise in the marriage rate. The increased number of marriages during the next few years is expected to be a factor in increasing the demand for houses.

Third. Stagnation of building during the depression.

Residential building during the period from 1930 to 1935 was only about one-sixth of the average from 1921 to 1930.

Fourth. The desire of home owners to move to suburbs and to escape from rundown neighborhoods.

Development of suburban residential areas is expected to continue as a factor in motivating construction of new houses. Also in areas where business has encroached, with returning prosperity home owners will move to more favorable locations.

Fifth. The net population movement from the farms to cities.

First reversal of the movement from the farms to the cities occurred from 1930 to 1932 when many of the jobless were forced back to the farms from which they had migrated. Since 1932 the tide of migration again has flowed to the urban areas.

Sixth. The tendency toward reduction in the size of families.

Removal of older children to separate quarters, a tendency for relatives to seek their own quarters rather than to live together, and a growth in the percentage of adults in the population have contributed toward a reduction in the average size of the family. This trend is expected to continue.

The far-reaching plan which the framers of the bill have set themselves deserves our utmost cooperation, and it is up to the House to give this measure the support it deserves.

We all agree on the necessity for action. It is proposed to set aside $976,000,000 for slum clearance and new housing over a period of 4 years. Personally, I believe a larger sum could well be appropriated for this purpose.

While I do not believe that this bill will adequately solve the problem of slum clearance and new modern housing at low rates, still I believe it is a step in the right direction. We must not let anything stand in the way of its passage and successful application.

It is particularly close to my heart as a representative of this district to see to it that our people get adequate housing in modern buildings at low rents. The problem before Congress is to push forward legislation which will make this a better world to live in and give the average citizen a happier life.

Our President has stated in many public addresses and over the radio that he believes that the aim and object of government should be the creation of a fuller life for our people. If our citizens are better housed and are given modern homes to live in their lives will be happier and they will take a great pride in being citizens of this glorious country of ours.

THE CONSTITUTION MUST BE AMENDED

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, when the present administration took office 3 years ago, it embarked upon a far-reaching program of legislation designed to stimulate business and improve the living conditions of the American people. In the course of the past year we have, however, seen most of this legislation declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. When the Democratic national convention is held in Philadelphia next week, the paramount problem that will confront it will be the question of a far-reaching constitutional amendment designed to give to Congress the power to deal with economic conditions. Before entering upon a discussion as to what such an amendment ought to provide, I should like to call the attention of the House to two joint resolutions that have already been proposed for the consideration of this body.

One is House Joint Resolution 440 introduced by Representative MARCANTONIO on January 8, 1936, commonly known as the workers' rights amendment. The other resolution is Senate Joint Resolution 249 introduced by Senator BENSON, of Minnesota, on February 24, 1936. Both of these resolutions would give to the Congress of the United States the power to regulate conditions affecting production and distribution of goods and services and would also give Congress the power to create agencies for the production of such goods and services. In my opinion either of these proposed amendments would be adequate to meet the immediate needs.

If, however, we are to consider the nature of an adequate constitutional amendment, it seems to me that it would be well to consider what further power, if any, ought to be incorporated in an amendment designed to grant to the United States Congress powers sufficiently broad to permit an adequate consideration of economic conditions by the representatives of the people. I should like to suggest, therefore, for your consideration an amendment substantially as follows:

HUMAN-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in order to permit Congress, as the elected representatives of the people of the United States, to take action necessary to bring to the people of the Nation the abundance which full-capacity use of its natural resources, its machinery of production, and the skill of its people make possible, the following amendment to the Constitution, to be designated as the human-rights amendment, be, and is hereby, proposed to the States, to become a valid part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Congress shall have the power to enact laws providing for the ownership, operation, and management, through instrumentalities of the Government of the United States, of business, manufacturing, commerce, industry, and banking, and shall have the power to purchase and condemn by eminent domain such enterprises.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have the power to regulate, limit, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age; to regulate hours and conditions of labor and to establish minimum wages in any employment; to regulate production, industry, trade, and commerce; to provide for the support of children, mothers, aged, sick, and other persons not gainfully employed in the form of periodic grants, pensions, benefits, compensation, and indemnities from the Public Treasury or through contributions; and to provide for the economic and social welfare of the people of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on gains, profits, and incomes derived from securities issued either before or after the ratification of this amendment under the authority of the United States, the authority of any of the several States, and the authority of any subsidiary government of any State, including municipalities, as well as the right to make direct levies on capital.

"SEC. 4. Nothing contained in the fifth or the fourteenth amendments to this Constitution relative to the taking of property without due process of law shall be construed to impose any limitation on the legislative power of Congress and the several States with respect to any of the subjects referred to in this article."

FOR AN ERA OF ABUNDANCE

A constitutional amendment in substantially the same form as the foregoing would, in my opinion, give Congress the power necessary to bring about by constitutional and democratic means the era of full production and plenty for all which modern technology, the skill of our people, and our great natural resources make possible.

Section 1 would give to the Federal Government the power to set up agencies for the production and distribution of goods and services to the citizens of the United States.

Not only is this power necessary in order to release the great potential productive power of which our country is capable but it is also necessary that Congress should have this power if it is to deal with problems that will confront it in the very near future.

Under the New Deal the Government of the United States has embarked in the Tennessee Valley upon the greatest social experiment ever attempted by the Government of this country. Not long ago the constitutionality of a part of that project was before the Supreme Court for consideration. In this decision the Supreme Court upheld the right of the Government to operate the power plant at Wilson Dam and to build transmission lines for the disiposal and sale of the surplus power generated there. The Court, however, went out of its way to make it plain that they were not passing on the whole problem of Government ownership and operation of power projects but only upon the Wilson Dam itself. They upheld the activity of the Government in regard to the Wilson Dam because the Wilson Dam was originally built for purposes of aiding navigation and insuring national defense.

T. V. A. MAY BE INVALIDATED

But Wilson Dam is only a small part of the Tennessee Valley project. Within a year the water that flows over Wilson Dam will also flow over the Norris and Wheeler Dams in a great power project. Within 10 years, 10 great dams will have been completed for the purpose of utilizing the same water in a great coordinated power development that has as its objective not the aid of navigation nor the insuring of national defense, but rather the improvement of the social standards of the people who live in the Tennessee Valley region.

It seems almost certain that before long the cases that have been brought by 19 utility companies will be decided against the interests of the people in the Tennessee Valley, and the T. V. A., the greatest social experiment ever attempted by the Government of this country and the one part of the New Deal program which looks in the direction of abundance for all, instead of planned scarcity, will be cast aside.

The power to set up agencies for the production and distribution of goods and services is important for an even more urgent reason. About a year and a half ago the Federal Emergency Relief Administration determined that where $163,000,000 a month was spent for relief the same standards of relief could be granted for $60,000,000 a month if the unemployed were permitted to contribute their own labor toward their own support. Furthermore, the F. E. R. A. found that if the sum of sixty millions were increased to seventy-eight millions, then the standards of people on relief could be raised 35 to 40 percent. This would have raised the living standards of people on relief above the standards of people normally employed in industry.

FIFTY DOLLARS A MONTH WASTEFUL

It is unfortunate that public opinion is not willing to support an adequate standard of relief for the unemployed. A recent survey conducted by the Poll of Public Opinion showed that 65 percent of the people interviewed believed that the Federal Government ought to turn relief back to the States and municipalities.

The Republican Party in its platform has taken the same position. It holds that the New Deal has destroyed the morale of many of our people and made them dependent upon Government. It favors the withdrawal of Government from competition with private pay rolls. Apparently, the Republican Party holds that industry has really competed for the services of the 12,000,000 wage earners who have been unemployed during the past 6 years. The Republican Party apparently regards as unfair competition the fact that the Government for the past 8 months has given three and one-half millions of these people work at an average of $50 a month.

They refer to the frightful waste and extravagance of the New Deal.

But in the administration of relief only 3.6 percent of the money spent goes for administrative purposes. Moreover, 95.5 percent of the people employed on W. P. A. projects are taken from the relief rolls. The only fair inference to be drawn is that the Republican Party considers the payment of $50 a month to unemployed heads of families as frightfully extravagant and wasteful. The Republican Party platform further considers balancing of the Budget "not by increased taxes, but by cutting expenses drastically and immediately."

CUTTING BUDGET MEANS CUTTING RELIEF

Members of Congress realize that the present income of the Federal Government is merely sufficient to pay for the operating costs of the various departments, including the payment of interest and the maintenance of the Army and Navy.

If we are to balance the Budget not by raising taxes but by reducing expenditures, this means that we shall have to do away with relief and all the other so-called "emergency" agencies.

In short, the Republican Party is determined that we shall return to the relief situation that existed when Herbert Hoover was in the White House, when the average relief check per family per month amounted to $8.

A proposal of this kind is almost too inhuman to contemplate. The relief program of the New Deal is pathetically inadequate. The statement was made at the recent national conference of social workers held in Atlantic City that death certificates in a certain county in Colorado showed that 79 people had died during the past year from starvation.

I believe this statment to be true. After I heard of this situation I communicated with the head of the Catholic Charities for the State of Colorado, and this gentleman, who is thoroughly reliable, furnished me with 10 verified death certificates from Denver County, in which certificates starvation, malnutrition, emaciation, and undernourishment, and so forth, were given as the causes of death.

Recently the Governor of Pennsylvania stated that physical examinations given to 59,000 school children in the city of Pittsburgh showed that 45,000 were victims of malnutrition and defects traceable to slow starvation.

MILLIONS PERMANENTLY UNEMPLOYED

No one conversant with the facts believes that the twelve to fifteen millions of our now unemployed will ever find reemployment in private industry. Students of the subject agree that during the last 7 years output per man-hour in manufacturing has increased by 30 percent. This means that we could go back to the industrial activity of 1929 and still have eight to ten million unemployed people.

We have now waited 7 years for industry to give these people jobs. In view of present indications it is quite certain that the great majority cannot expect to find reemployment in private industry. If, on the other hand, the public is not willing to provide the funds to maintain these people on relief, then there is only one alternative, and that is for the Government to take steps to enable these unemployed people to be gathered into a Nation-wide self-help, cooperative system financed and sponsored by the Federal Government so that these people may be enabled to contribute their own efforts toward their own support.

But if this is to be done, it is necessary that the Federal Government be given the necessary power.

THE EXTRAVAGANCE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

While the Republican Party platform speaks of "frightful waste and extravagance", it is only too clear that the waste and extravagance of this depression is not to be found in the sums of money that have been spent by the New Deal in trying to keep victims of the depression alive, but rather in the frightful waste and extravagance that has resulted from the unemployment of these 12,000,000 wage earners for a period of 6 or 7 years; the waste and extravagance that has resulted from the operation of our productive plant at approximately 50 percent of its actual capacity for the last 6 or 7 years. It has been estimated by a Government-sponsored study that since the depression began we have failed to produce goods and services to an estimated value of more than $350,000,000. This is more than the total value of all property in the United States at the present time, whether it be real, personal, or mixed. The real waste of this depression is to be found in the fact that for more than 6 years we have wasted 24,000,000,000 man-hours annually. According to a competent Government engineer, these man-hours, if converted into engineering projects, could have built 20 Boulder Dams, 10 transcontinental cement highways, 5,000,000 modern 6-room houses, and an automobile, radio, and refrigerator for each of the 30,000,000 families in the United States for every year during the past 6 years.

THE PROBLEM OF NONPRODUCTION

This is not saying that the people who are unemployed would have the necessary skill to carry on the particular type of work required, but it is saying that translating the unemployment of these people into man-hours this is what could have been done each and every year since the depression started had an equivalent number of man-hours been converted into these projects under current engineering practice.

The American people are becoming aware of the fact that our great problem is the nonproduction of goods and services. In the State of Washington the Democratic Party has come out on a platform calling for production for use. There is obviously no other solution for our economic difficulties—but this solution is not possible unless the Constitution is amended to give Congress the power to set up agencies for the production and distribution of needed goods and services.

The second section in the article seeks to give Congress the power to regulate the conditions affecting the production and distribution of goods and services. This power will have to be vested in the Congress if child labor is to be prohibited, if minimum wages and minimum hours are to be established, and if adequate provision is to be made for the support of children, mothers, the aged, the sick, and other persons not gainfully employed. The Supreme Court has made its position definite and certain in regard to what it will do on any attempt on the part of Congress to legislate on these matters, unless a constitutional amendment is first adopted which will give to Congress this power.

When President Roosevelt states that in his opinion everything can be done that needs to be done under the Constitution as it now stands, it merely means that he now considers such legislation as the N. R. A., the A. A. A., the Guffey coal bill, and other measures of this kind as unnecessary, and that in the future he will only ask Congress to confine itself to those limited powers that have been left to it by the decisions of the Supreme Court.

PLANNING FOR SCARCITY

This amounts to a surrender of even those limited ideals which the New Deal tried to realize. This statement on the part of the President means that there will be no

fundamental difference between the New Deal and the Old Deal except that the New Deal will stand for boondoggling, while the Old Deal proposes to go back to the dole administered by the States and local municipalities. Unless the Constitution is amended, it becomes impossible to plan for abundance through full production. The only planning that will be possible will be limited planning for scarcity in order to maintain the profit system.

The third section provides for direct levies on capital and the taxing of income from tax-exempt securities. It is essential that both of these powers be granted to the Congress of the United States.

At the present time the public indebtedness of the United States, local, State, National, and guaranteed, amounts to approximately $50,000,000,000. The corresponding indebtedness of Great Britain, however, is $52,000,000,000. In view of the fact of our greater population, income, and wealth, our indebtedness would have to be from two to three times as great as that of the United Kingdom to be comparable.

This, however, is not possible if our indebtedness is to be in the form of tax-exempt securities. For instance, if a wealthy man owns a million dollars in tax-exempt securities paying an income of $40,000, this is fully as great a load to the State as though the indebtedness were twice as great, provided the income from these securities could be taxed. In England, for instance, if a man has his wealth in government bonds, a large part of his income is taken back by the state in order to pay the interest on these bonds as they accrue.

WEALTH ENTAILS RESPONSIBILITY

In this country we have gone on the theory that we must offer special inducements to the people of wealth in order to persuade them to buy the bonds of our country. In England the people of wealth have been forced to recognize that wealth also entails social responsibility—that if their wealth is to be preserved they must be prepared to meet their obligations to society. In other words, that a stable government is not possible unless every effort is made to alleviate social distress.

It would perhaps be no exaggeration to say that a government without tax-exempt securities could finance and carry a national indebtedness twice as great as that carried by a government whose securities are exempt from taxation. In other words, in the tax-exempt country a man might derive $40,000 net income out of a million dollars invested in tax-exempt bonds, where in another country permitting the taxation of all securities it would be necessary for him to own $2,000,000 in securities to derive the same net income; the taxing of the income from tax-exempt securities becomes merely a way of reducing the interest rate.

In this country the people of wealth are reluctant about buying Government securities, and as a result we have followed the practice of making our offers more and more attractive.

If we should reach the point where people of wealth would decline to buy our Government securities, we should then be faced with the alternative of simply having the Treasury Department issue the bonds, then take over the Federal Reserve System and sell these bonds to our centrally owned Government bank. This, to the orthodox banker, means inflation, pure and simple. Still it is certain if we do not have the power to tax presently exempt securities that we shall reach this point much sooner than would otherwise be true.

THE CAPITAL LEVY

The power to levy on capital is another instrument that in England has served to persuade the people of wealth to meet the obligations which the ownership of wealth entails. For many years it has been the advocacy of a capital levy that has brought about the most bitter opposition to the Labor Party and its program. Nevertheless, this same threat of a capital levy has also been the principal reason that England is able to carry a national debt comparatively three times as great as our own.

The advocacy of the power to levy on capital and to tax presently exempt securities is fundamentally a conservative proposal. It opens the door for an evolutionary change into a production-for-use system and it at least permits the improvement of economic conditions for the time being. For instance, if this country were to engage on a great public-works program, entailing an increase of its national debt to $100,000,000,000, this would simply mean that we should have public buildings, parks, roads, houses, and so forth, which we do not now have, to the approximate value of $70,000,000,000. While the figures on paper might indicate that the Government was $70,000,000,000 poorer, this is after all merely a matter of bookkeeping. From a physical standpoint we should have $70,000,000,000 more in the way of stone, mortar, structural steel, and other tangible evidences of work accomplished. Physically, we should be $70,000,000,000 better off than we are at the present time and if the Government found that it was not desirable to carry such a big debt load, with the power to levy on capital the Government could simply require that the 2 percent of our people who own 80 percent of our national wealth surrender to the Government for cancelation some of its evidences of indebtedness. Actually this proposal is in the line of conservatism and evolutionary change rather than in the line of revolutionary and violent change.

SHARING THE WEALTH

During the past few years there have grown up in this country strong groups that believe that we must share our national wealth.

No informed economist will quarrel with these people about the fundamental soundness of their viewpoint. They may disagree about the feasibility of specific methods. The power, however, to levy on capital and tax all income is the one way that the objective of the "share-the-wealthers" may be accomplished; but it can only be done after the Constitution has been made into a permissive instrument granting Congress broad power to deal with the problems presented by a decaying profit system.

POWER NOT DANGEROUS

But whenever it is proposed to give Congress the power to enact legislation designed to bring about planned production for plenty the objection is always raised that it is dangerous to give such broad powers to the representatives of the people. What would happen, is asked, if Congress should lose all judgment and simply run wild?

The answer to this objection is to be found in the fact that Congress now has full power to destroy within its hands. This power to destroy is vested in Congress by the Constitution. It is inconceivable that even the Supreme Court would ever attempt to take away this power.

I am referring, of course, to the fact that Congress has full power to spend money for these purposes that have been traditionally recognized as a proper field for Government spending.

Whether this be by way of a large public-works program, the building of the biggest army and navy in the world, the waging of foreign war, the creating of a great bureaucracy with every supporter of the administration on the pay roll, or by some other approved method, it must be conceded therefore that there is no limit on the amount of money that Congress and the Chief Executive may spend if they so desire.

POWER TO INFLATE

In order to pay for this spending Congress may impose taxes of a kind that would absorb all income above a certain point. Congress might also levy excise taxes that would virtually take from certain sections of the people most of their present income, or if this should fail, there is then no limit on the extent to which this Government might borrow, and if people should finally become unwilling to buy Government securities, then the Government could simply take over the Federal Reserve System, causing the Treasury to issue securities which the Federal Reserve System would

buy at par. In other words, the Congress and President have the power to embark on a program of pure inflation if they should ever desire to do so. If they so desired they could issue fiat money to any extent that they might choose.

Congress, therefore, through the wrecking of the national currency, through inflation, has the power to destroy orderly processes of Government and economic life any time it decides to do so. In short, there can be no question about the full and complete destructive power that Congress has at the present time.

The decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the N. R. A., the A. A. A., the minimum-wage case, the railroad-pension case, the Guffey coal bill, the "hot oil" case, and so forth, have virtually amounted to holding that the Congress of the United States is restricted in its power to deal with economic problems save and except by bringing about inflation. In other words, as matters now stand Congress cannot go far without bringing upon the country disastrous consequences.

Whether Congress would use broad economic power intelligently or not remains, of course, to be seen. Power of this kind can obviously be used constructively or destructively. If, however, we believe in democratic government, we cannot expect to meet and cope with critical problems unless power is granted the representatives of the people to carry out their mandates. As matters now stand the Federal Government obviously does not have this power.

HAS POWER TO DESTROY SUPREME COURT

Whenever it is proposed to give Congress broad permissive power, this suggestion is always construed, by the representatives of the vested interests, as an attack upon the Supreme Court and American institutions. As matters now stand Congress has the power to destroy the Supreme Court if it should decide to do so. In the first place Congress has the power to determine how many justices there shall be on the Supreme Court. The number of justices has been varied many times in the history of the country as political circumstances have seemed to require it. We have tended to forget that the Supreme Court has been a political football from its very inception. Congress could increase the number of justices to 50, to 100, or to any number necessary in order to insure getting the type of legal opinion that would harmonize with the viewpoint of Congress and the Executive.

Congress could arbitrarily fix a retirement age that would get rid of justices that might be considered undesirable because of superannuation. The Congress might fix a term of service and provide that members must automatically retire after having served a specified length of time. The Congress of the United States might refuse to make any appropriations for the performance of the functions of the Supreme Court, and, of course, it must be remembered that except in a few cases where the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction (the Court in all other matters has only appellate jurisdiction), the Congress may limit the extent of this appellate jurisdiction in any way that it sees fit.

Therefore, except in cases involving original jurisdiction, the Supreme Court in the final analysis has only that power which Congress permits it to exercise.

These are only a few of the methods, that come to my mind, by which Congress could dispose of the Supreme Court if it were inclined to do so. The proper method, however, in view of the practice that has grown up, and been sanctioned by the people of the United States, is to submit to them the question as to whether the Constitution shall remain a legalistic strait jacket or be made into a broad permissive instrument that would give the representatives the power to carry out the wishes of the people.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM IGNORES QUESTION

The Republican platform recently adopted at the national convention of the Republican Party held at Cleveland does not recognize that there exists any need for greater legislative power either on the part of Congress or the State legislatures in order to deal with the crisis. The Republican nominee, however, has indicated that if it should become necessary, he would advocate a constitutional amendment granting this power to the several States.

This presents the rather idle question as to how bad conditions in his mind would have to become before he considered it desirable to have legislation on the subject of child labor or minimum wages and maximum hours for women employed in industry.

The proposal, however, that the conditions of workers should be improved by legislation by the several States is palpably dishonest. In the first place it is generally recognized by labor representatives in the Northern and Eastern States that the legislatures of those States have now gone so far in the matter of social legislation that industry finds it advantageous to move its plants into Southern States, where social legislation affecting hours, wages, and conditions of labor is virtually nonexistent.

The Northern and Eastern States cannot, therefore, proceed further with advanced labor legislation without speeding the rate at which industry is moving out of these States into States without legislation designed to protect the workers.

On the other hand, it cannot be expected that these States backward in the field of labor legislation will proceed to enact protective measures, since it would be certain to retard the movement of industry into these States.

This attitude was well exemplified in a certain State, where an effort was made last year to amend the laws of the State in such a way as to permit the installation of sewers in mill-towns. This attempt, however, was defeated, even though it is common knowledge that open privies are a menace to health in urban communities.

The announced position of the Republican candidate can therefore not be construed as a genuine effort to face a social problem, but rather an attempt to appeal to psychological lag after the issue of State rights is no longer a matter of protecting the common man against exploitation, but has rather become an assurance to the great corporations that they will be permitted to exploit without let or hindrance from either Federal Government or the governments of the States.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY MUST FACE ISSUE

When the Democratic Party holds its convention in Philadelphia next week, it will be forced to recognize that most of the legislation enacted during the past 3 years and designed to carry into effect the so-called New Deal economic program has been declared null and void by the Supreme Court.

In a recent speech at Little Rock, Ark., President Roosevelt expressed it as his opinion that it would be possible to attain the objectives of the New Deal without amending the Constitution.

It might be assumed from this that the measures declared unconstitutional were a mistake in the first place and should not have been enacted into law. If this is the case then the New Deal is approaching perilously close to the position that has been preempted by the Republican Party ever since the Civil War.

We have at the present time certain movements in this country that have proposed different plans for dealing with the problems that have been created by 7 years of acute economic crisis. If the plans of these organizations are analyzed in terms of the Supreme Court decisions for the past 2 years, it will be readily ascertained that none of these organizations can hope to enact their proposals into law unless broad permissive powers are first granted to the Congress of the United States.

It would seem reasonable to assert, therefore, that before any of these movements can give their support to the candidacy of any individual for the Congress of the United States, the first requirement must be that this individual shall be willing to support an amendment to the Constitution sufficiently broad to give Congress the power to enact into law the program which the particular organization is sponsoring.

Without regard to the differences of opinion that exist between the sponsors of these various economic programs, it is imperative as a first step that the issue of a constitutional amendment in the form of an enabling act to the Congress of the United States be presented in each congressional election in 1936.

FOREIGN COMPETITION WITH DOMESTIC SUGAR PRODUCERS—BLACKSTRAP MOLASSES

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, this resolution (S. J. Res. 278) extends the sugar quotas for 1 year. I am aware that it will pass. However, I want to call attention to certain facts at this time, so that future legislation may remedy the faults that are embodied in the present proposal.

A similar House resolution was before our Agricultural Committee, and the present Senate resolution retains sections 1 and 2 only of the House resolution and eliminates the other sections. But even now in its present condition it is undoubtedly contrary to constitutional limitations because it is a direct and undisguised attempt under the quota system to limit and regulate the volume of production of sugarcane and sugar beets in and among the several States by an act of the Federal Congress. It is, therefore, in direct conflict with the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Butler against the United States handed down on January 6, 1936, which holds that the production of agricultural commodities in the several States is not subject to the control of the Federal Government. I quote one paragraph from that opinion:

> Until recently no suggestion of the existence of any such power in the Federal Government has been advanced. The expressions of the framers of the Constitution, the decisions of this Court interpreting that instrument and the writings of great commentators will be searched in vain for any suggestion that there exists in the clause under discussion or elsewhere in the Constitution, the authority whereby every provision and every fair implication from that instrument may be subverted, the independence of the individual States obliterated, and the United States converted into a central government exercising uncontrolled police power in every State of the Union, superseding all local control or regulation of the affairs or concerns of the States.

I believe that we can accomplish everything that this resolution proposes without violating our fundamental law.

I complain also because there were no hearings in the committee and those who may have been in opposition were given no notice and no chance to be heard. The resolution is now before us upon ex parte statements and one-sided arguments and because of the requests of certain producers and refineries who were the only people consulted so far as I know. I hope that hearings will be had at the opening of the next session and that everybody will be given an opportunity to be heard so that the Congress and the country can be informed of all of the facts.

Sugar is a nonsurplus crop. It is a cash crop. In storage and in warehouse it is a better collateral than almost any other agricultural commodity. The United States and the Virgin and Hawaiian Islands produce only 30 percent of our continental consumption, while 70 percent is brought here from foreign and nonterritorial offshore areas. We should encourage the production here at home of all the sugar that we can produce economically and we must look forward toward giving the American market to the American producer.

We grow sugar in Iowa. We have a rich and adaptable soil. We have rainfall and do not depend upon irrigation. We are nearer to the large consuming markets and we ought to get some cheaper freight rates than other areas, although the base system—Pittsburgh-plus system—prevails to our disadvantage. Future legislation should correct evils in this respect. I repeat that so far as is possible we should give the American market to the American producer, but this resolution really results in giving 70 percent of our market to offshore foreign and nonterritorial populations.

But all sugar legislation should do what this resolution and what present legislation fails to do—that is, give protection to American farmers against competition with the half-clad, half-fed, half-civilized peon labor of foreign countries. Industrial alcohol, for example, should be distilled from home-grown corn and vegetables and not from cheap blackstrap and garbage sent here by foreign opulent sugar refineries of the West Indies.

The volume of importation of molasses has grown in recent years, and in 1935 it amounted to nearly 250,000,000 gallons of a value of nearly $12,500,000. During the first 3 months of 1936 the importation was approximately 28,500,000 gallons. Molasses importations represent a loss to American farmers of more than $12,000,000 per year. We could use 1,000,000 acres of corn land in producing 41,000,000 bushels of corn in the manufacture of alcohol if such corn was not displaced by approximately 248,000,000 gallons of molasses now imported for such purpose.

If we would prevent the importation of this item alone, we would take care of every bushel of our surplus of corn. It is an interesting and significant coincidence that all of our surplus corn could be used here in the distillation of industrial alcohol if importations of blackstrap were embargoed or prevented by a sufficient tariff.

Two years ago in the committee I proposed an amendment which would have limited the importations of blackstrap for distillation purposes down to the quotas based on pre-war and pre-Volstead conditions. At this time when we are limiting American production it seems ridiculous to give this opportunity to foreigners, and in speaking on the question, among other things, I then said:

> If you really want to restore the farmer's buying power, you will give him the American market. If you really want to make him prosperous, you will allow him to raise and sell his products. If you want cheap foreign labor to displace him in the economic structure, then you will continue to favor the American Molasses Co. of Boston, and the big sugar refineries, who control the present situation, and the lobby which has been here before Congress representing them. You will continue to uphold the big banks that have large investments and loans in foreign sugar refineries and sugar plantations. How about the Chase National Bank, the National City Bank, and the Bank of Montreal? As Congressmen, whom are you going to be for? That is a question which you will have to answer sooner or later, because the time is coming—and I hope it will come soon—when you cannot hide behind a rule which prevents discussions and amendments and also prevents justice to American farmers.

This importation is a very small fraction of agricultural products allowed to come into this country in competition with the home folks who are trying to live a home life on our family sized farms. This legislation and all future sugar legislation should have them in mind.

THE ANTILOBBY BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday vindicated itself as a deliberative body. It demonstrated the value of frank and candid discussion of a legislative measure. The House of Representatives is overwhelmingly in favor of legislation to safeguard against secret and corrupt lobbying of the character shown to have been carried on in connection with the holding-company bill at the last session of Congress. In the debate yesterday it was disclosed that we were dealing with a bill which would have been a virtual denial of the right of the citizens of the country to petition Congress or be represented before it in behalf of or in opposition to legislation.

I had received letters of protest from members of the Townsend movement, claiming that the bill aimed at their movement. I sought to allay their fears by assurances that it did not. Yesterday in debate it was admitted by proponents of the measure on the floor that it did. I had it admitted in answer to a question of my own. I stated in substance to a proponent of the bill that, as I understood it, the objection was not that the representatives of any organization or movement would have to register and state what they got and who they got it from and what they did with it, but that great popular movements would virtually have to register their entire membership in Washington and every cent that all the members contributed to the movement.

The answer in substance was that those organizations throughout the country whose principal business it is to influence legislation, and who collect money for this purpose, must show from whom they collected it and how much they got and what they did with it.

My rejoinder to this explanation was that it would be impracticable and that we had as well pass a law prohibiting them from lobbying and be done with it.

The statement was further made by the proponents of the bill that it did reach the American Federation of Labor and all patriotic organizations or anyone else who hires and sends a lobbyist to Washington to influence legislation either way.

Section 2 of the proposal submitted to the House makes this clear. It would work in this way, taking the Townsend movement as an illustration: The movement would have to file with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate the names of all persons who contributed to the movement for the purpose of influencing legislation at Washington and the amount contributed. This would mean every one of the millions of members of the movement, and this report would have to be made monthly. It would be the same with all other popular movements to influence legislation. I single out the Townsend movement only by way of illustration.

Paradoxically enough, the great corporations at whose practices this legislation was presumed to be aimed would not have to do this. They are not organized principally to influence legislation. Only their lobbyists would have to register, give the name of their employer and the amount of money they received, and what they did with it. This is as it should be. The same should be required of all other representatives lobbying on legislation. But when to this you add the requirement that the names of the members of organizations of millions of voters, each of whom makes some contribution, be it a dime or a quarter, must be registered at Washington, together with the amount contributed, plus monthly reports, it should require no argument to show that this is not only impracticable, but impossible. Whether this was intended or not, there can be no dispute about the result.

The conference report brought in these provisions of the bill. I voted against the report on the roll call. It was rejected by a vote of 264 to 77.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN MISQUOTED

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have read from time to time, with a great deal of interest, a statement attributed to President Abraham Lincoln in which he was alleged to have prophesied that if the growth of monopolies continued in the United States it would be most destructive to the country, or words to that effect.

Knowing that from time to time quotations of this character are not based upon facts, before repeating it I thought I would inquire of the Librarian of Congress if he could advise me when and where such utterances were made. For the benefit of those who desire to be accurate I submit a letter I have received from the Library of Congress, which is self-explanatory:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF THE LIBRARIAN,
Washington, April 16, 1936.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House Office Building.

DEAR SIR: For the Librarian, pray let me acknowledge your letter of April 15, enclosing a newspaper clipping giving the statement "I see, in the future, a crisis approaching", etc., attributed to Abraham Lincoln, and asking for the book containing this statement.

The Library of Congress from time to time has been in receipt of letters making inquiry regarding this statement, but our people here have never been able to find it. In her book, Personal Traits of Abraham Lincoln, Miss Helen Nicolay, daughter of John G. Nicolay, who was one of President Lincoln's secretaries, writes as follows:

"My father once made a list of a dozen or more spurious quotations and allegations concerning Lincoln, but the one he was most often called upon to deny was this:

" 'Yes; we can all congratulate ourselves that this cruel war is drawing to a close. It has cost a vast amount of treasure and blood. The best blood of the flower of American youth has been freely offered upon our country's altar that the Nation might live. It has been a trying hour for the Republic, but I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of the war. God grant that my fears may prove groundless!'

"This alleged quotation seems to have made its first appearance in the Presidential campaign of 1888, and it has returned with planetary regularity ever since. Although convinced by internal evidence of its falsity, my father made every effort to trace it to its source, but could find no responsible respectable clue. The truth is that Lincoln was no prophet of a distant day. His heart and mind were busy with the problems of his own time. The legacy he left his countrymen was not the warning of a seer, but an example of obligation to face their own dark shadows with the sanity and courageous independence he showed in looking upon those that confronted him."

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. SLADE.

THE NEW DEAL

Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following address by me before the Wilsonian Democratic Club of Forsyth County, in Winston-Salem, N. C., June 3, 1936:

Mr. President, members of Wilsonian Democratic Club, and friends, built as I am, it would be difficult indeed to pretend indifference to the warmth of your greeting. I thank you for it and rejoice in the opportunity given me to talk to my friends in this splendid community just at this time. I am also deeply appreciative of the generous words of presentation spoken by my friend and your good friend, Fred Hutchins. Fred is primarily interested in my candidacy for renomination to Congress, not because of our warm friendship but because of the more important fact that he knows that I shall continue unswervingly to represent all the people of this community rather than a few selected groups.

I am not here because of any fear of the outcome in the primary, though I recognize that some of the influential citizens of this community have been quietly fighting my candidacy several months while I was in Washington trying to carry on my work and perform my duties. This is their right so long as their campaign is waged on a high plane and in the open daylight. With the diversity of interest in this great district, it would be miraculous if any human being could always act in a way to please all the people. My record will speak for itself, and on it I stand tonight. The mistakes which I have made have been of the head and not of the heart, and I have no apologies to offer anyone.

It makes me feel mighty good to know that I can face every man, woman, or child in the district and greet no single accusation of having broken a promise. Furthermore, no one can truthfully charge me with belonging to any group or class of our citizens. I am a free man, and I am striving to keep you and yours free, both economically and politically.

Six years ago I was Granville County's candidate for the nomination to the House of Representatives from the imperial Fifth District. On three different occasions I have been honored with a vote of confidence by the people of Forsyth County. Today, after 6 years of valuable experience and, I believe, effective representation, I seek a fourth term, but I come now, not alone as a candidate from Granville, but the candidate from the entire Fifth District. Every county in the district, by a sizable majority, has expressed its confidence in me and my record. But, after all, this office belongs to the people and the holder is merely a trustee for a limited time. If the duties and responsibilities have been faithfully and effectively carried out it would seem but natural and right that the trust be renewed or extended. If the duties and responsibilities of the office have not been faithfully and effectively carried out it is the duty of every good citizen to seek another trustee.

If I am your choice I want your vote as an expression of your good will and confidence. I am deeply interested in the welfare of the social and business life of this community, which might be termed "the hub" of my district. I recognize that your stakes are heavy and that effective representation in Washington has a bearing upon the social and economic well-being of every person in the county. Please remember that you can have no problem which will be alien to my best interest. No man, woman, or child in the county has ever sought my aid or assistance that I did not quickly and cheerfully lend it.

The primary reason of my presence here tonight is to try to promote my candidacy, and I know of no better way to do it than to talk to you frankly about the New Deal—its meaning, its objectives, and its accomplishments. It would be foolish for me to expect all who hear me to agree with what I say or to enjoy my saying it; and I shall therefore expect and be prepared for a volley of criticism from those few here who have long planned my ouster, largely because my actions have on every occasion demonstrated my abiding interest in the welfare of all the people. As a matter of fact, I like constructive criticism, and I know I need it, especially

when it is prompted by a good motive. Some of those, however, who have criticized and will continue to criticize my actions are without this type of motive and have never lifted their hands to help me in my work or help me in a way whereby I might help you. Even they must admit, however, that I have been fair and aboveboard in all my actions. I seriously question whether my most severe critic could have done a much better job than I have done. Of course, if I am wrong in this surmise, there is a way to prove it. That way and opportunity presents itself every 2 years.

Now let me speak my mind: Though I love to be liked and respected by all men and have many friends who often disagree with me and my attitude toward public questions, I want everybody to know that I am absolutely indifferent to the support of any man who has actively allied himself with the Liberty League. Surely no one here will misunderstand that statement and its implications.

Before coming to the main theme selected for my discussion tonight I want to touch briefly on a few side lights of this campaign. On one of my recent visits here I could not but be laughingly amused at the big ad on the big building across the street. I heartily agree that our district needs a man in Congress, but, my friends, I cannot swallow the balance of that statement. Here is the true situation: With the exception of a group of my opponent's personal friends, kinspeople, and associates here and in the district and those who are opposed to the underlying principles of the New Deal and our matchless and beloved leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, there can be discovered but few, relatively speaking, who will not agree that the district has a man in Congress now who is willing and capable of effectively representing the best interests of the district.

My attention has been called to a statement which my opponent made the other night at a county rally. He is reported to have said, in connection with the position he recently held in Washington, that Mr. Farley asked him to take it, and that it was accomplished without a recommendation from anybody. Certainly this statement was made inadvertently, for, before his appointment was cleared, he came to me in the company of your distinguished fellow townsman, Mr. R. M. Hanes, and requested that I endorse him. At Mr. Hanes' and his request, I sent a telegram to General Farley recommending him for any position which he was qualified to fill. I claim, however, no credit for the success of his effort. But, lo and behold, he had hardly warmed his administrative chair before he turned on me with a vengeance and did everything he could to nominate the good lady from Rockingham County in the 1934 campaign to take my place. Reserving other comments—"That's gratitude!"

There is another gentleman here who apparently has the same conception of that virtue. You know, my friends, I don't mind a man coming out in the open and criticizing my record and fighting me with all his might and power, politically, but there is something in my nature that makes me detest an enemy who will pose as a friend.

This gentleman is a candidate for the State legislature; why he is interested in seeking this office, you might well inquire. Notwithstanding his assurance of friendship and support for me on several occasions, he has been going around the district conniving with a prospective opponent to bring about my political destruction; why, I even secured his son a position with an agency of the Government, at his request, and I was busily engaged in trying to get him another position at the same time he was, as my friend, planning my downfall. Friends here have reported to me of his activities and that of another gentleman, high up in the leaf department of a great industry. You know, I have some little knowledge of the way some men connected with the big organizations carry on their political manipulations, and I will let you in on it one day pretty soon.

Often I overlook things of this kind and take them as a part of the game; but I could not, in fairness to myself or friends, let him get by with these unpardonable tactics. I am also familiar with the quiet and undercover opposition from a few other supposedly good friends. I challenge them all to come out into the open and put their cards on top of the table, as any true and courageous man should do if he is to continue to hold the respect of his fellow men.

This is a day of unusual political thought and strange happenings. Ours has become a surging Democracy, and unquestionably we are on the verge of vast economic and social changes. The political currents run deep and turbulent. We should face the situation realistically, but it is no time for good men and true to get excited or indulge in fulminations. Clear thinking and bold speech are essential if we are to make the best of a puzzling situation. On the other hand, there is little wonder that a political upheaval seems to be in the making in certain parts of the Nation, and especially when some of your prominent businessmen, fashioners of public thought and community builders, lend their financial and moral support to the campaign of Governor Talmadge for no other purpose, in my opinion, than to belittle and derogate the constructive work of our President.

I shall later on refer to a few more side lights, but there is now something more important and interesting to talk about. So let's get to it.

Now, first let us consider together the meaning of this thing we call the New Deal. I admit that there is no unanimous agreement, even among the leading New Dealers, as to what the New Deal is or ought to be. Such an agreement would of itself be contrary to my conception of it. Any observer, therefore, has the right to describe the New Deal from any standpoint he may choose. From my own viewpoint, the New Deal is the early stage of the final effort of the American economic and political system to throw off the shackles of ruthless and high finance which has resulted in making a few men masters and millions slaves. In all its various aspects the New Deal is related to this central line of progress.

Broadly stated, it has before it two great goals: The abolition of dire poverty and the equality of economic opportunity. Toward a social order in which there will be no dire poverty, no exploitation and no lack of opportunity New Dealers shall ever travel. No sane and good man will agree that poverty and distress should abound in an age of plenty. There can be no other conclusion as long as this condition exists, but that the minorities are under the system robbing the majority. For fear of being misunderstood, I want to make it clear to all those who may be listening that I do not subscribe to the notion that an economic millenium can be created by an act of Congress. To hold such a notion is a cruel and vicious error which can result only in disappointment and discontent, or eventual revolution. We shall the sooner reach the goal above stated when the American people understand that the way to economic independence and social enjoyment will come through the performance of work and helpful services. This country will be what we make it by our own efforts. The great objectives will be realized through the progress of education, through research and invention, through increasing control of natural resources, and through fair yet effective regulation of business within reasonable bounds. This, of course, involves control, in its broad sense, of our monetary policies, upon which the well-being of every citizen is more or less dependent. It is, therefore, high time that the American people should understand that poverty cannot be abolished by law, that hard work cannot be eliminated by statute, and that no government can create an ideal economic system.

The essential elements of the New Deal may be said to be the lines of action that look toward the elimination of financial centralization and the restoration of economic freedom. Looking through the inevitable confusion of action since the dark days of the Hoover administration and the "hang-over" following it, we can now see at least four coordinate lines of progress: First is effective regulation and supervision of the securities markets and of the banks. Reviewing the first 30 years of this century, we realize that the rulers of finance exercise their power largely by two of these instruments. From the battle between Morgan and Harriman over the Northern Pacific down to the great pool operations of the 1929 boom, the giants have fought their battles in Wall Street to decide who should have the right to stick the farmer, the worker, the small investor, and the consumer. Though few people realize it, the banks enjoy the function of creating and destroying money and of deciding who shall have the use of credit for business purposes. These are large powers, and they have been used in ways that caused lasting trouble, human misery, and far-reaching economic dislocations. Mitchell and Wiggin are gone, as are many others of their kind, but not before they had contributed largely to the sufferings of their countrymen. Most of our bankers were honest and are honest now, but no one can truthfully deny that they have played favorites in granting the use of credit. They have assisted in the concentration of financial power, and they have helped to float bonds that sent many a man to eternal sleep or to the poorhouse.

When the times were dangerously booming, honest bankers inflated credit for their own profit and the Nation's loss. When times were desperately hard, honest bankers destroyed $10,000,000,000 of money. They had to do it by force of circumstances and because of the system under which they operated. Banking is too big a job, with the public interest too much at stake, to be left free to follow the lure of short-term profit. The Nation, acting through its central Government, must control the expansion and contraction of the volume of money which is accomplished through open-market operations. Do you realize that when the Government buys or sells bonds and securities, it is in effect buying and selling money. When it buys, the volume of money is increased and the cost decreased, and when it sells, the volume is decreased and the cost increased. It is truly the exercise of the super-sovereign power of a nation. The Government must also oversee in proper ways the allocation of credit for the protection of small-business men.

The abandonment of the gold standard, citadel and shrine of high finance, was the first and most important step toward the accomplishment of this first line of progress. For with the recapture of the Nation's gold supply the financial tycoons can no longer strike chills to the marrow of those who propose action in the national interest by threatening to draw out their gold and leave us flat. They have lost their sacred calf and have been snubbed by the Supreme Court when they have tried to get it back.

The second main function of the New Deal concerns itself with the distribution of income: Capitalism, which the New Deal has saved, is supposed to have its own internal mechanism for distributing income through wages and dividends. Under the domination of high finance, however, it is evident that this mechanism is failing to work. Even before 1929 several million Americans were unemployed, kept from starving by charity, kept from producing useful goods and services by the policies of the lords of finance. The few million stockholders of American industry were getting good dividends, but only the insiders had any power of control. The proof of the failure of this distribution system is the fact that poverty increased on one end and wealth on the

other. Under this system one-fourth of 1 percent of all the corporations in the United States control one-half of all corporate wealth and are thus able to fix prices on many of the most essential things in our daily living. The purpose of a more equitable distribution of the Nation's wealth production should be clearly understood. At this point let me state that I for one have no patience, but rather contempt, for the view that every man who has a dollar or wants to make one is a public enemy. At the same time, I have no patience, but utter contempt, with that man who, blessed in a worldly way by the opportunities of living in America, snugly wraps the mantle of selfishness about him in a cowardly refusal to wager on our common future. Do not let such a man tell you he is afraid of confiscation, afraid of socialization, or afraid of Government in business.

Remember the only certain thing about government is that it will change. It is not something, but it is for something. Politics is its science. Politics is the living breath of representative democracy. Politics is the treatment of social and economic problems in a democracy. Politics of a sort has been the lot of this Nation since Cornwallis surrendered. Politics troubled the last days of George Washington, harrowed the earned leisure of Lincoln, and ruined the evening of Woodrow Wilson's life. Had the businessmen of those earlier days abandoned their jobs and committed industrial suicide because of politics, this Nation would never have advanced an inch. All of us should know that every legislative step of importance since the Constitution was written was claimed by critics as foreshadowing doom. And after every attack of nerves and the jitters immeasurable progress resulted.

Unless our working people can have larger incomes, industry cannot run, and unless the great unpropertied middle class can be propertied, we can have no hope of a stable and happy economic order. Liberty is meaningless as long as the large majority of our people live close to the bread and butter line. All fair-minded men must admit that there is something fundamentally wrong with an economic system which permits the income of one man in the high brackets to exceed the income of forty-two hundred in the low brackets. A persistence in this order of things will force the Nation into an unhappy form of government, such as exists in certain European countries.

I know that the poor cannot be made rich by giving them their pro-rata share of the wealth of the Nation. Even such a thought does violence to the concept of a true democracy. And whenever the door of opportunity does not stand ajar to the man of talent, courage, and ingenuity, an alien form of government with its destruction of the liberties of a free people will supersede the great American democracy. It is certain, however, that a more equitable distribution of the national income can be brought about by cutting down the power of the rich to prevent the use of our resources. Remember, concentration of wealth cannot but create artificial scarcity, which will eventually bring on economic chaos and revolution.

The third line of progress of the New Deal is in the direction of personal security. One of the principal causes of the overconcentration of wealth is the pathetic and hopeless struggle of the great middle class of our people to save money for a rainy day. For years and years these savings went into financial institutions where they became the football of high finance. Savings in small sums are weak and helpless, but gathered into large funds they offer temptations to graft and even more to honest but mistaken manipulations that destroy business property. The savings of the poorer classes of our good people not only go to increase power of the rulers of high finance, but they also help, under our financial system, to overload the business world with debts, for every investment is a debt. The New Deal, therefore, by appropriate legislation is developing means for guaranteeing basic economic security to all the people.

The fourth necessary line of progress, in my opinion, must be directed toward industrial decentralization. The insufferable and inexcusable instability of business, caused by periodical booms and depressions, is brought about by centralization of ownership, of control, and of geographical location. All three are, of course, connected but different. The rural areas are drained of small industries which are essential to their economic health. The United States will continue to be in a badly unbalanced condition with money incomes concentrated into a few metropolitan areas and with wide sections of our country sinking deeper each year into debt and decay. Of course, Federal income taxation and spending in debtor areas helps somewhat to redress the balance, but never enough. A gradual decentralization of industry is therefore the only permanent remedy. We must find means to cause small locally owned industries to prosper in the rural areas so that all the occupied portions of our country may be financially healthy and able to support a civilized standard of living.

These four lines of progress are surely parts of the general program of which the New Deal is a manifestation. Implicit in the New Deal are the desire and the purpose to improve living conditions in America. Frankly recognizing the inequalities, the injustices, yea, the cruelties of the social order that it inherited from its predecessors after a decade of debauch, this administration immediately set about to redress the most glaring abuses and to lead back the people, even if only a little way, toward the path from which innocently and unheedingly we strayed in pursuit of a gilt-edged rainbow that always was just around the corner.

Let us now calmly and with our own fair thoughts appraise the present situation today in the light of the conditions that obtained when our great leader in that dark hour of 1933 brought hope and courage to a prostrate and faltering people. I remember, as you do, that on election day in 1932 there was a strange unrest in America. There was murmuring in the market place. Mortgages were being foreclosed and people were losing their homes and farms. Those who had jobs were being dismissed because there was no business, and the factories were idle. There were long bread lines; thousands were hungry and cold. My friends, the citizens of the United States, to put it mildly, were afraid. Those people who were hungry and jobless and worried were willing to try anything that would make for a change, so they sent a new man to the White House. He made no claims to superintelligence or magic ability. He gave no guarantees, but he said he would try. He said he would experiment, since existing conditions could be solved only by experimentation. Some of the experiments might fail. It was natural to expect them to do so, but he would do something—the best he could—so that business might resume its onward march and the hungry be fed. And he started. Some of the things he did seemed truly wild and fantastic; some were strange, but they were progressive, forward looking; and people had forgotten how to look forward.

Millions of our citizens had become afraid and had crept into corners, clutching the little that remained of their money and property. To understand a good many of the things that happened, particularly in the early months of the administration, it is necessary to keep in mind that in the 4 months between the election and nomination the depression turned into a panic, and at the moment Mr. Roosevelt took office the country was paralyzed. Action was imperative—not careful, deliberate planning, but quick, decisive action. Conditions called for emergency measures which I shall discuss briefly later on. Long-range dreams had to give way to instant practical action. The do-nothing cowardly policies of the Hoover administration had almost sunk the Nation. Instead of nature's taking its course, it was daily taking its toll in life and property. From the moment the first word of his inaugural address fell upon the ears of a dismayed and despairing citizenry, confidence and courage began to come back to the American people. Slowly the wheels began to turn. People lost their fear. Conditions were so vastly different at the time that he took office from what they were during his pre-election campaign that his entire program had to be changed if the Nation was to be saved. He became convinced that the deflationary spiral must give way to forced spending. Accordingly, overnight he was forced to abandon his economy policy and began to pump out billions in Government expenditures, in loans and in gifts to individuals, to communities, and to whole States.

Price levels, Mr. Roosevelt concluded, were too low. The country was carrying a heavy load of debt incurred at higher price levels. One of two things had to happen. Either prices must be forced up so that debts might be borne or the debts must be repudiated by inflation or moratorium. The simplest and soundest course seemed to lie in raising the price level. In this desperate struggle Mr. Roosevelt resorted to many legislative and economic weapons. Most of what happened is well known. The results can be seen upon the faces of millions of our citizens, not to mention the incredible material blessings that have followed. No honest or unprejudiced mind could agree that President Roosevelt's 3 years have been crowned with the rosy success described in the political speeches written by some administration spokesmen. Nor have they been the menacing failure pictured by speakers on the white list of the American Liberty League which operates a branch office in your good city. Results, however, of these 3 years of courageous, effective, human, and wise leadership of the Roosevelt administration tell its story in the lives and conditions of the average man, woman, and child in America. All agree that the Nation has achieved a marked measure of recovery which will undoubtedly increase under his leadership in the next few years. Business is more than 90 percent of normal. In some lines it exceeds the 1929 peak. Some industries making consumption goods are doing more business now than they did even in 1929. Values of securities, listed and unlisted, have increased in an amount 5 times greater than the total amount spent for relief purposes.

Real estate again has a basis of value, and its future was never brighter. Our banks are in an impregnably sound condition, with 55,000,000 accounts insured against loss up to $5,000. The American dollar is unimpeachable and the standard of sound value in every world market. Corporation earnings have shown a tremendous increase, and agriculture is gradually finding its place under the sun. Through the policies of this administration the first effective effort has been made to place agriculture upon an equality with industry. Farm income has increased from a low of around four and one-half billion dollars at the beginning of 1933 to a high of around eight and one-half billion dollars. Bank deposits are larger today than they were at the peak of the so-called paper prosperity period of 1929. Though the national debt has increased from twenty to thirty-four billions of dollars, every penny of it has been spent among ourselves and for our benefit. A large portion of this amount represents loans made by the Government for the protection of business. Without the present budgetary deficit our banks would not be in their strong position today. Thousands of large and small businesses would have gone out of business and millions of our citizens would have been forced to almshouses. By other appropriate legislation Government loans have been provided to strengthen the capital structure of our banking institutions; thousands of farm and city homes have been saved from foreclosure; entire municipal units have been able to preserve their credit.

Under the New Deal program the Federal Government has for the first time recognized its obligation to the aged and infirm, and through the Social Security Act provision is made to prevent this class of our worthy citizens from eating the bitter bread of charity, and thereby lifting the dread of an uncertain future from those who live in economic insecurity. Under this same measure a program of unemployment insurance has been started to take care of our working classes of people in times of low business activity. Aside from its great humanitarian purpose, if properly administered, it will serve as a powerful cushion against the instability of business. The greatest of all paradoxes in this country is the fact that there is a plenty for all, but all do not have a plenty.

This administration is also urging the adoption of the pending child-labor amendment to the Constitution that would forever put an end to the cruel exploitation of underprivileged children. It has also recognized the obligation it owes to the youth of the land to insure for them an opportunity to secure adequate educational advantages. It has sent hundreds of thousands of young men from the slums of our cities and the waste places of our land to C. C. C. camps, where they can do useful conservation and reforestation work while upbuilding their own bodies and invigorating their own souls. These things are but a translation of the saying of the greatest apostle in all the ages when he uttered, "We then that be strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak."

Under the New Deal and through the Public Works Administration, much of a definite and permanent benefit has been done our country by not only giving work to the involuntary idle but to make this Nation a better place in which to live. Some great writer has recently stated that "No nation can impoverish itself by employing its unused man power, material, and wealth in improving its equipment and resources." These projects should, of course, be such as have a lasting social and economic value. Under this program we have built many thousands of schools in which to educate the youth of the land, many thousands of sewers and waterworks to protect the health of our citizens, still other thousands of hospitals, sanatoriums, public buildings, bridges, and power plants, as well as other first-class improvements to add to the moral and physical strength and comfort of American citizens. And while we have thus been striving for the economic and social welfare of the people, we have also provided relief to the unemployed, so that no one has lacked essential food or clothing or shelter. No honest Government of any great country should or could do less under such circumstances.

The great social objective of this administration has been to try to increase the security and the happiness of a larger number of people in all occupations of life and in all parts of the country; to give them greater distribution not only of wealth in the narrow terms but of wealth in the wider terms; to give them assurance that they are not going to starve in their old age; to give honest business a chance to go ahead and make fair and reasonable profits and to give everyone a chance to earn a living. Is there anything in these objectives that can be called a menace to our traditional private competitive system? Mr. Roosevelt, though recognizing and endeavoring to remove as quickly as the people understand and will permit the evils in the present system, has never said or done anything to indicate that he thought the way to deal with adenoids was to chop off the patient's head.

In building for the future through reform measures we have not lost sight of the fact that in the past money prosperity and social bankruptcy have too often gone hand in hand. We venture to hope for a future in which we will have both material and social prosperity. Opposing the social regeneration and civilization of the Nation stand the exploiting classes composed of those men who already are too rich and powerful for the good of the people, but who, nevertheless, are greedy for more riches and more power. A number of them call themselves Liberty Leaguers and, for the first time perhaps in their lives, have discovered that we have a Constitution, because the interpretation of certain sections of this great document has unquestionably been the retreat and hideout for predatory wealth.

I believe in the preservation of the Constitution and amending it only by orderly procedure, but I do not believe it should be used to tie us to the dead hand of the past and thereby block the onward march of progress. Any instrument made by man can and should be changed by man for mankind's welfare. I regret that there are a few men in this community who because of their riches have become drunk with power made possible under the old order of things. In some instances no doubt their salaries are several times the size of their heads, and many times the circumference of their hearts. They know not of the trials and tribulations of those who work with their hands, having by inheritance lived in luxury. They evidently still believe that economic might makes right. They would rule you or ruin you. To them a suggestion as to how they shall exercise their suffrage would be an insult, but for one of them to attempt to influence you against your convictions is taken as a matter of ordinary right. They believe that the cream of life and its comforts belong to them, and that the great masses of the people should be content with skimmed milk. To them not less than a whole loaf, but to you the crumbs from their tables. In order to retain their position of economic lordship in this community and this State they would threaten you the loss of your position if you hesitate to do their bidding, regardless of the valuable and proficient services which you may render them in your given line of endeavor. This is, of course, usually done through their stool pigeons. They believe in corporate aristocracy—not true democracy.

Though posing as the friend of the average man and sympathetic toward the New Deal program when in certain places in Washington, down here in their own circle you will find them fighting every advance which the New Deal is making for social justice. They have, no doubt, always opposed every measure looking to social advance. Some of them have bitterly opposed practically every New Deal measure with the exception of those particularly aimed in their direction and for their benefit. Some of them have publicly villified and maligned in the ugliest terms the great President of this Nation and the leader of the common people. They have even questioned his integrity by such remarks as "you can't put your finger on him", etc. Thank God some of them cannot. Some of them opposed particularly the payment in cash of the adjusted-service certificates, when the amount of their profits, as a result of the war carried on by the holders of these certificates, brought into their coffers millions of dollars. Some of them have lived on Government contracts since Mr. Roosevelt came into power, with the result that their profits have mounted and their properties have almost doubled in value. These are they who have for years believed in low wages, long hours for those who carry the heaviest burdens of life, while they live in palatial homes, yachts, and summer retreats. Their profits, as you know, have not come primarily through a contribution to the welfare of society, but partly through child labor and the economic exploitation of their employees. They are for laissez faire, not for the status quo ante.

It is hard to believe that they have ever cared how the great mass of the American people live. Little is their concern whether 60 percent of our citizens are living at or below the margin of existence. Let the ratio go to 70 or 80 percent, provided there is no interference with their baneful economic habits. To be sure, in their altruistic moments they say people must be fed and clothed and sheltered, but expend on them no more than is barely enough to keep them alive in order that they may continue by their toil to add to the wealth and power of those who have built themselves up on the exploitation of their fellow men and by means of special privileges which have been granted to them by a complacent Government.

Some of this group are moving heaven and earth to defeat me in this primary. I know their names; I know of their efforts; and I fully understand their motives. Is not their opposition conclusive of the correctness of my position on public issues? It has been and it will be impossible for me to represent the spirit and energy of the great mass of my people in this district and at the same time please this small group.

In a democracy every interest is entitled to fair representation, and my record shows that I know this. One would think that they would be chastened in spirit and fairer in action because of our narrow escape from a social and economic cataclysm that seemed about to engulf us all in a common disaster, and that they would now be ready and willing to set to work to build on this continent such a Nation as the humane and socially minded of our founding fathers saw in their dreams—a Nation consisting not of numerically small class holding most of the wealth of the country with 60 percent or more lacking adequate food, clothing, and shelter, but a Nation which, except for that handful of misfits and derelicts that are constantly being sloughed off of every social group, shall be composed of citizens who are economically free because they possess the means of supplying themselves with those things that make life worth while and who are therefore truly politically free.

I have been blessed by the fact that I have suffered and felt the pinch of poverty. Though well born, I was forced, because of the financial circumstances of my family, to make my own way since I was a boy in the teens. I know what it is to work both with my hands and my brain, and for that reason I am happy that I can always feel a common touch. I also am the happy father of seven fine average children—four boys and three girls.

When I think of my country and my people, I cannot but think of my children. Mrs. Hancock and I are trying to rear them in such a way that they will grow up to love their country because of its justice, equality of opportunity, and freedom of life. We have also tried to instill into them the fact that the torch of progress has been kept aflame, not alone by the achievements of science, industry, and culture but as much by the sympathy, tolerance, and cooperation of those who are eager to give new ideas a chance to prove their value and whose desire for the betterment of humanity embraces all. Is the America that we shall pass on to our children to be an economic feudalism with the powerful lords of finance in control of our resources; with a small but very rich group at one end of the scale and an ever larger and poorer class of dependent vassals at the other? Is it to be an America of contented and happy citizens supporting themselves in comfort by their own efforts? Are the property and means of production of America to become more and more concentrated in the hands of a privileged class, or is there to be a wider diffusion of them among the mass of the people, as those who founded this country intended there should be? Is it to be the function of our Government further to foster, protect, and encourage a concentration of wealth that has already reached a point where it threatens the very life of the Nation, as it has already put its soul in jeopardy? Or is the ideal to be that of serving the best interests of the greatest number of our citizens? Serving the best interests of the greatest number of our citizens, is my friends, the New Deal in action; and I am happy that I have been and that I still am a part of it, and unless all dependable signs fail, I shall continue to be a

part of it, regardless of the combination of power and wealth which is arrayed against me in my district.

There are several reasons why this group is fighting me, and here is one that I am especially anxious for you to know: Born and reared in a tobacco-growing county, quite naturally I have become familiar with and sensitive to the problems of the tobacco grower. I have seen him labor under the most trying circumstances to make a crop, employing in the effort every member of his family, even to the little girl tots. Too often I have seen his economic condition worse at the end of the year than it was when he commenced, because of the unfair distribution of the income from this great industry. As a North Carolinian, I am naturally deeply interested, as my record will show, in preserving and promoting the tobacco industry. If this were not true, I have got no business living in North Carolina, much less serving the Fifth District, where a large percent of the people are dependent upon some phase of the tobacco industry for a living. I know, however, that there is sufficient income to go around more equitably.

But here's what I want you to know: It was my privilege and duty in the last session of Congress to actively sponsor what is commonly known as the Flannagan bill. In short, this measure aimed to correct some of the abuses and difficulties in the present marketing system. It provided that in given areas where two-thirds of the farmers had by affirmative vote approved the plan, the Federal Government would, by competent, impartial, expert graders, examine and inspect all tobacco before it was sold by the warehousemen. All the cost in connection with this service is borne by the Government. In addition to the grading of tobacco, the bill provided that there shall be a daily market news service telling the farmers the average current price which each standard grade brings on certain markets daily.

Since the companies require that their buyers shall be experts, it occurred to many of us that it would be less than fair if the Government didn't furnish expert graders for the growers. Without this additional service, all who understand the present system must admit that the average farmer has little or no bargaining power in the sale of his tobacco. Regardless of the friendship which exists between the buyers and the farmers, have you ever heard of a buyer in a business transaction helping a seller? It is the contention of those who understand this problem that every pile of tobacco of approximately the same grade should sell for approximately the same price on the same warehouse floor the same day to the same buyer. Does it do it? No; and it never has. There is no guaranty that with this service we would have a perfect system; but no one can deny that, if the measure is properly administered in cooperation with the warehousemen, it should result in a great improvement to the system and a protection to the growers.

No person or interest can be harmed if those who carry on this operation want the grower to receive the true worth of his tobacco. If the warehouseman is not interested in seeing this done, then the grower is without representation or protection under the present system, and the sooner he learns this the better off he will be. If properly administered, this measure should also tend to protect the smaller markets without injury to the larger ones. Warehousemen usually fare pretty well, and the more the grower gets the larger are their commissions. Surely there should be some real responsibility on the part of the warehousemen for the protection of the grower. It was and is the judgment of the sponsors of this bill than no person can be injured or deprived of any of his rights. It is true that it will tend to eliminate the opportunities for unearned profits on the part of the pin-hookers, who quite frequently, because of the hurried way in which tobacco is sold, six or seven hundred piles an hour, pick up piles at a bargain, regrade them, and then sell them, sometimes as farmer tobacco, at a profit greater than the total amount received originally by the grower. It is also the belief and judgment of the sponsors of this measure that it will insure perpetuation of the present loose-leaf auction system, which should and can be made highly competitive. You know it seems rather strange and unbelievable that though the farmer stakes his all under the present system, and is the real party in interest, he is not eligible for representation on the tobacco boards of trade which regulate and control the method of disposing of his labor.

How would you like for, say, a month of your labor and industry to be auctioned off in 5 or 6 seconds without expert advice as to its worth? If the present system as now operated is for the best interests of the grower and not the warehouseman and buyer, pray tell me why this group is so bitterly opposed to the Flannagan bill. I invite any opponent of this bill to meet me anywhere in the district to debate its merits or demerits before a group of tobacco growers whom they are supposed to represent and protect and from whom they receive their living. If they are for the grower first, instead of fighting me, they should and would be busy improving the system for his protection. If this is not a meritorious measure and shot through with justice, why did every member of the North Carolina delegation, with one exception, including both Senators, support it? Why did the A. A. A. heartily endorse it? Why did the President strongly favor its passage and give it his blessing? I am happy to state that not all the warehousemen are opposed to it. Some conscientiously question its merits, others oppose it because they belong to the buyers and refuse to put the growers' interest first. I want you to classify them for your own welfare and protection.

Now, let's analyze the attitude of some of the critics who were saved by the New Deal. You will certainly want to laugh. Most of these critics sing the same old song. They would carry us back to the 1929 Garden of Eden. A few days ago I met one of these gentlemen on the street of this good city, living in a dreamland of long ago when personal liberty could be used to the extent of capitalizing upon the very souls of the masses who work for a living with their hands and who formed the foundation of America, past, present, and future. He told me that, though business was much better under the New Deal, American business and the American public are afraid to go ahead because they do not know what the present administration will do.

I said, "Exactly what are they afraid of?" His answer was a general confusion of perfect ignorance as to the purposes of the New Deal. My friends, do you believe the American people are afraid of having their bank deposits guaranteed up to $5,000? Are they afraid of having their homes saved when private financial institutions failed to save them? Are they afraid of having the uncertainty of poverty in old age swept aside with social-security legislation? Are they afraid of being protected in their dealings in securities against the unscrupulous practices of some of the money changers? Are they afraid of having their national wealth increased with a program of self-liquidating public works? Are they afraid of a power development program to bring cheap electricity into homes that are warped with drudgery? Are they afraid of legislation to prevent the overcapitalization of industry that heretofore has resulted in their being fleeced out of millions of dollars for worthless watered stocks and bonds? Are the American farmers afraid of 75-cent corn, $1.25 wheat, 10-cent hogs, 14-cent cattle, 11-cent cotton, and 20-cent tobacco, as compared to 9-cent corn, 20-cent wheat, 2-cent hogs, 4-cent cattle, 6½-cent cotton, and 9-cent tobacco in 1932? Are they afraid of having their farms refinanced at a rate of 3½-percent interest and a saving of from 2 to 3½ percent? Are they afraid of Federal loans on their agricultural products affording them an opportunity to await the arrival of satisfactory market conditions? Are they afraid of legislation directed toward eliminating the unfair discrimination in prices as between large chain-store combines and the independent merchants, whose preservation is essential if we are to have economic freedom and the consumer protected against monopolistic prices?

Are you afraid of legislation which will make it possible for the man who works with his hands to bargain on some effective basis approaching equality with his employer? Are they afraid of legislation which will take the profits out of war and make material powers and property subject to the Nation's call in the same way that the young men are drafted into service? Is anyone afraid to have the unemployed of this Nation fed through the productive agency of the Public Works or Works Progress Administrations until such time as American industry becomes sufficiently rehabilitated to absorb them? Do you honestly believe that the American public or American business are afraid of the generally improved economic conditions largely brought about by the New Deal, as evidenced on the market pages of every newspaper in the United States, be it hostile or friendly to the program? I know you are not, and I know you know the American public and the average American businessman is not afraid of this program. They are behind it, and when free to speak, commend it in glowing terms.

I'll tell you what the American public is afraid of and what the small-business man is fearful about: Our history has taught us to believe in the virtue of free business initiative; but is it not a fact that we had actually lost most of our freedom in 1932? The international bankers, the trusts, the chain stores, and the holding company tactics hemmed us in from above. Below were the lesser rackets of the underworld lying in wait to snap at any businessman who appeared to be friendless or unprotected.

As a result of this situation were we not fast becoming a nation of "yes" men, cringing to bankers, industrial tycoons, and gangsters? When the power and grip of these antisocial forces are lifted from the neck of the small American businessman and farmer, his fears will vanish like the mist before a rising sun. The New Deal has recognized this un-American and deplorable situation and has set about to tear it up, root, trunk, and branch, and we are making progress every day.

I must conclude. I would like to extend my remarks, but the time will not permit. These are, in my opinion, the fundamental social and political issues upon which the future of America depends and the solution of which cannot longer be postponed. Where does my opponent stand on these issues? Will he make his views public? Ask him. The situation can only properly be called a crisis. In this crisis in our national life you and I have grave responsibilities that we cannot evade without forfeiting our birthright. Under the continued leadership of President Roosevelt, if the issues can be made clear, the chance that the American people may throw off the yoke of high and ruthless financial control and reassert their liberties is worth the wager of our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. When the carping and sulking critics, who have been repudiated at the bar of public opinion in America for their economic sins of omission and commission, have sunk into oblivion, the name and record of Franklin D. Roosevelt will shine forth in glistening beauty and inspiration from the hearts of the millions whose lives have been permanently blessed by his New Deal program.

I thank you, and good night!

HON. THEODORE L. MORITZ

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few remarks in behalf of my friend and colleague, Congressman THEODORE L. MORITZ, who represents the Thirty-second District of Pennsylvania.

I do not hesitate to say that since Mr. MORITZ has been a Member of Congress he has sponsored and supported progressive and humanitarian legislation, such as adequate pensions for the aged, widows with dependent children, and all those who are physically incapacitated; increased compensation for disabled veterans, payment of the adjusted-service certificates, and also legislation to benefit the coal miners, farmers, and all others who labor for a livelihood.

I have heard Members of Congress refer to Congressman MORITZ as a liberal. A person who is a liberal is broad-minded, progressive, and humane. A person possessing these attributes makes an excellent servant of the people.

Read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and you will learn from Mr. MORITZ's speeches and the bills he sponsored and supported that he is a real representative of the people. I have not any doubt that if THEODORE MORITZ is reelected to the United States House of Representatives next November he will again serve the people as he did in 1935 and 1936.

ENGLAND FINISHES ITS THREE MILLIONTH HOME; AMERICA CAN EMBARK ON A SIMILAR PROGRAM THROUGH PASSAGE OF THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN BILL

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following:

ENGAND FINISHES ITS THREE MILLIONTH HOME

Mr. Speaker, the Nation-wide, insistent demand for passage of the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill continues. In fact, as the closing days of the present session approach the hope is being expressed on all sides that this legislation, so vital for furthering the economic and social well-being of the Nation, will not fail of enactment in the House before Congress adjourns. It has already passed the Senate by a large majority.

In its latest editorial the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, which has given its editorial support to the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill since its introduction in the Senate and House, again musters powerful and sound arguments for the bill's passage.

THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN BILL IS ONE OF THE ACES OF THE NEW DEAL, SAYS THE SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER CHAIN

The Wagner-Ellenbogen bill is one of the aces of the new deal, the editorial states, and insists that Congress should play it now.

Pointing out that announcement has just been made of the erection in England of the three millionth home built since the war, the editorial makes the important observation that government assistance in England to only about 15 percent of her new housing started England's home-building boom—a boom which has been the main factor in her recovery.

Expressing the hope that the House Banking and Currency Committee will report the measure and that the House will vote its passage before adjournment, the editorial also asserts that both politically and economically the Democrats would be wise "to add this administration measure to the galaxy of reforms to which they can point with pride at Philadelphia."

PASSAGE OF THE WAGNER-ELLENBOGEN BILL POLITICALLY WISE AND ECONOMICALLY SOUND

The Republicans' platform failed to mention rehousing, one of the most obvious next steps in our own recovery, the Scripps-Howard papers point out. It would therefore be the part of political wisdom to enact the bill—which is urged by millions of organized backers.

Economically, too, the Democrats would be quite as wise, the editorial observes, quoting John T. Flynn, who says that—

Here lies the greatest single instrument of recovery that the mind of man can invent in our system.

The urgent need for housing is again pointed out:

Experts estimate a need for 7,000,000 additional dwelling units during the next decade, not counting the replacement of unfit, dilapidated buildings now occupied; rehousing the lower-bracket income families in decent homes would stimulate the heavy industries, reemploy labor, set off the belated private home-building boom. And the expense—in grants and loans to local housing authorities in the next 3 years—probably would be returned in tax savings from lower crime, delinquency, fire, and disease costs.

This is an excellent exposition of the need for the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill, and a sound argument for its passage. I hope that the House will recognize the great merit and the great need for the Wagner-Ellenbogen bill, and enact it at this session.

ROBINSON-PATMAN BILL TO PROTECT INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion with respect to what will be the effect of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman anti-price-discrimination bill.

Large and powerful organizations that have been able to receive preferential prices in purchasing commodities to be sold in competition with independent merchants have conducted widespread propaganda against the bill. In many instances the information has been misleading, and in some cases actually untrue, with respect to the purpose and effect of the bill.

All of this has been done because of a desire upon the part of such organizations to continue to utilize their wealth, power, and corporate connections to obtain preferential prices or other favorable considerations in the purchase of their merchandise and thereby be enabled to undersell the small merchant who is their competitor. The effect of all this in many cases has been to eliminate the small or independent businessman entirely and thereafter leave the consumer under complete control of the big business with competition destroyed.

The Robinson-Patman bill is based upon the fundamental principle that it is not in the public interest to permit any system of unfair price discrimination, or other business practice or custom, to exist whereby an advantage is given to one person over another. To permit such is to create a tendency, as is now the case, to have all merchandising lines of business serving the consuming public gravitate into the hands of the favored few who, by reason of great corporate wealth and influence, are able to demand, coerce, and by threats intimidate manufacturers into granting to them preferences of price or other favorable considerations not extended to the general buying public.

It can be readily seen that if unfair business practices, such as the Robinson-Patman bill seeks to correct, were permitted to continue, the time would not be far distant when every line of business that supplies the necessities of life to our people would be in the hands of a small number of large corporations. The small merchant engaged in the sale of groceries, meats, clothing, dry goods, shoes, drugs, tobacco, hardware, furniture, household appliances, fuel, building materials, agricultural implements and supplies, and other articles of general merchandise that enter into our daily life, would soon be eliminated and all possibility of his earning a livelihood as an independent businessman destroyed. The small store in city, town, and village, and the general store at the crossroads in the country section, would become only a memory as a thing of the past.

There is no denial of the fact that these large and influential corporations in different lines of mercantile business are enabled, because of their size, to demand and receive preferential prices and other worth-while advantages in making purchases of commodities from the manufacturer; and the small-business man, because of his inability to bring the same measure of pressure, is denied the more favorable treatment accorded to the large corporation with its tremendous wealth of resources. The result cannot be other than detrimental to the small-business man and equally unsatisfactory to the manufacturer upon whom demand is made accompanied with threats and coercive methods.

A careful study of the report made by the Federal Trade Commission, based upon its investigation of the practices of some of the so-called chain stores, as well as upon the facts set forth in the report of the special congressional committee that made a Nation-wide inquiry into the same subject, leaves no doubt as to the advisability and the necessity of Federal legislation of the kind and character contained in the Robinson-Patman anti-price-discrimination bill.

The continued expansion of the chain-store type of business into every line of activity has created a condition that becomes increasingly disturbing and calls for firm and decisive action before all possibility of individual initiative in small business of a mercantile character is destroyed. Failure to do so would result not only in destruction of small business enterprises, but would also make possible a monopoly that would preclude any cut in prices and place our people at its complete mercy.

Although the demand for this legislation originated with the small-business man, who has felt the ever-increasing pressure and encroachment of big business and the consequent difficulty of continuing in business under prevailing conditions, yet the manufacturer who has been subjected to the threats and demands of the chain-store organizations has likewise felt the necessity of legislation of this character.

The Federal Trade Commission had this to say on that subject in its report:

> There has been considerable criticism of some of the methods used by chain systems in their bargaining with manufacturers for special price concessions. The criticism comes largely from the manufacturers themselves, many of whom protest the methods used while yielding to them. Some state their yielding was accomplished only as the result of threats and coercion.

And again the Federal Trade Commission makes this statement:

> Thirty-three of the manufacturers interviewed stated positively that threats and coercion had been used by chain-store companies to obtain preferential treatment.

To give some idea of what has happened in this respect, the report of the investigation showed that one large chain-store organization received in rebates from manufacturers and wholesale merchants over $8,000,000 in one year. It was disclosed that they refused to buy unless they received a price preference or the equivalent in merchandise. Thus, it can be readily seen that the manufacturers and wholesalers themselves are as much in need of protection and as anxious for it as the independent merchants.

It is also of interest to note that the huge savings resulting from rebates, to which I have just referred, were not entirely passed on as a saving to the consumer nor reflected in a higher rate of wage for the employee. The report of the investigation showed that this corporation paid a comparatively few of its officers and directors a total of $1,996,000 a year. It paid several of them over $100,000 a year, one of them $180,000, and another $140,000. All of this was made possible out of secret rebates received by that one corporation to the amount of $8,000,000. It is equally interesting to know that the same report also showed as a result of a survey that was made that the weekly wage rate paid to chain-store employees was 30 percent less than that paid by independent operators to their employees for similar work.

In conclusion, and answering a fear expressed by some, it is my opinion that the restoration of equality of opportunity in business as provided for in the Robinson-Patman bill will not increase prices to the consumers. In this connection it is well to bear in mind, as stated in the report submitted by the Judiciary Committee of the House:

> Unfair trade practices and monopolistic methods which in the end destroy competition, restrain trade, and create monopoly have never in all history resulted in benefit to the public interest. On the contrary, for the most part, they have been symbolic of lower wages, longer hours, lower prices paid producers, coercion of independent manufacturers, domination of that field of industry, and in the end high prices to consumers and large profits to the owners.

The purpose of the Robinson-Patman bill is to strengthen existing antitrust laws, prevent unfair price, and other discriminations, preserve fair competition in the interest of the consumer and small-business man, and at all times maintain equality of opportunity so that even the most humble may continue in their chosen field of business. It seeks to protect the weak against the strong. With this principle of American justice and fair play I am in entire accord and give my present and continuing support.

THE UTILITIES MUST BE CURBED

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, the utility crowd is desperate. Investigations conducted by Congress and other agencies have resulted in startling revelations. The people have at last been shown how they have been mulcted by the utilities and how they have lost billions of dollars to the utility racketeers. As a result of these scandals, the utility lobbyists have been driven out of Washington.

The utility barons are desperate in their attempts to return to the seat of our Government. In their desperation they have concocted the most diabolical conspiracy that ever besmirched the history of this Nation. Since their lobbyists have been revealed as corrupters of government and tools of reaction, they have banded together to place their own lawyers and representatives in the very seats of Congress.

SLUSH FUND GATHERED

The utilities are gathering a gigantic campaign fund to defeat every incumbent Congressman who has opposed their greed and reaction. Every Congressman who voted to abolish the existing evils in the utility industry is marked for defeat by the lavish use of the huge slush fund gathered from the utility profiteers.

The utilities can no longer depend on lobbyists and legislative agents. They have selected utility lawyers and utility agents to run for Congress in the hope that their own lawyers and agents will protect their unfair privileges. These utility lawyers if elected to Congress would save the utilities the expense of paying lobbyists and giving bribes. They would save the expense of paying for fake telegrams and for other false and malicious propaganda.

Never in all history have the utilities been so arrogant, so bold, and so brazen in their attempt to debauch the electorate and to poison the fountain of popular government. It was bad enough to have the utility lawyers, lobbyists, and propagandists in the antechambers of legislative halls and in the hotel lobbies of the Capital. To place these same utility representatives in the seats of Congress would spell the doom of representative government and democracy.

UTILITIES MUST NOT BE PERMITTED TO OBTAIN CONTROL OF CONGRESS

The people must be aroused before it is too late. The utilities must not be permitted to succeed in their brazen attempt to dominate national legislation by spending millions of ill-gotten dollars to elect utility lawyers and agents to the National Congress and the State legislatures.

It is now an established fact that the utilities control and dominate every faction of the Republican Party in Pennsylvania. The battle between the so-called liberals and the old guard in the Republican Party is merely a sham battle—a smoke screen to hide the real attempt of the utilities to control the next congressional delegation from Pennsylvania. So-called reformers, so-called liberals, and so-called independents are the instruments of the utility interests of this State to corrupt the Government. Utility bosses bossed the Republican political bosses. Utility barons dictated the Republican nominees. So-called harmony slates were the creation of utility representatives. Every nominee was hand-picked as safe for the utilities.

When you know who sat in on the conferences in Philadelphia that selected the supposedly independent Republican slate, you know that the utilities dominated the selections. You know that no matter what banner they fly—independent, reformer, or old-gang politician—they are the servants of the utilities. I challenge the State leaders of the Republican Party to deny this.

Utility companies render a service that is not a luxury but a necessity. They are monopolies. The Government prohibits any competition with them. The people are at their

mercy unless governmental agencies, honest and fearless, step in and act for the benefit of the people. A courageous Congress can save the investors and the rate payers from exploitation. That is why the utilities are so anxious to elect their own friends to seats in our National House of Representatives.

MARCH FLOODS RECALLED

The floods of last March illustrated the great importance of the utility services in our daily lives. The floods and the shut-down of the power plants revealed the vital need for strict regulation of the utilities by the Government.

We remember the complete break-down of normal living in western Pennsylvania. The streets were dark. The police and fire-alarm systems were disrupted. Newspapers ceased publication. The radio stations ceased broadcasting. The bakery plants were closed. No automobile gasoline was available. Every office building and mercantile establishment was closed. Not a single wheel of industry, commerce, trade, or communication was able to turn. The entire community was paralyzed; the city was desolate; the community had ceased to live. This event proved the absolute dependence of the people on the utility service. It proved the power that lies in the hands of those who control the utilities.

UTILITIES COULD STARVE PEOPLE

It would be possible for a city to be completely isolated from the rest of the world, to be completely paralyzed and denied every comfort and necessity of life. The entire community could be starved within a few weeks if the owners of the power plants chose deliberately and wantonly to shut down their plants and refuse to supply electric current.

The electric light and power industry supplies 25,000,000 residential, commercial, and industrial customers. It supplies to manufacturers 55 percent of the energy consumed in their productive processes and to mining and quarrying 63 percent of their power requirements. No dictator, past or present, in all the world's history held such mighty power in his grasp as do the dictators of the utility field. Let the utility dictators determine upon it and they could pass a death sentence upon the people. Only a government which is in the hands of the representatives of the people could prevent such a catastrophe. That is why the utility dictators are endeavoring to control our Government, so that the Government would protect them in their onslaughts on the people.

SOME METHODS OF EXPLOITATION

The utility barons have learned that control of government enables them to make huge profits by—

First. Tax exemption.

Second. Milking investors by the sale of worthless stocks and bonds.

Third. Syphoning the profits into the pockets of insiders and failing to pay dividends to honest investors.

Fourth. Plundering the consumers by excessive rates.

UNFAIR TAX EXEMPTION

While home owners and farmers are taxed for the cost of government, the utilities, through their control of State and local governments, have escaped payment of taxes. The utility barons can well afford to contribute to secret funds to purchase or retain control of governmental agencies. For if the dividends on this investment were no more than the real-estate tax exemptions on utility properties, they would represent a handsome return to these speculators in politics, utility services, and Government.

In Pittsburgh alone the utilities fail to pay the real-estate tax on more than $132,000,000 worth of property.

In Allegheny County the sum is much larger. In Pennsylvania as a whole hundreds of millions of dollars of utility property are tax exempt.

UTILITIES ENJOY MUNICIPAL SERVICES BUT HOME OWNERS PAY FOR IT

The utilities enjoy police and fire protection, the sewerage and health facilities, and the street and highway systems. They use all these municipal services and facilities but do not pay anything for it. All these services and facilities are paid for entirely by the home owners. Exemptions from real-estate taxes for the utilities means increased real-estate taxes upon the homes.

UTILITY TAX EXEMPTIONS ARE ILLUSTRATIVE OF REPUBLICAN PARTY CONTROL IN PENNSYLVANIA

The price we pay for electric light and power, gas, water, trolley, bus, taxicab, or train transportation, or for telephone service is regulated by the public service commission. But it is not within the memory of man that the Public Service Commission of Pennsylvania had ever ordered a substantial reduction in the rates of any major public utility. This was true under the control of the commission by the Old Guard Grundy Republicans, the Mellon-Vare machine, the Penrose machine, or the "lily white" reform administration of Pinchot.

Scores of millions of dollars have been taken out of the pocketbooks of Pennsylvania citizens and sent to Wall Street speculators to pay exorbitant dividends on utility stocks.

THE NOTORIOUS M'CLURE INVESTIGATES

At an investigation conducted by a committee of the State senate of which the convicted Senator John J. McClure was chairman it was testified:

That the Penn Central, a major State utility, earned approximately 30 percent during 1930 despite the fact that a 7-percent return is the legal limit.

That the Duquesne Light Co. had a write-up of fourteen and one-half million dollars in 1928, and that it made excessive illegal profits of $28,000,000 from 1925 to 1931. That the Duquesne Light Co. valued its properties at $152,000,000 for rate-making purposes and at $40,000,000 less for tax-assessment purposes.

That the Insull empire took two and one-half million dollars in loans from the Penn Central Light & Power Co. for use of other subsidiary companies. These loans were never repaid—to the detriment of the investors in and the consumers of this company.

That a former member of the Public Service Commission of Pennsylvania deposited $888,738 in banks during a period when his salary was only $110,000.

That another member of the commission received a fee of $150,000 from Mitten Management of Philadelphia and had his hospital expenses of more than $3,000 paid by a former head of the Philadelphia Co. of Pittsburgh.

These are just a few of the many startling revelations that came to light. What would have been revealed to the public had the lid been completely lifted would have shocked and amazed the people.

Here is another astounding revelation:

DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY MAKES MILLIONS WHILE PEOPLE STARVE

During 1930 and 1931, 2 years of adversity and depression, of misery and starvation for millions of people, the Duquesne Light Co. made $12,000,000 in excessive and illegal profits.

It is stated by competent authorities that the excessive or illegal profits of electric companies alone—not counting gas, transportation, communication, and other utility services—are more than $500,000,000 a year and that their write-ups or watered stock greatly exceed $520,000,000.

When you get a glimpse of the ramifications of the utility racket, you realize why the utility interests are willing and anxious to spend millions of dollars to elect their own utility lawyers and tools to Congress.

THE HOLDING-COMPANY SCHEME

The utility holding company racket is another nefarious scheme that the utility barons will revive, if they succeed in electing their lawyers and agents on the Republican ticket.

I voted for the Wheeler-Rayburn bill to curb the vicious practices of the utilities holding companies. The fake telegrams and false propaganda did not fool me. I stood by our great President on this issue. I voted to prevent a recurrence of the loss to millions of people who invested in stocks and bonds of utility companies and lost their life savings in the collapse of the Insull empire and in many other criminally managed and corruptly operated utility holding companies. The utility racketeers know that they cannot intimidate me. They cannot bribe me. They are trying to defeat me by supporting for election a man who represented them for many years and in whom they have confidence. They are ready to spend a huge slush fund

against me. I defy them to do their worst. I shall continue to fight for the investors, the consumers, and the home owners.

CONTROL BY SMALL INVESTMENTS

The assets of utility operating companies amount to about $12,000,000,000. The holding companies own only 3 billions of dollars. Yet, in spite of their mere ownership of one-fourth of the utility assets, they control and dominate the entire field.

Four large utility holding company systems control 50 percent of the entire electric utility business in the United States. These giant super companies have grown so large, powerful, and arrogant that it is necessary for the National Government to control them or they will succeed in their efforts to control the Government and dominate the people.

A $16,000,000,000 SWINDLE

In 1929 insiders sold utility holding company stocks for $19,000,000,000, when their actual investment in plant equipment and capital assets was only $3,000,000,000. When the bottom fell out of this inflated balloon, the people lost $16,000,000,000 by this fraudulent oversale of stocks.

The Byllesby Co. dominates the Philadelphia Co., which in turn controls the Equitable Gas Co. in Pittsburgh, the Duquesne Light Co. in Pittsburgh, the Pittsburgh Railways Co., the Pittsburgh Motor Coach Co., and other utility companies. All these operating companies have been so bled and milked by supermanagement that poor service and excessive rates must prevail in this community.

THE GROUNDWORK FOR HIGH RATES

Byllesby Co. purchased the common stock of the United Railways Investment Co. for $500,000 and transferred it to a subsidiary for $5,500,000. The public was sold this stock at the increased figure and the rates were based on this $5,000,000 write-up.

In 8 years the Cities Service Co. collected $11,600,000 from subsidiaries for tax payments but only paid $1,700,000. It pocketed $8,800,000 as profits. The stockholders of subsidiaries were thus robbed of dividends, the operating companies of profits, and the consumers of rate reductions.

Electric Bond & Share Co. bought Texas utility property for $2,400,000 and conveyed the same property several months later to a subsidiary for $10,500,000—a write-up of 400 percent. The write-ups of the Cities Service system exceeded $134,000,000 in several years. The write-ups of 18 other companies exceeds $2,000,000,000.

WATERED STOCK IS COSTLY TO CONSUMER AND INVESTORS

The purpose, of course, of these write-ups is to have an inflated basis upon which to figure the rates charged to consumers. Furthermore, the holding company is thus often enabled to get out all of its investment and make a large profit by the sale of overvalued stocks and bonds, and still retain ownership, control, and domination of the properties. These holding companies, superholding companies, and subholding companies are only so many corporate aliases by means of which the big bosses on the inside juggle water into controlling stock and fictitious values into bonds to defraud the investors and to build up a stupendous, fraudulent rate base. This base is used to raise the already excessive rates.

To support overcapitalization and inflated values, these utility holding companies resort to every known device to extort money from the operating companies and from the investing public. Electric Bond & Share Co. in 1 year alone collected management fees of $9,000,000 for services that cost them only four million. As is always the case, the consumers and the small investors paid the bill.

AN OUTRAGEOUS 50-YEAR CONTRACT

No busses have been used to supplant or supplement inadequate streetcar service in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County because the Duquesne Light Co. has a 50-year contract to supply power to the Pittsburgh Railway Co. for its streetcar system. (Both companies are owned by the Philadelphia Co.) This contract has 28 more years to run. The busses use no electric current and the Duquesne Light Co. would therefore lose a good customer, so the car riders of Pittsburgh must continue to pay excessive fares for an inadequate service.

The Pittsburgh Railways Co. has refused to pay toll charges for use of bridges in Allegheny County. It owes the city of Pittsburgh more than a million dollars in overdue charges for street improvements. It pays no real-estate taxes and shirks its every responsibility to the community. The alleged losses of the Pittsburgh Railways Co. are not caused by lack of patronage but solely by its system of accounting and by its financial superstructure.

The Pittsburgh Motor Coach Co. is owned by the same utility system and is used to prevent the progress in transportation facilities enjoyed in other cities. A 25-cent bus fare in Pittsburgh is outrageously excessive and a reproach to its people who have tolerated it for many years.

UTILITIES VERSUS THE PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the utilities because they exploited the people by excessive rates and poor service. I have fought them because they have robbed widows and orphans and other investors by selling them worthless and fraudulent stocks. I have done my part to curb the illegal activities of the utilities and to compel them to heed the welfare of the people. I believe the utilities are entitled to fair play—no more and no less.

Because I have fought the utilities they are fighting me. But this is not a battle between me and the utilities. This is not a fight between me and my Republican opponent whom they support with such enthusiasm. This is a fight between the people and the utility exploiters.

In voting to send me back to Congress, the people will vote for lower rates for electricity, for gas, for streetcar and bus services. In sending me back to Congress, the people will do their part in preventing the future robbery of widows, orphans, and other investors by unscrupulous utility manipulators.

Mr. Speaker, great wealth and special privilege are arrayed against President Roosevelt and the Democratic Members of Congress because the present administration has promoted the welfare of the people and halted the exploitation of the people by racketeering special interests.

SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS TO BUY VOTES

A short time ago the members of a very wealthy New York family pledged themselves to give $7,000,000, or 10 percent of their fortune, to try to defeat President Roosevelt. Just think of it! One family alone will spend $7,000,000 to buy the coming election.

This is only one example of the conspiracy of special interests against the people. Ill-gotten wealth is determined to defeat the Democratic Party because it sponsored and enacted social legislation. Millions of dollars will be spent for the direct and deliberate purchase of votes. This attempt to debauch the electorate is more widespread and better financed than ever before.

If this attempt succeeds, democracy is ended in the United States. If the utility racketeers and their follow conspirators, the steel and oil barons, are able to buy the election for President and for Members of Congress, then free government has perished and liberty will have died.

MY OPPONENT REPRESENTED UTILITIES

Such a condition prevails in my own congressional district. My Republican opponent has been associated with utility companies during most of his professional career. He is listed on record as representing utility companies in many cases and has appeared before the Public Service Commission of Pennsylvania in behalf of utility companies. It is important to remember that he never appeared in behalf of consumers and rate payers to urge a reduction in rates, but that he always appeared on the side of the utility companies in opposition to the interests of the consumers and customers of the utility companies.

It is interesting to note that my Republican opponent served an apprenticeship in the office of Senator Crowe—the successor to Boss Boise Penrose, notorious czar of the corrupt Republican gang of my State.

A SUPPORTER OF DAVE REED

My Republican opponent poses as a liberal but supported the reelection of that arch conservative, David A. Reed—the Mellon representative in the United States Senate. Only a skillful actor on a political trapeze could support an opponent of social, humane, and labor legislation like Senator Reed and still cry for liberalism. This inconsistency on the part of my opponent casts doubt on anything he may say or promise during the campaign. It is impossible to be a liberal and at the same time support and be supported by reactionaries.

THE CHOICE OF REACTIONARIES

My Republican opponent is receiving the support of the opponents of old-age pensions and of unemployment insurance. He is supported by the foes of progressive legislation, such as minimum wages, maximum hours, collective bargaining, and other social measures. He is supported by the entire Mellon group of bankers, manufacturers, and utility operators. The same group of reactionary leaders who are endeavoring to defeat President Roosevelt are contributing to his campaign chest. He cannot accept their support and their contributions without accepting their principles and approving their policies.

HE IS OPPOSED TO SOCIAL LEGISLATION

My Republican opponent is opposed to the principles of the National Recovery Act which aimed to abolish child labor, eliminate the sweatshop, reduce the hours of labor, prevent abusive and unfair trade practices, and promote increased employment. He is opposed to this act and must, therefore, be listed as opposing the purposes and goal of this legislation.

A vote for my Republican opponent means a vote for the utilities. A vote for my Republican opponent means a vote for the antisocial policies of big business and concentrated wealth. A vote for my Republican opponent means a vote against old-age pensions and unemployment insurance; it means a vote against social security and against humanitarian legislation.

A candidate must be judged by his past record, by his associations, and by his supporters. He cannot safely be judged by his professions of pseudo liberalism, however honeyed may be the phrases in which they are couched.

VOTERS WILL REELECT ME

I have absolute confidence in the judgment of the voters of my congressional district. I know that they will remember my efforts in behalf of the people and my every vote in behalf of social, humanitarian, and labor legislation. I know that they will repudiate the candidate of the utilities and return me to Congress to continue my work in behalf of the people of my district, my State, and the Nation.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—DULUTH AND SUPERIOR OCEAN PORTS—HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Minnesota are vitally interested in the St. Lawrence waterway. When this great engineering project is an accomplished fact, Duluth and Superior will become the natural gateway for the greatest volume of trade enjoyed by any port in the United States. The St. Lawrence waterway will bring the Atlantic Ocean to Minnesota. When Duluth becomes a seaport a vast territory will focus its commerce upon Duluth Harbor.

The trade of all the States from the northern limits of Montana and Idaho southward as far as Colorado will pass through the new seaport, Duluth-Superior. This means a large part of the northwest wheat country, the meat-packing centers of Sioux City and Omaha, the copper districts of Montana, and the wool-raising districts of the West. The diversified industries of Minneapolis and St. Paul will prosper, and their products will be carried east by the St. Lawrence seaway. Domestic trade between East and West will be facilitated.

NO TIME TO LOSE

The War Department engineers estimate it will take 7 years to construct the St. Lawrence waterway. There is no time to lose. The Mississippi Valley is now in a sharp decline. This area lost 18 Congressmen in the last census. Minnesota lost one Congressman when the State was redistricted. In 1930 we had 10 Members of Congress from Minnesota. Now we have nine. We have been operating under a handicap ever since the construction of the Panama Canal.

From the point of transportation costs, the Panama Canal moved the west coast and the east coast closer together than the distance from Akron, Ohio, to the Atlantic seaboard. Trade was deflected from the Midwest. The cost of rail transportation has greatly increased. Low water rates provided by the St. Lawrence waterway will encourage the development of both agriculture and industry in the Middle West. This arm of the mighty ocean will be extended to the Midwest producer. Interior America will no longer be marooned.

ST. LAWRENCE TREATY

On July 18, 1932, a treaty was signed between the United States and Canada providing for the construction of a deep waterway not less than 27 feet in depth, from the interior of North America through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic Ocean. The United States Senate must ratify the treaty and Congress must appropriate funds to cover our share of the expense.

LOCATION OF WATERWAY

The St. Lawrence waterway will extend from Duluth and Superior through the Great Lakes for 1,000 miles to the head of the St. Lawrence River. It will extend down the St. Lawrence River for 183 miles to Montreal, and there it will connect with the channel already provided between Montreal and the Atlantic Ocean.

The Great Lakes are deep enough for the largest ship ever built or imagined. Only the channels connecting the Lakes need be deepened, and improved harbors must be provided.

PLAN OF ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

There will be six sections of construction in the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway.

SECTION 1: ST. MARYS, ST. CLAIR, AND DETROIT RIVERS—135 MILES

The first section of the waterway extends from Duluth-Superior through Lake Superior, into St. Marys River, through Lake Huron and into the channels connecting Lake Huron and Lake Erie. The Soo Rapids, dropping 20 feet over a rock ledge, block the outlet to Lake Superior. The United States has already provided four locks there, side by side, and Canada has provided one. Two of the more modern locks there afford a depth of 24 feet at normal lake levels. Therefore, to provide a depth of 27 feet, a new lock will be needed. It can be built where the oldest lock now stands, on the American side. It will afford a depth of 30 feet.

Then there are the channels through the St. Marys River, connecting Lake Superior and Lake Huron; the channels in St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River, between Lake Huron and Lake Erie. Through part of these channels there is sufficient depth and width. However, there are shoal reaches there. In the St. Marys and Lower Detroit Rivers the shoal bottom is solid limestone ledge. Lake St. Clair is a shallow lake, but it has a soft bed and can be easily dredged. Altogether there are over 100 miles of channel that must be dug from Lake Superior through Lake Huron and into Lake Erie, in order to create a channel deep enough for the largest ocean-going vessels. No work will be necessary between Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. The cost of deepening these channels is $56,500,000, of which $23,000,000 has been appropriated and much of it spent in deepening the channel to 25 feet.

SECTION 2: WELLAND SHIP CANAL—25 MILES LONG

A part of Canada's contribution to the St. Lawrence waterway will be the Welland Ship Canal, built at a cost of $128,000,000 and formally opened on August 6, 1932. The Welland Ship Canal connects Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. It is 27 feet deep, with seven lift locks 820 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet deep. All locks in the St. Lawrence seaway are to be of the same size.

SECTION 3: THOUSAND ISLANDS SECTION—67 MILES

Section 2, the Thousand Islands section east of Lake Ontario, has already been deepened to 27 feet.

SECTION 4: INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION—48 MILES

Construction in the International Rapids section awaits the ratification of the St. Lawrence treaty. The United States will provide most of the work involved in this section. There will be two dams and three locks 30 feet deep and 8 miles of canal. The United States is to spend $215,492,000 on this section, but in return will receive certain benefits from over 1,100,000 horsepower of electrical energy created by use of the rapids. This benefit is estimated at $90,000,000. Canada will spend $59,250,000 on this section.

There are three parts to the International Rapids section, one on the international border and two wholly in Canada. One dam will be constructed about midway of the section and the other at the lower end. These dams will make deep navigable pools. A short canal with locks will be built around each dam in order that navigation can pass. The dams will afford opportunity for the development of hydroelectric power on a large scale.

UPPER DAM AT CHRYSLER ISLAND

The first dam will be located at Chrysler Island, 24 miles below the head of the first rapids. This dam will be 88 feet high from bedrock to water level and over a half mile in length. It will have crest gates to pass surplus river flow. Powerhouses will be at the two ends of the dam, each about 1,500 feet long. The head of the dam will vary from about 24 feet in summer to less than 20 feet in winter. The power machinery will develop slightly less than 600,000 horsepower, 300,000 on each side of the border. The navigation canal and lock will be on the Canadian shore.

LOWER DAM AT BARNHART ISLAND

The lower dam will be at Barnhart Island, 14 miles downstream from Chrysler Island. This dam will be of about the same height as the other, and the head will be from 60 to 64 feet.

The powerhouses will be fed through a head race formed by the back channels at Barnhart Island. Navigation will be carried around the dam in a canal with two locks on the American side. The total power installation will be about 1,600,000 horsepower, 800,000 on each side of the border.

The total estimated cost of improving the International Rapids section is about $275,000,000. The total power installation is from 2,200,000 to over 2,500,000 horsepower, of which half will be on the American side and half on the Canadian side.

Canada is to build the lock and canal around the upper dam at Chrysler Island and assume responsibility for the lands and flowage within Canadian borders, also construct all works of rehabilitation within her borders that may be necessary because of the raising of the water levels in the International Rapids section. The United States is to construct the locks and canal around the lower dam and assume like responsibility in the United States section. The remaining work, including construction of the two dams with power works, will be constructed under a temporary commission representing both nations, with funds provided by the United States.

SECTION 5: CANADIAN WATERS—68 MILES

Section 5, the Beauharnois Channel, wholly in Canada, is about completed. Canada will spend $82,954,000 in the installation of two 30-foot locks at the eastern end and the building of three locks and a 3-mile canal at Lachine. This will carry the deep seaway to Montreal.

SECTION 6: MONTREAL TO FATHER POINT—340 MILES

The sixth and last section is from Montreal to Quebec. Here there is a first-class channel 30 feet deep; the channel is being further deepened to 35 feet. From Quebec to Father Point, on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the channel is already 35 feet deep.

COST OF ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

These six sections complete the St. Lawrence waterway. The War Department and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association have furnished me with much of this information, and I am here inserting a brief summary of St. Lawrence waterway costs furnished by the same sources:

Treaty allocation of tasks and costs

To Canada:	
The New Welland Ship Canal	$128,000,000
Deepening a portion of Thousand Islands section	772,000
Total already expended	128,772,000
International Rapids section	59,250,000
Lake St. Francis-Soulanges and Lachine sections	82,954,000
Total to be expended	142,204,000
Grand total	270,976,000
To United States:	
For deepening Great Lakes connecting channels, providing a new lock at the outlet of Lake Superior and constructing compensation works, $56,500,000. For these items there has already been authorized or appropriated and largely expended	23,000,000
Deepening a portion of the Thousand Islands section	461,000
Total already expended	23,461,000
Completing Great Lakes connecting channels, building new lock at the Soo, and constructing compensation works	33,500,000
International Rapids section	215,492,000
Total to be expended	248,992,000
Grand total	272,453,000

SIXTEEN LOCKS

In traveling from Duluth to Montreal vessels will pass through 16 locks: 1 at the Soo, 7 in the Welland Canal, and 3 on the St. Lawrence. Of these 16 locks, Canada will operate and maintain 13 and the United States 3—the 1 at the Soo and 2 around the lower dam in the International Rapids section.

The waterway will be closed by ice during the winter. On the average, the first ship arrives at Montreal about April 28 and the last ship leaves on December 7. The average period of navigation will be about 220 days per year.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

Small ocean-going steamers travel back and forth every year between European and North American Atlantic ports on the Great Lakes, carrying cargoes much more reasonably than by rail. In 1934 there were 237 through cargoes, 140 in and 97 out. The Kohler Co. of Wisconsin saves more than $4 a ton on clay brought in from England. The Studebaker Corporation of Indiana claims a freight reduction of $25 a car is possible when larger ships can engage in through Lakes-ocean trades.

THE GREAT LAKES SHORE LINE A SEACOAST

The completion of the seaway will mean that the Great Lakes shore line will become a seacoast, and ocean-going transportation costs will apply. It will add value to products of industry and agriculture. New markets will be developed. New industries and new business will flourish.

When the ocean rolls back into the interior 88 percent of the world's cargo ships will be brought to the eastern termini of the railroads. It will give the western railroads direct access to the Atlantic now enjoyed only by eastern roads.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

More than 2,500,000 horsepower of electrical energy will be generated by the development of the St. Lawrence River. It will open up 3,576 miles of new seacoast connecting Atlantic and Gulf seaboards. It will bring the Atlantic Ocean 1,000 miles inland. It will lessen the handicap of adverse transportation costs to interior America.

The area involved in the St. Lawrence development covers more than 22 States, with a population of more than 40,000,000. The potential tonnage of the waterway is 30,174,625 tons.

THE NATIONAL SEAWAY COUNCIL

The National Seaway Council is organized to further the St. Lawrence Waterway project. This council is composed of several organizations, including the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, the Great Lakes Harbors Association, the New York Power Authority—which has done a great deal of research and study and has information and statistics on the project—the West Michigan Legislative Commission, the Ohio Lake Ports Association, the Minnesota Arrowhead Association, the Northern New York Federation of Chambers of Commerce, the Champlain Valley Association—representing interests of New England groups—the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange.

A NEW DRIVE IS ON FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

A group of Congressmen met on May 28, 1936, with representatives of these organizations. We determined to advertise the benefits of the St. Lawrence waterway and to make a drive for ratification of the St. Lawrence treaty during the next session of Congress. New spirit has been injected into the fight for the St. Lawrence waterway. This great project will benefit Minnesota, the Northwest, and the entire country. We demand approval of the St. Lawrence waterway project during the next session of Congress.

A FEW REASONS WHY IT IS NECESSARY TO STABILIZE OUR BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was a sad day when the Guffey-Snyder Bituminous Coal Act was declared unconstitutional. It meant more chaos in this great industry. Greater destruction of a major national resource. In the final analysis it meant:

(a) Increased troubles and difficulties for the operators.

(b) It disturbed and continued to disturb the labor groups both socially and economically.

(c) That the consumer will pay more eventually for the coal he uses.

(d) It means bankruptcy for many companies that otherwise would have gotten along nicely.

(e) It means a step backward in our effort to establish a basal procedure for the coal industry.

Hence we think that the following are sound, basal reasons why some law like the Guffey-Snyder Coal Stabilizing Act must be put into operation, if we ever expect to help the three parties concerned—the laborer, the producer, and the consumer:

First. There are a great many good coal mines and there are a great many poor coal mines.

Second. It is not economically sound for poor coal mines to deplete the national bituminous-coal reserves at a cost of production in excess of a fair sale price, when there are good mines which can at a profit supply the demands of fuel and power consumers. This procedure increases the cost of production of the good coal mines on account of decreased volume of production, and also causes the sale price of bituminous coal to include a gratuity—absorbent for inefficient and/or noncompetitive cost—on account of operations of the poor mines. The consumer is unwilling to pay this gratuity and seeks other fuels or power.

Third. The good bituminous-coal mines are rapidly mechanizing in order to decrease their cost of production. Mechanization will result in (a) a decreased total man-hour coal employment of at least 25 percent, with a gradual reemployment of the 25 percent as the consumption of coal and its derivatives increases; (b) a material increase of employment in related industries; (c) employment in the coal industry being placed upon an economically sound basis; (d) the creation of a coal reserve on account of cessation of operating poor mines.

Fourth. The consumer has the right and the opportunity to select fuel or power requirements from several different products. The bituminous-coal mines, which have a geological formation and quality capable of supporting a competitive and efficient mechanized cost of production, should be classified as good and should proceed—

(a) To mechanize and place their operations on an efficient cost-of-production basis;

(b) To place their product or its derivatives on a competitive basis with producers of petroleum, natural gas, and electricity;

(c) To organize several byproduct and electric corporations, their capital stock to be disposed of to owners of good coal mines or to the investing public; and

(d) To issue first-mortgage bonds of these byproduct and electric corporations as security and borrow cash capital secured by said bonds.

These byproduct and electric corporations should construct at central locations in, or at converging points of, the several bituminous-coal fields, byproduct and electric generating plants. These plants should purchase, not produce, their coal requirements from the producing coal mines nearest—measured in transportation cost—to the respective plants. The excess coke and gas from the byproduct units of these plants would be used as boiler fuel at the electric generation units of these plants, to generate electricity to be sold to the electric power companies. The other byproducts would be sold in competition with petroleum derivatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 19, 1936, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

874. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting another part of the Commission's study and investigation of the work, activities, personnel, and functions of protective and reorganization committees, in pursuance of section 211 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 251. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city and county of San Francisco to construct a causeway and highways on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 13001. A bill to eliminate unnecessary expense in the administration of estates of deceased and incompetent veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 457. Joint resolution defining the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims under the act approved April 25, 1932 (47 Stat. L. 137), and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 3032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 177. Joint resolution to define the term of certain contracts with Indian tribes; with amendment (Rept. No. 3033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UTTERBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3957. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; without amendment (Rept. No. 3034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. House Joint Resolution 632. Joint resolution

to authorize further stay in pending proceedings under the immigration and naturalization laws against certain groups of foreign-born persons; with amendment (Rept. No. 3039). 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. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10645. A bill for the relief of Benno Shmukler; without amendment (Rept. No. 3026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10372. A bill for the relief of Isaac Limonsky; without amendment (Rept. No. 3027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10370. A bill for the relief of David Limonsky, alias David Binder; without amendment (Rept. No. 3028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10371. A bill for the relief of Lazer Limonsky, alias Louis Meerowitz; without amendment (Rept. No. 3029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 8638. A bill for the relief of the Franklin Ice Cream Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHULTE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10646. A bill for the relief of Joseph Herschmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 3036). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10513. A bill for the relief of Janet Hendel, nee Judith Shapiro; without amendment (Rept. No. 3038). 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. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 13007) to provide for the preservation, as historic naval relics, of the *Constitution*, the *Constellation*, the *Hartford*, the *Olympia*, and the *America;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 13008) to regulate and control the manufacture, sale, and use of weighing and measuring devices for use or used in trade or commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 13009) to abolish the spoils system and promote efficiency, economy, and merit in the Government service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution (H. Res. 555) requesting the President of the United States to cancel, annul, and abrogate the provisions of the tariff treaty with Canada of November 18, 1935, in regard to cheese, cream, and cattle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMLIE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 637) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be known as the human rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 638) 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. KOPPLEMANN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) authorizing the printing of the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the investigation of the dairy industry as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial in the nature of a resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of Federal legislation requiring the marking of articles made of imitation leather; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 13010) for the relief of Ward Mathewson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 13011) granting a pension to Mary Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13012) for the relief of Roland Stafford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 13013) granting an increase of pension to Mina D. Hubbard; 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:

11121. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mrs. Walter Sperry and 178 other citizens of Licking County, Ohio, urging adequate peace legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

11122. By Mr. CONNERY: 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

11123. By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of Federal legislation requiring the marking of articles made of imitation leather; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

11124. Also, resolutions by General Court of Massachusetts, favoring enactment of Federal legislation to prohibit the employment of women in industrial plants after 6 p. m.; to the Committee on Labor.