

tion and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pensions to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish-American War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2664. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of Riverside, Calif., in support of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2665. Also, petition of the citizens of Brawley, Calif., in support of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2666. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of citizens of Painted Post, N. Y., urging Congress for the passage of a bill increasing the pension of the Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2667. Also, petition of citizens of Peruville, N. Y., urging Congress for the passage of a bill increasing the pension of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2668. Also, petition of citizens of Millerton, Dutchess County, N. Y., urging Congress for the passage of a bill increasing the pension of the Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2669. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of sundry citizens of Yountville, Calif., urging speedy consideration by Congress of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

2670. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Clarksburg Council, No. 30, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Clarksburg, W. Va., signed by H. W. Kinsey, counselor, and F. H. McClung, recording secretary, supporting the Robson-Capper Federal education bill, urging its early consideration and passage; to the Committee on Education.

2671. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Monessen (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of House bill 1815 and Senate bill 15, retirement bills; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2672. Also, petition of Monessen (Pa.) Rotary Club, advocating passage of House bill 1815 and Senate bill 15, retirement bills; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2673. Also, petition of Monessen (Pa.) Kiwanis Club, advocating passage of Senate bill 15 and House bill 1815; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2674. Also, petition of the Latrobe (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of Senate bill 15 and House bill 1815; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2675. Also, petition of the Latrobe (Pa.) Ministerium, favoring passage of Senate bill 15 and House bill 1815; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2676. Also, petition of Latrobe (Pa.) Rotary Club, favoring passage of Senate bill 15 and House bill 1815; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2677. Also, petition of members of the United Presbyterian Congregation of New Alexandria, Pa., urging passage of Lankford Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2678. Also, petition of the Reformed Presbyterian congregation of New Alexandria, Pa., urging passage of Lankford Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2679. Also, petition of the Methodist congregation of New Alexandria, Pa., urging passage of Lankford Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2680. Also, petition of the Presbyterian congregation of Conshy, Pa., urging passage of Lankford Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2681. By Mr. YON: Petition of Ray Neel, John Broxton, W. J. Wapp, and others of Westville, Holmes County, Fla., favoring passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2682. Also, petition of A. J. Anderson, C. F. Schad, E. W. Caro, and others, of Pensacola, Escambia County, Fla., favoring passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, January 9, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I ask that the Journal for the calendar days of January 6, 7, and 8 may be approved.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Allen	Frazier	Kean	Sheppard
Ashurst	George	Kendrick	Shortridge
Baird	Gillett	Keyes	Simmons
Bingham	Glass	King	Smoot
Black	Glenn	La Follette	Steck
Blaine	Goff	McCulloch	Steiner
Bleasle	Gould	McKellar	Sullivan
Borah	Greene	McMaster	Swanson
Bratton	Grundy	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harris	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Hastings	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Oddie	Wagner
Copeland	Hawes	Overman	Walcott
Couzens	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Deneen	Hefflin	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Fess	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Fletcher	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] on account of the death of Mrs. Goldsborough.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] has been detained from the Senate this week by illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has been necessarily detained from the sessions of the Senate by a death in his family.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent from the Senate, as they have been named by the President as members of the naval conference and are sailing to-day for London to attend the sessions of that conference.

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

LOAD-LINE LEGISLATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 345, Seventieth Congress, second session, additional information relating to load-line legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed as part of Senate Document 65.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Hamilton & Hamilton, attorneys, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1929, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking toward their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. GREENE and Mr. FLETCHER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. ALLEN presented resolutions adopted by Post No. 18 of Arkansas City and Ernest Brown Post, No. 138, of Caney, both of the American Legion in the State of Kansas, favoring the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of J. O. Murphy and sundry other citizens of Gridley and Hilltop, and of Rev. Wm. T. Smith and sundry other citizens of Lawrence, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAPPER presented the petition of members of Firth Charlesworth Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Beloit, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PATTERSON presented a petition of 78 citizens of Stoddard County, Mo., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma presented a petition of sundry citizens of Comanche, Okla., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES presented the memorial of members of Esther Reed Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the proposed repeal of the national origins provision of the immigration act of 1924, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF POSTAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 3045) for the relief of Walter P. Crowley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3046) granting a pension to Alice Morosse; and

A bill (S. 3047) granting an increase of pension to Fannie P. Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3048) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 3049) to confer upon the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho the right to tax, for State and county purposes, persons, copartnerships, and corporations, and their property within that portion of the Yellowstone National Park which lies within the boundary lines of said States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 3050) for the relief of James M. Booth; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 3051) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument to commemorate the heroic sacrifice and the service of Martin Charger and 10 other Indians in the rescue of white women and children held as captives by an unfriendly Indian tribe; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3052) for the erection of a Federal building at Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 3053) to amend section 25 of the Federal farm act so that national farm loan associations, as indorsers of first mortgages, will only be liable for deficiencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 3054) to increase the salaries of certain postmasters of the first class; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

A bill (S. 3055) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Smith; and

A bill (S. 3056) granting a pension to Ottillia H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN:

A bill (S. 3057) granting a pension to John D. Nite (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3058) granting a pension to Kansas Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE:

A bill (S. 3062) to amend the act entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," approved March 2, 1929; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 3064) to make permanent the additional office of district judge created for the eastern district of Illinois by the act of September 14, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 3065) for the relief of Timothy C. Harrington; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3066) granting a pension to Byron E. Murphy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce three bills and to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanation of the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bills will be received and referred to the appropriate committee and the explanation printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WAGNER introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 3059) to provide for the advance planning and regulated construction of certain public works, for the stabilization of industry, and for the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression;

A bill (S. 3060) to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3061) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913.

The explanation of the bills is as follows:

These three bills together constitute a single program of legislation to deal with the unemployment problem. The purpose of S. 3059 is to provide for the long-range planning of public works and the timing of construction of such public works in such manner as will best stabilize employment in industry. In order to carry out the policy of stabilization by means of the long-range plan a board is created composed of the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, which is charged with the responsibility of putting into effect the provisions of the bill.

The bill provides for the advance planning in detail of public projects, including river and harbor works, flood control, public buildings, and Federal-aid highways, so that work on any one or all of these may be accelerated in periods of depression without the necessity of delay for the preparation of plans. An amount not in excess of \$150,000,000 in any one year is authorized to be appropriated.

S. 3060 abolishes the existing United States Employment Service and provides in lieu thereof for a system of cooperation between the Federal and State Governments in the maintenance of State and municipal employment offices.

S. 3061 expands the statistical work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor and directs it to gather information and statistics of employment for manufacturing; mining, quarrying, and crude petroleum production; building construction; agriculture and lumbering; transportation and communication; and retail and wholesale trade.

Similar but not identical bills were introduced in the Seventieth Congress. Thereafter, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate (S. Res. 219, 70th Cong.), an investigation into the problem of unemployment was had by the Committee on Education and Labor, and a report thereon (No. 2072) was filed. Among the recommendations of the committee were the following:

"(3) The States and municipalities should be responsible for building efficient employment exchanges. The Government should be responsible for coordinating the work of the States so as to give a national understanding of any condition which may arise and so as to be able to assist in any national functioning of the employment exchanges.

"(5) Efforts should be made to provide an efficient system for obtaining statistics on unemployment.

"(6) The Government should adopt legislation without delay which would provide a system of planning public works so that they would form a reserve against unemployment in times of depression. States and municipalities and other public agencies should do likewise."

The bills are in consonance with the recommendations of that committee.

GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce and have referred to the appropriate committee a bill making an appropriation to aid in the construction of the George Washington Memorial Building in the city of Washington. This request, Mr. President, is made pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes. This undertaking sponsored by the association is laudable, the motive is patriotic, and the great objective sought to be achieved, deep rooted as it is in the hearts of our citizens, is the most essentially American expression of love, admiration, and affection ever manifested by this

Nation in war or peace. It reflects the eternal truth that the gratitude of the Republic has an indelible and everlasting memory.

I hope, in fact I know, that this most worthy request of all the people will receive immediate attention by the committee and action by the Senate.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (S. 3063) making an appropriation to aid in the construction of the George Washington Memorial Building in the city of Washington was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On request of Mr. WALSH of Montana, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas be excused from further service on the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and that Mr. HAWES be assigned to said committee.

USE OF PROFANITY OVER THE RADIO

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, on Monday last I submitted a few remarks regarding the use of profanity and of indecent and obscene language over station KWKH, the radio station at Shreveport, La. I stated at that time that I had no interest in the policy of the owner of the station in the subject which he was discussing, but that I believed the law should be obeyed as to indecent, obscene, and profane language. I find that reports that I was objecting to the use of such language over the radio station have been interpreted by independent merchants of the country as an objection on my part to the policy of the owner of that station in attacking chain stores. Again I want to make clear that I have no interest for or against his policy in attacking any store or organization so far as the law is concerned. My whole objection is to the use of indecent, obscene, and profane language over the radio station KWKH.

These remarks of mine brought a flood of letters and telegrams to me from all over the country on both sides of the question. I took up the matter with the Radio Commission and also with the Attorney General of the United States. The Radio Commission stated that they did not have affidavits to the effect that anybody had been uttering profane language over this station and that they did not have any affidavits as to the indecency or obscenity of the language used over the station. I think by this time they have such affidavits and will have many more.

I have no concern at all with what Mr. Henderson says about me personally and I do not care even to discuss it. He can say anything he pleases about me. But I am concerned that this great art, this great gift of science, shall not be used in a way to befoul the air and make it impossible for women and children to listen to the language that is being used over this station.

I have received a great many letters relating to the matter. I have one that I want to read, because it expresses my own idea. It comes from a gentleman by the name of J. M. Allen, and is headed Fort Valley, Ga., and reads as follows:

Being in the employ of the Southern Railway system and not interested in chain-store controversies, I wish to indorse and approve the stand you are taking against station KWKH, Shreveport, La., with reference to the profane language that is being used by the announcer. On the night of December 24, Christmas Eve, I heard him make a statement about a chain-store operator, in the presence of my wife and daughters, worse than cursing, and language that I would not allow any man to come into my home and use. We have refrained from listening in on that station since because of the fact that if such language is going to be tolerated over the air and permitted to come into enlightened Christian homes where wives and children are listening, it seems to me we are in a deplorable state of affairs in this country. I am sure that if you had heard the statement that I heard on December 24, Christmas Eve, coming from this station you would spare no time or effort to have it stopped.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to his colleague?

Mr. DILL. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I understood the Senator to say that he had received letters on both sides of the question which he is discussing. I wonder, if I understood him correctly, if it is possible that some American citizens are defending the use of profane and obscene language over the radio. I will ask the Senator, if any such citizens have been doing that, did they have the courage to sign their names to their communications?

Mr. DILL. I will say to the Senator I have only received one letter which defends the profanity and obscenity indulged in over this station, and I would not read that to the Senate because of the language in which it is couched. I have received a considerable number of letters and telegrams from those who

favor the policy of Mr. Henderson in attacking the chain stores and who evidently look upon his language, although they do not say so, as something not to be considered very seriously. I can understand how some men might feel that way who do not stop to think that the radio goes into the very inmost recesses of the lives of literally millions of the children of America. The fact that the station is what is known as a cleared channel, no other station in the United States having the same wave length, and the fact that it has very high power and a very fine transmitting instrument enables it to reach into homes which would not be reached otherwise. People are inclined to listen to those radio stations whose programs comes in most clearly.

I have no desire to interfere with this station as a station. It is a well-organized and well-built station, but what I am protesting against, what I am asking the Radio Commission to take action concerning, and what I have asked the United States Attorney General to refer to the United States district attorney of the Louisiana district in which Shreveport is located is to put a stop to the abuse of the air. If this man or his announcer continues to disregard the law as provided in the radio act, then, I think, he should be arrested and prosecuted to the extent of the law, and his station should be closed. I am not going to take any more of the time of the Senate; I simply wanted to make my position clear in this connection.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, as I understood him, the Senator from Washington said that he had conferred with the Attorney General concerning the grave matter to which he has directed the attention of the Senate. I desire to inquire whether the Senator learned that offenses of the character he has described are taken care of in any way by the criminal law?

Mr. DILL. I may say to the Senator that I simply wrote a letter to the Attorney General calling attention to my own remarks in the Senate and to the provision of the radio law which forbids the use of such language and the penalty which the radio law attaches for violation of the act. I suggested that he refer the matter to the United States attorney for the district in Louisiana in which Shreveport is situated, with a view to inducing the owner to stop this abuse of the use of the air and the violation of the law; and if he did not stop it, to prosecute him under the criminal provision of the radio act.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The situation is, then, that the law seems adequate to cover the case at the present time?

Mr. DILL. I think there is no doubt about the adequacy of the existing law to prohibit the abuse under the criminal provision which the radio law contains.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

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

NOMINATION OF SENATOR SACKETT TO BE AMBASSADOR TO GERMANY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in open executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 9, 1930.

To the SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

I nominate FREDERIC M. SACKETT, of Kentucky, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Germany.

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I move that the nomination of Mr. SACKETT be confirmed without being referred to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

The Chair lays before the Senate the following communication from Mr. SACKETT, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1930.

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,

The Vice President.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am sending to-day my resignation as United States Senator from Kentucky to Gov. Flem D. Sampson, of Kentucky, at Frankfort through the following telegram:

"Hon. FLEM D. SAMPSON,

Governor of Kentucky, Frankfort, Ky.:

"I hereby tender to you my resignation as United States Senator from Kentucky and confirm the same by letter mailed to you to-day.

"Sincerely,

"FREDERIC M. SACKETT."

May I add, Mr. President, that I sever my service in the Senate through this resignation with sincere regret?

Very sincerely yours,

FREDERIC M. SACKETT.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table.

MR. COPELAND. Mr. President, it would be too bad to have the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT] retire from the Senate without mention of the splendid service he has rendered here.

While he has not been a Member of the Senate for a long time, I am sure that the charming personality of this good friend has impressed itself upon the entire membership of the body. I had the pleasure of serving with Senator SACKETT on the District of Columbia Committee. I have served on that committee since coming into this body, and I can say in all frankness that no member of that committee has served more faithfully, loyally, and unselfishly than has Senator SACKETT. His retirement from the Senate leaves the city of Washington the poorer, for it will be deprived of the splendid service which Mr. SACKETT has rendered during these years.

I am sure that I speak the feeling of every Senator on this side as well as on the other side of the Chamber when I say that we wish for Mr. SACKETT and for his good wife every success in the new and exalted office which he has been called to fill. I feel that the country is to be congratulated that we are sending a man so tactful and useful and forceful to the great German nation across the water, and I pray that happiness and prosperity may attend every move on the part of Senator SACKETT in his new sphere of activity.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating James Waldron Remick, of New Hampshire, to be war claims arbiter, vice Edwin B. Parker, deceased, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

MR. SMOOT. Mr. President, just before the close of the session last evening there was a motion pending offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to proceed with the paper schedule. I wish the Senator would withdraw his motion and allow us to proceed with the sugar schedule.

MR. HARRISON. Mr. President, I shall not insist upon my motion to take up the paper schedule first, as some Senators desire to speak immediately on the sugar schedule. I am having drafted an amendment fixing the present rate as to the action of the Senate Committee on Finance, and if the Senator desires now to submit his motion to take up the sugar schedule with the understanding that I may offer that amendment when it is prepared, it will be all right.

MR. SMOOT. I have no objection.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi withdraws his motion.

MR. HARRISON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana to yield to permit me to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

MR. RANSDELL. I am glad to yield.

MR. HARRISON. I want to have the amendment to the amendment pending.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). The clerk will read the amendment to the amendment.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 121, line 12, in the committee amendment, strike out "1.5425 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1.24 cents," and in line 15 strike out "575" and insert in lieu thereof "460."

MR. SMOOT. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Schedule 5, "Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of," beginning on page 121 of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, under the heading "Schedule 5, Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of," on page 121, line 12, before the words "per pound," to strike out "1.5625 cents" and insert "1.5425 cents"; in line 14, after the word "test," to strike out "but not above 94 sugar degrees, 625," and insert "575"; and in line 17, after the word "proportion," to strike out the semicolon and the remainder of the paragraph, so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 501. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 sugar degrees, and all mixtures containing

sugar and water, testing by the polariscope above 50 sugar degrees and not above 75 sugar degrees, 1.5425 cents per pound, and for each additional sugar degree shown by the polariscope test 0.0575 of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion.

MR. RANSDELL. Mr. President, after long delay, hard trials, and tribulations we have at last reached the sugar schedule of the pending tariff bill, and I have been selected to fire the opening gun in support of the House provision, giving a duty of 2.4 cents per pound on sugar effective against Cuba, for which honor I am grateful.

PROTECTION AS A DEMOCRATIC POLICY

As a Louisiana Democrat who has always been a protectionist I am delighted that the doctrine of protection for American products of factory and farm, taught forcibly by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the founders of the Democratic Party, was adopted in substance at the Houston convention and urged with much eloquence in last year's campaign by our great Democratic leaders. Our platform plank on the tariff indicated that the party has returned to the moorings of its first 40 years after nearly a century of adherence to the policies of free trade and tariff for revenue only; and great was the rejoicing thereat of many Democrats who, like myself, had felt almost strangers in their father's mansion.

The special session of Congress was called primarily to consider the farm situation in those States that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. No better light could guide our footsteps than the policy of Jefferson, for he gave to this problem the same thought and logic that have immortalized his doctrines dealing with the rights of man, religious freedom, and universal education.

Simply stated, the remedy proposed by Jefferson for the ills of agriculture and industry alike was adequate protection. In the heat of partisanship that raged throughout his long career it became the fashion of his opponents to deny him any part in the origin of the doctrine of protection. The first revenue act, passed by the First Congress, was signed by President Washington on July 4, 1789, and that act was the handiwork of James Madison, who in its preparation counseled with his mentor, personal and political friend, Thomas Jefferson. It was entitled "An act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States," and in its first section these words were used:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported * * *

None of the declarations in favor of protection by our early chieftains was more explicit and direct than those of Andrew Jackson, victor in the Battle of New Orleans. And next to Jefferson, principal founder of the Democratic Party, his ideas on the tariff have always been regarded as good party doctrine by the sturdy Democracy of Louisiana, which was so devoted to the Democratic Party that it gave its candidates a greater majority than any other State in 1928.

The doctrines of our founders, upon which I addressed the Senate at some length on November 1, should be once more the guiding light of the party. The platform adopted at Houston last year reiterates our belief in adequate protection for American industries and agriculture. It stated, in part, that—the Democratic tariff legislation will be based on the following policies:

(d) Duties that will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue for the support of Government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

Wage earner, farmer, stockman, producer, and legitimate business in general have everything to gain from Democratic tariff based on justice to all.

RATES IN HOUSE BILL

In this tariff discussion, the plight of the American sugar farmer deserves serious consideration. On May 28, 1929, the House of Representatives adopted a tariff bill by which the sugar schedule fixes a duty of 2.40 per pound on raw sugar imported from Cuba.

Facts and figures have been produced by the domestic sugar industry, which includes hundreds of thousands of American farmers who produce cane, beets, and corn for sugar, to show that, based upon present conditions and future prospects, a tariff rate of at least 2.40 against Cuba is absolutely necessary.

The American Sugar Cane League, composed of more than 4,000 growers of cane in the South, declares that the cost of producing sugarcane in Louisiana, where the bulk of the industry is carried on in the United States, is shown by figures

gathered from over 600 growers through the State Agricultural Credit Corporation, which is a subsidiary of the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, to be, on an average, \$4.96 per ton. The detailed figures of this production cost are shown in a table which, without reading, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Crop costs—Detailed per acre	
FALL WORK	
Turning under beans, lister and four furrows and harrow	\$4.00
2 tons seed cane, at \$4	8.00
Distributing seed and covering	3.00
Ditching and drains	2.50
Feed	2.00
	19.50
SPRING WORK	
February :	
Mechanical scraping winter grass	\$0.20
Wrapping middles and barring off	1.30
Scraping with hoes	2.30
March :	
Recapping middles and rebarring	1.30
Fertilizer	7.50
Molding cane and breaking middles	1.95
April :	
Hoeing rows	1.30
Disking and breaking middles (five times)	7.50
Second hoeing	1.00
Quarter drains (5 cents per operation)	.50
Ditch cleaning	2.00
Lay-by	1.75
Digging quarter drains	1.00
Corn and soybeans	6.00
	35.60
Overhead, administration, taxes, etc.	55.10
	8.00
Harvesting 17 tons, at \$1.25	63.10
	21.25
Cost of producing 1 ton, at 17 tons per acre	84.35
	4.96

Mr. RANSDELL. At the present prices of raw sugar in the United States, which average around 3.80 cents per pound for 96° test sugar, the return to the grower of cane is \$3.80 per ton, the custom being to sell the cane at the rate of \$1 per ton for each cent per pound that 96° test sugar sells for on the New Orleans market. As the cost above shown for producing a ton of cane is \$4.96, there is consequently a loss of \$1.16 per ton registered in spite of the existing tariff on sugar, which is 1.76 cents per pound on the Cuban article of 96° test.

In the large-scale production of the domestic crop which would result under the stimulus of an increased tariff, the American farmer would be enabled to earn a reasonable profit on his investment, because increase of production means increased efficiency and increased economy among the cane growers. As production rises price per unit falls, thus enabling the cane farmer to advantageously apply the small saving per unit to the total aggregate loss he now suffers.

SUGAR PRODUCER IS A FARMER

Sugar is a product of the American farm. The grower of sugarcane and beets is no less a farmer because his product must be processed before it is sold on the market. He plows, cultivates, and harvests in the same manner as any other farmer and is entitled to the same consideration and the same benefits as are offered to the other American farmers. His problems are the same and he is affected by the same influences and disadvantages borne by other farmers who raise different crops. A man who produces corn is no less a farmer because his product is used to manufacture sugar instead of being fed in its natural state to animals. A tobacco grower is no less a farmer because his product is manufactured into cigars and cigarettes. The dairyman's place in agriculture is not changed because his products are manufactured into cheese, butter, and casein. The grower of sugarcane and beets and corn does not lose his identity as a farmer because his products are manufactured into sugar and molasses.

All great national farm organizations have not only recognized the sugar cane and beet producer as a farmer but have espoused his cause as part of the farmer's program. The American Farm Bureau Federation, with a membership of 1,000,000, states:

The principal reason for an increase in the duty of sugar is to stimulate the production of domestic sugar crops as a substitute for other crops of which a surplus is produced.

The National Grange, whose membership is 800,000, states:

The Grange is in favor of increasing the duty so that sugar imported from Cuba would be required to pay a tariff of 2.4 cents per pound. If this is not sufficient to encourage production, we favor a higher rate.

REVIEW OF SUGAR TARIFF RATES

When the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 was passed, imposing a duty of 1.685 cents, the first great impetus to domestic sugar production was given, and approximately 85 per cent of the sugar imported into the United States paid full duty. Within six years the beet-sugar output increased over 400 per cent.

But after Hawaii was annexed and we assumed control of the Philippines and Porto Rico we allowed sugar from these islands free admission to our ports. In addition, we granted Cuba a 20 per cent preference under our full duty sugar rates. Practically all nations having so-called colonies protect the sugar industry of the mother country either by levying full duty on imports or allowing colonies only a preferential.

The flood of free and concessionary sugar has been growing larger and larger each year, until at the present time they furnish over 99 per cent of the sugar entering our ports. In other words, concessions to our island Territories and to Cuba have resulted in less than 1 per cent of our current sugar arrivals paying full duty, as against 86 per cent in 1901.

Despite this handicap the production of sugar in the United States has increased 350 per cent in the past 28 years. But Cuba's increase has been nearly 700 per cent. Just now she is completing a sugar-grinding season with the largest output in her history, estimated at 5,200,000 long tons of raws. Of this great production she forced 70 to 80 per cent onto the American market regardless of cost. If we are to keep this enormous amount of sugar from being dumped in our markets at prices ruinous to the domestic industry, the remedy is to increase the sugar tariff. This method of equalizing costs is customarily used by sugar-producing nations in order to protect home industry. Thirty-one other countries have a higher rate on sugar than our existing tariff.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD, as Exhibit A, a summary of the foreign duties on imports of refined sugar from the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

(The table will be found at the end of Mr. RANSDELL's remarks as Exhibit A.)

Mr. RANSDELL. The sugar industry in the United States owes its existence to Government policy. It is unthinkable that, having aided in its establishment, the Government will now abandon the industry in the face of the worst competition it has ever known. Permit the domestic industry to decline, and it is not difficult to imagine a few men in control of foreign supplies exacting any price they see fit to name.

I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD, as Exhibit B, a short history of sugar tariff schedules since 1789.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

(The table will be found at the end of Mr. RANSDELL's remarks as Exhibit B.)

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY WORTH SAVING

Mr. RANSDELL. Seventeen States of the Union produce sugar beets on a commercial scale. California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming are all producing sugar beets. Louisiana, Florida, and Texas produce cane for sugar and molasses, while all Southern States produce some cane for sirup. The extent to which sugarcane is grown in the Southern States has never been realized, and I have secured figures from the Department of Agriculture showing the production which will certainly prove interesting to my southern colleagues, not only from the standpoint of past performances, but, more important, for future development. The figures follow:

State	Thousand gallons of sirup made		Acres used for making sirup		Per cent reported used for sirup 1928	Indicated total acres of cane	
	1928	1929	1928	1929		1928	1929
South Carolina	750	832	6,000	6,000	84	7,100	7,100
Georgia	4,060	4,536	29,000	28,000	84	34,500	33,300
Florida	1,440	1,871	8,000	9,000	—	9,900	26,500
Alabama	1,572	2,447	16,000	17,000	79	20,200	21,500
Mississippi	3,600	4,188	18,000	19,000	83	21,700	22,900
Arkansas	240	178	2,000	2,000	82	2,400	2,400
Louisiana	6,679	8,000	20,000	23,000	—	151,700	214,000
Texas	1,760	1,518	11,000	11,000	80	13,800	13,800
United States	20,401	23,600	110,000	115,000	—	261,300	326,100

While I have not the exact figures to show the value of this splendid product of sirup, I can assure you that it was at least 60 to 70 cents a gallon. So you see the value of the sirup crop in all of these Southern States was very, very considerable.

The figures on total acreage of cane in Florida were furnished by the commissioner of agriculture for the State of Florida, Mr. Nathan Mayo, and by the Dahlberg interests, which are interested in sugar production in that State.

The number of farmers growing beets in the United States is approximately 100,000, with 10,000 farmers in Louisiana alone engaged in growing cane for sugar production.

An industry that is stagnant or declining in 20 States of the Union carries its own appeal for preservation. The New England cotton textile and woolen industries have been losing ground for some years. But this is not regarded as a reason for abandoning but rather preserving these industries. Our domestic sugar industry has fallen upon hard times. It has had a past which marks a distinct epoch in the agricultural prosperity of the country and it will have a future if permitted to survive the competition of cheaper grown semitropical cane sugars.

In some quarters of the Senate the opinion seems to prevail that the producers of domestic sugar in asking for a higher rate of tariff are demanding preferential treatment or some sort of legislative gratuity. Nothing could be more inaccurate. A higher rate is urgently necessary for the simple and obvious reason that the domestic producers never have been sufficiently protected, nor will they be in the bill as it is now before this Senate. Nevertheless, the miserly increase which we propose to give will, in some small measure, at least, alleviate the conditions which are all too familiar to those who have the slightest knowledge of the situation within the sugar industry.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. The Senator referred a moment ago to the duties imposed by other countries upon sugar imported into their borders. Does the Senator propose to state any of the figures from that table?

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall do so later on in my address. I am glad the Senator asked the question. It is an exceedingly interesting one, and I will go into detail on it.

Mr. KENDRICK. I know that the figures surprised me, as one Member. I had no idea that so many other countries are imposing much higher duties on sugar imports than we are.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is very true. Not only that, but they are encouraging the domestic industry in other ways than by this duty.

Right at this point perhaps I should answer the Senator a little more fully by referring to Exhibit A, which has already been introduced.

I find from that appendix that Brazil imposes a duty of 17½ cents a pound. Think of it! Against our 1.76 cents proposed at the present time, Brazil imposes a duty of 17½ cents.

Italy imposes a duty of 12.7 cents per pound.

Spain, a duty of a fraction over 9 cents a pound.

Peru, a fraction over 6½ cents a pound.

Japan, something over 4½ cents a pound.

France, 4 cents a pound.

Germany, nearly 4 cents a pound.

Mexico, 3.8 cents a pound.

Argentina, 3.6 cents a pound.

England, 2.53 cents a pound plus a 2-cent bounty. It will be interesting to the Senate to know that whereas Britain produced no sugar 15 or 20 years ago, she now actually produces enough sugar in England to supply her people for 6 weeks; and how did she do it?

By imposing a duty of 2.53 cents a pound and giving a bounty of 2 cents additional, an aid to the extent of nearly 4 cents a pound, and the production of beets in old England is growing by leaps and bounds. Would that we might follow her wise steps in this respect.

Canada, a duty of practically 2 cents a pound.

Belgium, 1 cent a pound.

I am glad the Senator from Wyoming asked me the question.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, could the Senator give us the information in connection with the import duties of Germany?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes; I have that information. The rate of import duty in Germany is 3.84 cents per pound.

Mr. KENDRICK. Is it not true that Germany is now producing more than her domestic need in sugar?

Mr. RANSDELL. I believe that is true. I have a memorandum relating to Germany which I would be glad to read somewhat in detail:

Prior to December 18, 1928, the German rate of duty on raw sugar was \$1.40 per 100 pounds, and on refined \$1.62 per 100 pounds. The law effective on the above date, December 18, 1928, increased the rate of duty on raw sugar to \$2.27 per 100 pounds and on refined sugar to \$2.70 per 100 pounds, with the proviso that when the price of refined sugar on the Magdeburg exchange exceeds \$4.54 per 100 pounds the rates of duty revert to the rates of the act of August, 1925, namely, 86 cents per 100 pounds on raw sugar and \$1.08 on refined sugar.

In July of this year (1929) the above law was amended so as to permit an increase in the monthly average price on the Magdeburg exchange (which determines the reversion of the duty to the 1925 rate above named) to a price ranging from \$4.57 in January to \$4.829 in September each year; that is to say, under the law, as amended, the duty will not revert to the 1925 rate during the nine months from January to September until the average monthly price on the Magdeburg exchange reaches the higher figures named. For three months of the year, from October to December, the former turning point still applies; during these months the duty reverts to the 1925 rate when the average monthly Magdeburg exchange price exceeds \$4.54.

This explanation seems to indicate a duty of 2.70 cents a pound on refined sugar so as to insure a selling price of 4.82 cents. But if the price rises above 4.82 cents then there is a drop in duty.

Further answering the Senator's question, it is my understanding that Germany has developed a magnificent beet-sugar industry, which has not only been extremely profitable to its citizens but has done a great deal to promote a fine system of agriculture generally in Germany, for it is a well-known fact in agriculture that when beets are planted and thoroughly cultivated the roots penetrate a long distance in the ground, thereby aerating it and preparing it for a subsequent crop of grain or anything else.

The beet is an ideal crop for diversification. Such great success did Germany have in this particular, as I recall the figures, that a few years ago, when the average production of wheat in the United States was a fraction over 13 bushels per acre, the production in Germany was over 28 bushels per acre, a good deal more than double, because of the advanced methods of agriculture pursued by the Germans, and largely because they had the wisdom to build up a great beet-sugar industry.

The producers of domestic sugar in America ask nothing beyond reason. They plead merely that their enterprise is entitled to the same consideration that is being given to other branches of American agriculture.

I can not insist on this too strongly. We ask no favors; we ask simply to be treated as other branches of American agriculture are being treated in this bill. Give us that kind of treatment and we will be satisfied, but we insist upon that, and nothing less than the House rate of 2.4 cents a pound will give us anything like the fair treatment to which we are entitled.

There is no reason to believe that the representatives of the sugar producers of the United States who have appeared before the committees of the House and the Senate find anything pleasant or stimulating in their visits to Washington. They would far rather, I am sure, that conditions were such that it would not be necessary to ask Congress to interfere in their business. In other words, the producers of domestic sugar want, more than anything else, a stabilized enterprise. To-day they face a situation in which even a minute degree of stability seems impossible. They are confronted by factors over which they can exercise not the slightest control. To the normal conditions of chance, which are a part of all agricultural pursuits, they are burdened by an ever-increasing competition from Cuba and the Philippine Islands. If we grant the increase in the tariff which is now proposed, at least we offer some measure of stability and equality of competition. If we fail to enact these rates, we sacrifice an American agricultural enterprise and deny direct benefits to the American farmers in favor of a foreign enterprise which is conducted under conditions repugnant to anyone who has the slightest conception of the meaning of American standards of living.

SUGAR FARMING AS AN AID TO DIVERSIFICATION

We are forever dinging into the farmer's ears, diversify, diversify! Beet culture means double diversification; it enriches the soil, its pulp feeds directly into our dairy industry. But human beings engaged in the task of wrestling to extract a living from the crust of this planet have no interest in diversification as an abstract proposition. Our farmers can not and will not diversify unless they can expect a fair profit therefrom.

BEET CULTURE

Beet-sugar production, with proper tariff protection, can be materially increased in the West, thus relieving the surplus of grain and at the same time give to the farmer a money crop. The sugarcane output can be greatly expanded in the Gulf States by placing a considerable portion of the cotton land in

cane, thereby relieving the cotton surplus. There are available more than 2,000,000 acres—1,000,000 in Florida; 500,000 in Louisiana; 500,000 in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas—which can be successfully devoted to sugarcane culture in the South, provided we have adequate protection. The unappropriated market possibility is wider for sugar than any other important American farm commodity. In the case of sugar we have a deficiency production that would theoretically afford an 80 per cent market expansion.

On the subject of diversification President Coolidge, as recently as 1926, said:

The American farmer receives advice on every hand to diversify his crops. He proceeds to do so by going in for sugar-beet culture, protected from the competitive impact of cheap Cuban labor by a tariff of 1,7648 cents per pound on Cuban raws. The American farmer is thus in process of building up a great home agricultural industry which at once improves the farmer's soil, enables him to diversify his crops and tends to release the American people from dependence upon the foreigner for a major item in the national food supply. The farmer is entitled to share along with the manufacturer direct benefit under our national policy of protecting domestic industry.

It is most important that as a Nation we should be independent as far as we may of overseas imports of food. Further, it is most important that our farmers, by diversification of their production, shall have an opportunity to adjust their crops as far as possible to our domestic rather than foreign markets, if we would attain higher degrees of stability in our agriculture.

I am informed by the Department of Agriculture that the land which could be planted with sugar beets, if protection to the industry is continued, is capable of producing quantities of sugar far in excess of our domestic requirements. While we can not expect to arrive at complete direct or indirect displacement of our excessive wheat acreage by an increase in sugar-beet planting, yet in so far as this may be brought about it is undoubtedly in the interest of American agriculture, and, therefore, to our people as a whole. Furthermore, such diversification with sugar beets has great technical value in agriculture for its gains to fertility and other advantages.

Only recently, within the past few weeks, the chairman of the Federal Farm Board, Hon. Alexander Legge, speaking before a meeting of the American Farm Economics Association, recommended that the farmers of the Middle West should grow less grain and thereby eliminate the surpluses which have been the cause of their troubles. We, therefore, have the opportunity, here and now, to say to those farmers that we will assist in this transition by voting adequate protection so that they may profitably raise sugar beets as a part of the diversification plan suggested.

CORN SUGAR

There is a feature of this subject which directly concerns the farmers that has been given practically no thought. Very few people realize the extent to which sugar is being manufactured from corn. Through the newly developed and rapidly growing corn-sugar industry, the corn grower of the Middle West would benefit from an increased sugar tariff just as much as the beet and cane producers. Already millions of bushels of corn are finding a market in the refineries which make corn-sugar products. The Senators from the great corn States of America who have been leaders in the national movement to bring relief to the farming sections have a splendid opportunity to perform a real service for the corn farmer. I wish at this time to insert a statement from the Associated Corn Product Manufacturers, showing the production of corn sugar for six years ending with the year 1928:

Year	Amount	Approximate value	Bushels of corn represented
<i>Pounds</i>			
1923	484,000,000	\$16,000,000	16,200,000
1924	557,000,000	21,000,000	18,500,000
1925	535,000,000	20,000,000	17,800,000
1926	607,000,000	29,000,000	23,200,000
1927	807,000,000	32,560,000	29,900,000
1928	969,000,000	28,000,000	32,300,000

The production figures are taken from the reports of these manufacturers. The prices, which give approximate values, are intended to be the average for the years and for the various grades of sugar. The reason for the higher prices in the years 1927 and 1928 is because a larger proportion of refined sugar is included in the volume produced. The amount of corn reported is averaged for all grades of sugar.

These figures indicate the possibilities of providing a ready market for millions of bushels of corn, thus giving immediate relief to the corn farmers in the Middle West, both in providing

an outlet for the present production and of creating a greater demand for the future production.

How fine a thing it would be for this session of the Congress to do the fair thing by imposing a duty of 2.4 cents a pound on sugar and thereby greatly aid not only the producers of cane and beets, but of corn, greatly increasing the amount of the consumption of corn by making sugar of it. We are doing our utmost at this session of Congress to legislate in aid of agriculture and by this simple method we could aid three great crops, cane, beets, and corn, and not do injustice to anyone, as I shall show later on in my remarks.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. From the statement just made by the Senator from Louisiana I am wondering whether or not he is favoring and will contend for the House rate of 2.4 cents per pound as against the rate recommended by the Finance Committee of 2.20 cents per pound against Cuban sugar?

Mr. RANSDELL. I am contending with all the force in me and shall continue to contend for the House rate of 2.4 cents per pound, for nothing less would save the great sugar industry of my State. It has been in the slough of despond for several years and not a fraction of a cent less than 2.4 cents per pound will give us any material benefit.

Mr. HARRISON. As I gather the facts, there has been an increase in the production of sugar cane in Louisiana during the last three years due to the importation of a new kind of sugar cane which will fight off the mosaic disease. That is quite true, is it not?

Mr. RANSDELL. The cane-sugar industry in Louisiana is being revived, I am glad to tell the Senator, by the introduction of a cane known as P O J, which is resistant to disease, but we have not nearly reached our former production of cane. We have other diseases, I may say, such as the cane borer and the scale, which have not injured this new variety of cane.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it not the Senator's feeling, and is not that the general feeling in Louisiana, since the replacement of the old cane by this new kind of sugarcane in that State, the old cane being subject to the diseases mentioned by the Senator, that the crop is much better than it was and there is a much better feeling among the people engaged in the sugar industry?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes; the crop is better than it was and there is a better feeling. I had a letter just the other day from one of my friends who is a large sugar producer in Louisiana, who told me he is losing at least \$1 per ton on every ton of cane he is marketing at the present time. I would like to read to the Senator just a few figures.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment at that point?

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that the same cane is now planted and grown in Java and other similar countries just the same as it is in this country. All the advantage that we have from that cane those foreign countries have with the same class of cane. If reports are true, I am fearful we are going to have the same kind of borer get into that cane, but I hope not. The cane produced in Cuba and Hawaii is all one class of cane now. It is very much better now than it was years ago, but they are all on the same basis so far as cane is concerned.

Mr. RANSDELL. In further answer to the Senator, I have in my hand a paper prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture. It is shown in this table that in 1919 our production was something over 280,000 tons; in 1922 it was 324,000 tons; in 1923 it was 295,000 tons; in 1924, 162,000 tons; in 1925 it dropped to 139,381 tons; and in 1926 it dropped to 47,000 tons. In 1927 it came up to 70,000 tons, and in 1928 it was 132,000 tons. The Senator will see that we have not gone back to our old position by any means. Our people have been in great distress.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to my colleague, who is very familiar with the subject.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I merely wish to state, without giving the specific figures, that we had in the past produced as much as 360,000 tons of sugar in Louisiana. In 1926 we dropped down to 47,000 tons, which was reported in the year 1927 as stated by my colleague. We then got hold of a new variety of cane and from an average of about 6 or 8 tons per acre we have gone up to nearly 18 tons. Of course, our people are hopeful, and they are hopeful because of the result obtained this past year. In addition to that, the hope they have is that Congress will consider the cane farmer a real farmer and accord him

and his product the same consideration that the Senator from Mississippi and others on this side of the aisle have given to other farmers and their agricultural products. Our farmers are hopeful of getting that same relief.

May I say in addition to that that the Willett & Gray figure was an estimate, and that we are going to make more than 200,000 tons of sugar for the year 1929 with only half of our land in cultivation.

Mr. RANSDELL. Then my colleague feels very hopeful that the industry will revive and will produce a very large quantity of sugar if we get the protection which the House rate would give us?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes. Louisiana or any other State can produce sugar if we get the proper protection, but we can not produce sugar when Cuban sugar sells in the New York market at \$1.73.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the depression in the sugar business in Louisiana in 1927 was due to the fact that disease had invaded the sugarcane of that State and the production was so small that the people could not realize anything on it?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; that is not true at all. It was only a contributing factor. In other words, they were worse off when they had this disease taking their sugar than they were before, but they had also to contend against the low production cost in Cuba of \$1.50 per hundred pounds.

Mr. HARRISON. But the tariff of 1.76 cents a pound, which was then in force against Cuban sugar, was not the cause of the production of something over 300,000 tons in Louisiana dropping to forty thousand and odd tons in Louisiana in the year 1926?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Not at all.

Mr. HARRISON. The fact that it dropped to that very small amount at that particular time was because of the disease, which was one of the things, if not the controlling thing, that made the distress so bad in the sugar industry of Louisiana.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It was not the controlling thing, because the sugar-beet farmers have had the same experience.

Mr. HARRISON. They did not have the same experience in all the different parts of the country. There were some parts of the country where that distressed condition did not prevail.

Mr. RANSDELL. Emphasizing what my colleague has so well stated, I wish to state that the beet-sugar industry in the entire United States has been languishing for years. It has not been a growing, prosperous industry. Sugar in our colonies, like Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, has prospered, but it has not been successful in continental United States, and more so in Louisiana than in the beet regions, because it is more expensive to make sugar from cane than it is from beets, and the beets furnish a wonderful diversification which the cane does not.

Mr. HARRISON. How does the Senator explain, if that is true, that one sugar organization in the United States, which controls practically one-half of the beet-sugar production of the United States, has declared dividends during the last 10 years of over \$50,000,000?

Mr. RANSDELL. I know little about the statement the Senator makes. Perhaps the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] can better explain it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Utah will not deny that it is true.

Mr. SMOOT. What was the Senator's statement?

Mr. HARRISON. I say that the Great Western Sugar Co. during the last 10 years has declared dividends amounting to more than \$50,000,000. I am taking the word of Mr. Lippitt, the head of the organization.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, I thought the Senator was taking the word of—

Mr. HARRISON. No; I am not taking the word of the National City Bank, because Mr. Lippitt stated they were wrong in some of their figures and correct in other figures. Mr. Lippitt then stated as I am quoting, and later in the debate I shall show more in detail what he stated when he appeared before the committee, and I know the Senator will not contradict me. He did state that during the last 10 years the Great Western Sugar Co., which controls 48 per cent of the beet-sugar industry of the country, had declared dividends of more than \$50,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That all depends on the amount of money that may have been invested as to whether it is a large dividend or not. I am perfectly willing to put in the RECORD the whole statement of the company from beginning to end.

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to put its statements in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator asked why. They have advantages in a number of ways. Those advantages are as follows:

They are located in a section of the country where the great bulk of their sugar finds almost a local market, whereas most of the others have to pay freight to get the greater part of their sugar into the eastern market. Very little of the product of the Great Western Sugar Co. goes into the eastern market, because Omaha and surrounding cities near the mills consume the greater part of it. The Great Western Sugar Co. own their own railroad and pay no freight at all with the exception of the actual cost of the operation of the railroad, and the amount earned from the railroad, of course, contributes to the dividends that are paid by the sugar industry.

Then there is another thing that enters into it. During all the life of that company they have never had the white fly. They have had no destruction whatever of a crop. That is another great thing that has helped them. The only time they ever had any trouble that I know of was this year. This year they have had thousands and thousands of tons of beets frozen in the ground. Passing through there during the warm weather following the freeze, one could smell the beets as they lay rotting in the ground. Those beets will be a loss, though not a total loss, to the farmers and also to the companies themselves because they will not have those beets to grind.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will agree with me, will he not, on the proposition that the Great Western Sugar Co. is an exceedingly prosperous organization, efficiently managed and economically operated? We agree on that, do we not?

Mr. SMOOT. No doubt it is very favorably located and most efficiently managed.

Mr. HARRISON. One of the reasons that a good many of these companies do not make money is that they have located their plants in sections where the beets can not be raised economically. Is not that so?

Mr. SMOOT. If they had the advantage of the freight rate which the Great Western Sugar Co. has, I think very likely they could get along, although they could not make as much money as the Great Western Co. because of the fact that that company produces about 50 per cent of the beet sugar which is produced in the United States, as the Senator has stated.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. I call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that the \$50,000,000 in dividends covered a period of 10 years and, based on the capitalization, might still have represented a very low rate of interest.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say, in answer to that, that the facts disclosed in the statement show that the assets of the company now are many times greater than when it started in business, and it began in 1905 with a capitalization of \$30,000,000.

Mr. KENDRICK. The same thing to a very much greater degree might be said, and truly said, of the United States Steel Corporation. The Senator, I am sure, would not favor a proposal to put all the other steel companies out of business merely because the United States Steel Corporation, the greatest of them all, is unusually prosperous.

Mr. HARRISON. No; but may I say to the Senator I think that the yardstick that should be applied in arriving at the difference in the cost of production here and abroad in meeting competitive conditions should be with reference to efficiently managed organizations in this country. We should not take some sugar-beet industries in Indiana or in Ohio where the farmers can utilize their lands for the raising of crops that are far more profitable than sugar beets and where cheap labor can not be obtained, for instance, in sections close to Detroit, where labor is paid a higher wage than on the farm and can not be procured in the beet fields and factories. A concern so situated can not be taken as a yardstick, but we must take the economically operated and efficiently managed institution for such a purpose.

Mr. KENDRICK. Exactly; we agree about that; but, as the Senator from Utah has pointed out, we at least ought to be given the right to contend for decreased freight rates that will enable those engaged in this industry to build it up, and through this means help develop the country.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I am in thorough sympathy with that view, and I so voted with the Senators from the West with reference to freight rates; but the fact that the Great Western Sugar Co. has a railroad over which it can bring its beets to the factory is one of the factors which show highly efficient organization and good management, which if some of the other sugar-beet industries would follow they would probably also be prosperous.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Mississippi that what he says is true of every

business in the United States. The United States Steel Corporation, for instance, would not care very much whether there was any protection afforded on the products which it manufactures. The automobile factories would not care very much whether we had free trade in automobiles. I mean such automobile companies as General Motors. That company would not care a cent if automobiles were on the free list; but there are other automobile manufacturing companies that would care. If to-day, however, we should give the United States Steel Co. such rates as it says it would be perfectly satisfied with, it could control the whole business in the United States and the others would go out of business.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator from Utah to contend that we ought to apply as the yardstick for the necessity of protection some uneconomically and inefficiently operated institution in this country?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I should not so contend; but I do say that it would not do to take an institution which is making a profit, being located in a section of the country where the land is peculiarly adapted, say, to the growing of sugar beets, and which has an unlimited amount of money, most of which comes from Wall Street, as a yardstick for similar industries in all other sections of the country. That would never do. If it is desired to build up merely one section of the country, that is the way to do it; but the United States extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Lakes to the Gulf; and, so far as protection is concerned, I believe in protection for every industry, no matter where it may be carried on, whether it be in Mississippi or in any other State.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield until I can ask the Senator from Utah a question?

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. While the Senator from Utah is on his feet, as he is chairman of the committee, I should like to ask him a question so that we may know just where we are in this sugar controversy. Is the Senator going to contend for the 2.40 rate against Cuban sugars or is he going to contend for the 2.20 rate?

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to support the 2.20 rate, for the reason—and I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Louisiana and also with the Senator from Mississippi—that I believe with a rate of 2.20 the industry can live. Under such a rate, I believe even the small companies may make some return; at any rate, they will not lose money. I do not want the duty upon sugar a single penny higher than is absolutely necessary to maintain the industry and to make the United States, in so far as is possible, independent of other sugar-producing countries that so unmercifully robbed us during the World War.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, the Senator, either in spirit or by his vote, is going to stand for the rate of 2.40 cents as against Cuban sugar?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that; I said that I would support the 2.20 rate.

Mr. HARRISON. I am asking the Senator the question now.

Mr. SMOOT. I said I would support the rate of 2.20.

Mr. HARRISON. So the Senator, then, will not lend his influence in any way, as the Senator from Louisiana says he will, to those who are fighting for a rate of 2.40?

Mr. SMOOT. I told the Senator my position, and I am going to adhere to it; there can be no question about that.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, when the Senator makes the statement, that is all right, but the Senator will remember that the other day, during the consideration of the wool schedule, for instance, he did back water pretty quickly in connection with the duty on wool.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I will have to refuse to yield further, if Senators are going to discuss wool and other unrelated subjects. I am trying to confine myself to the subject of sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is right, but I should like, with his permission, to take a moment to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi as to wool. I am going to support the committee amendment in connection with the rate on sugar. I supported the committee amendment affecting the wool rates, because I made the report as chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I have the floor, and though I am sorry to interfere, I will have to proceed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a second?

Mr. RANSDELL. If the Senator means really for only a second, I will be delighted to yield to the handsome Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I know the Senator from Utah does not want to get the Record confused. The Senator says he supported the recommendation of the committee on raw, wool. The Record will show that he voted for a higher rate than the committee recommended. He did not stand by the recommendation of the committee in that instance.

Mr. SMOOT. I am glad the Senator has called my attention to that. As the Senator will remember, perhaps, at the time the vote was taken on the wool duty I was engaged in conversation with the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator will notice, however, that on every other vote during the consideration of this bill I have supported its provisions as reported by the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, I hope—

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield further.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, the production of corn sugar has been more or less referred to as relatively unimportant and not of sufficient volume to have any effect. Most people are astounded at the tremendous increase in corn-sugar production in the past five years, and the indications are that this increase will continue. In 1928, 32,300,000 bushels of corn were used to manufacture 960,000,000 pounds of sugar, representing in value \$28,000,000. Thus, it is not difficult to realize the interest that all corn farmers have in the increase of the tariff on sugar, for no one can question the fact that the use of 32,000,000 bushels of corn for sugar brought direct benefits to the farmers who sold their corn for this purpose and helped to enhance the price of the entire corn crop. Then, if the duty on sugar is increased, the corn farmer will certainly feel the benefit. I hope my friends in the Senate who are interested in corn sugar will think very carefully over this matter when they come to vote.

CONDITION AND HOPES OF LOUISIANA CANE FARMERS

As to the cane growers, the outlook for the expansion of the industry has not been so favorable in a decade as it is at present, provided an equalization of the present disadvantages in their competition with cheaper tropical sugar is effected through adequate tariff protection. The Louisiana cane growers are paid \$1, and a fractional part thereof, per ton of cane for each cent or fraction of a cent per pound of the New Orleans wholesale price of raw sugar. The proposed increase of 64 cents per hundred pounds of sugar as called for by the House bill would mean an increase of 64 cents per ton for their cane. It should be noted that at the present price of sugar in Cuba the price paid there for cane is approximately \$2.20 per ton, while in Louisiana the cane growers receive at the present price level less than \$4 per ton.

It is important to note, however, that Cuban sugarcane yields about 240 pounds of sugar per ton, while Louisiana cane yields about 145 pounds. The Cuban manufacturer pays about 1 cent per pound for sugar in the cane. The Louisiana manufacturer pays about 2.7 cents per pound. Taking into consideration the duty on Cuban raws of 1.76 cents per pound, the Cuban sugar manufacturer stands on an exact raw-material cost parity with the Louisiana manufacturer, but no one claims that the labor costs in the Louisiana factory are not in excess of the Cuban costs. Is there anything unfair, therefore, in a proposition that would tend to equalize the differences in factory labor costs as between the Cuban and Louisiana manufacturer?

IMPORTANCE OF BY-PRODUCTS

The cellular fiber of sugarcane after the juice has been pressed furnishes the basic raw material for the manufacture in Louisiana of synthetic lumber called celotex. Bagasse—sugarcane fiber—is proving an excellent substitute for lumber, with the consumptive demand spreading out fanlike. There are about 520 pounds of bagasse in a ton of cane, out of which is secured approximately 260 pounds of bone-dry fiber used in the manufacture of celotex. This gives an added value of 20 cents to 30 cents per ton to the cane, but this does not go to the grower.

The president of the Celotex Co. stated before the Senate Finance Committee that the demand for bagasse is growing by leaps and bounds, and added that with proper encouragement the cane-sugar industry in Louisiana could be made to yield 1,000,000 tons of sugar. The entire amount of cane sugar produced in the United States in 1926 was only 47,165 short tons.

We have interlocked with the cane industry a synthetic lumber industry which bids fair to replace to a large extent the dwindling timber resources of the Gulf States. Thus, our domestic cane-sugar industry is not only entitled to preservation as an old and established business that has earned its right to live, but it carries with it assured possibilities for the restoration of our dwindling timber resources. We have harvested crops of southern pine and cypress which took generations to grow.

Having spent our lumber resources prodigally we now employ as a satisfactory substitute for lumber the waste of a crop that can be brought to maturity in a year, instead of 50 years.

Furthermore, the expansion of the cane-sugar industry would bring up the output of another by-product—blackstrap molasses—to the rapidly expanding consumptive demands of the alcohol, mixed feeds, and yeast industries. About 50 gallons of blackstrap molasses are secured from a ton of cane, and which sell for 11 cents per gallon.

DANGER OF DEPENDENCE UPON FOREIGN MARKETS

It is not generally realized that if we fail to preserve our domestic sugar industry the price of sugar in the United States will be entirely in the hands of foreign producers. In 1920 the price of sugar in this country got out of hand and rose to over 20 cents per pound to the consumer. We have a choice between encouraging home production or exposing our consuming public to the hazards of a runaway market on price-manipulated foreign sugars.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the Senator ever estimated what the 1920 gouge cost the American people?

Mr. RANSDELL. I have not; but it was a very enormous sum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the American people had to pay the 1920 price for an entire year's consumption of sugar, I suspect it would cost them something like \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. RANSDELL. At least that, I will say to the Senator; I think more than that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the thing that the Senator is contending for is in reality an ultimate protection of the American people against paying more for sugar?

Mr. RANSDELL. Exactly that; building up a great domestic industry, furnishing labor for a large number of American citizens at reasonable prices, and holding this commodity, which we must have in order to maintain health, down to such a low price that it is really one of the cheapest articles of human food. That price certainly would go up enormously if we did not have the crop grown here in our own country, as all foreign countries realize, and as demonstrated by the tables I have just introduced showing the wonderful protection which they give to the production of sugar in their respective countries.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In fact, if we permit the domestic sugar industry in the United States to die, 120,000,000 people will be utterly at the mercy of a closely organized foreign importation of sugar.

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes, sir. I presume the most powerful monopoly on earth is the Cuban sugar monopoly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Therefore, if that should ever result the American breakfast table would be at the mercy of the dictation of foreign prices on sugar?

Mr. RANSDELL. Unquestionably, and we would "catch it in the neck" beyond any question. It is so easy to save us from that trouble by applying to this American business the same broad principles of protection which have generally prevailed in our land since the first tariff bill was enacted, imposing a duty on sugar in 1789, and which has given us some protection on sugar ever since. It would be a fatal economic policy to put sugar on the free list and place us in the power of those foreigners; and if we are going to put a duty on sugar, why not put on a reasonable duty that will make the business of our people fairly and legitimately remunerative? We are trying to do that in this tariff bill. We are trying to treat everyone fairly. Let us treat the sugar producers fairly.

I wish now to take a leaf out of the book of British experience. Some of us think the British are pretty wise people. Many of our ancestors came from that country. British agriculture for the past generation had sunk to low estate owing to the free import of cheap overseas grain. Twenty years ago diversification in agriculture became the great problem in Great Britain, just as it is in America to-day. In 1910 an effort was made to grow sugar beets in a small way in England. The World War affected the situation in two ways—it laid in ruins the nascent beet-sugar enterprise and it also brought home to the British the seriousness of their utter dependence on overseas nations for their sugar requirements. A beet sugar society was formed after the war and two beet factories, Kelham and Cantley, were established. Five thousand acres of land were put under beet culture.

The enterprise, of course, could not stand on its own legs when confronted with the competition of cheap continental beet sugar or with cane sugar produced in Cuba and Java. The Government had the alternative of retaining an extremely high customs tariff on sugar—4 cents per pound—or lowering the tariff duty with compensation by a direct subvention to the domestic industry. In 1925 Parliament passed the beet sugar subsidy act to run for a period of 10 years and reduced the customs duty on sugar. By that act a duty of 1.8 cents a pound was placed upon raw-sugar imports and a subsidy of 2 cents per pound granted the domestic sugar interests, which returned to them \$20,000,000 in 1928. Under Government support the number of beet-sugar factories has increased from 2 to 19; the number of acres laid down in beets has increased from 22,441 in 1924 to 229,000 in 1929, or a tenfold expansion in four years.

Why can not America do likewise? Why has our beet-sugar industry been practically at a standstill? If it is wise for the British to build up their industry a thousand per cent in 10 years, why not follow their example?

Factory labor employed has risen from 1,455 during the sugar season of 1924-25 to 8,768 in the season of 1927-28. A corresponding increase, of course, has taken place in the number of laborers profitably employed in beet culture. Government aid to the British sugar industry has brought up the domestic supply of sugar to a point where it suffices the British consumptive requirements for six weeks. Production of beet sugar in Great Britain has risen from 1,870 long tons in 1920 to 223,000 long tons in 1929.

Other countries appreciate the potentialities of sugar growing in their agrarian policies. Czechoslovakia lays a duty of 4½ cents a pound on imported sugar; Spain between 4½ cents and 5 cents; Brazil has no nonsense whatever about sugar imports, laying a duty of over 17 cents a pound on foreign sugars.

I ask permission at this point to have inserted in the Record, as Exhibit C, a table showing beet-sugar production in the United Kingdom for the period of time covered by the years 1928 and 1929.

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

(The table will be found at the end of Mr. RANSDELL's remarks as Exhibit C.)

Mr. RANSDELL. The cane-sugar industry in this country is almost as old as the American Union itself, dating back to 1795. Our beet-sugar industry began to assume commercial importance just about 50 years ago. Our domestic industry for the past two or three years has faced the most critical period in its development. The British, by boldly coming to the rescue of an essential industry, have within 10 years almost accomplished what it has taken us 50 years or more to accomplish, and that with the climatic advantages overwhelmingly on the side of the American industry. Our yield of domestic sugar last year in continental United States would suffice our consumptive requirements for about eight and one-half weeks as contrasted with the nascent British industry which within 10 years has become of sufficient importance to suffice consumptive requirements for six weeks.

That is not very flattering to us Americans. The British in 10 years build up a great industry, sufficiently large to supply them for six weeks, while we have been making cane sugar since 1795 and beet sugar for over 50 years, and still we make only enough to last us for about eight and a half weeks! It certainly is not a favorable showing.

LOUISIANA'S RECOVERY FROM AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION

Since 1922 the sugarcane industry in Louisiana has passed through a period of great depression owing largely to diseases, which greatly reduced the yield. The crop failures increased each year, until in 1926 production had reached a low mark of only 47,165 tons as against 324,429 in 1922. At first the farmers were unable to explain these reverses and blamed it on the weather, the soil, the labor, the lack of fertilizer, and every other possible cause. In the meantime, the Department of Agriculture had discovered that the mosaic disease had taken control of the cane fields of Louisiana and was the primary cause of the distressing conditions, though considerable damage was done by the borer and snail. After extensive research it was determined that the only salvation for the Louisiana industry would be the introduction of disease-resistant sugarcane, and accordingly P O J varieties of cane were introduced. Of course this could not be done in one year and the remarkable success which has met the efforts of the Department of Agriculture of necessity has come gradually. In the meantime, taxes, interest, and operating expenses had to be met. The financial losses of our sugarcane farmers from year to year have been enormous. But many of them refused to abandon the industry.

They made experiments with sorghum. They tried cotton and truck crops. They used better seed. They sent men to all parts of the world to study conditions in other sugarcane fields. And now they have reached a stage of wonderful progress from the agricultural standpoint, but the extraordinarily low prices of sugar caused by Cuban dumping have resulted in the nullification of all the years of experimenting and development since on the basis of present prices they can not raise sugarcane profitably. The Department of Agriculture has accomplished a great achievement in modern sugarcane production, but unless the grower can secure a price for his product equal to the cost, plus a living wage, all of this work will avail nothing and the sugarcane industry must fail completely in America.

A very close investigation made this spring by the American Sugar Cane League shows that 500,000 acres of highly cultivable land in Louisiana would go into sugarcane if we had adequate tariff protection. There are now about 215,000 acres in cane. The estimate for the crop of 1929 is 218,000 tons, which compares favorably, indeed, with 47,165 tons in 1926, which was the low-production year.

I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD, as Exhibit D, a table showing acreage and production of sugarcane in the United States from 1911 to 1928.

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

(The table will be found at the end of Mr. RANSDELL's remarks as Exhibit D.)

Mr. RANSDELL. As a result of the work of the Department of Agriculture the future is inviting for sugarcane culture, provided the American farmer can secure a fair price for his product. It was not thought possible that the price of sugar could go as low as it did in June, 1929, when it reached 1.625 cents per pound delivered in New York, exclusive of duty; and it is against this situation that the cane grower asks for protection.

There has been a tendency to accept statements concerning the deplorable conditions of the sugarcane farms in Louisiana with a mental reservation that all persons seeking tariff increases seek to paint the picture as dark as possible. But I make an earnest plea that you allow no such impression to be gained of the situation in Louisiana. Every possible deterrent and setback which could come to any farmer has beset the path of the sugarcane growers of south Louisiana. The crops which fell off to 15 per cent of previous years alone present a situation that no other farming industry has had to face. On the 136 sugar factories in Louisiana in 1915, representing millions of dollars of investment, 132 were in operation in 1918, 91 in 1925, and only 55 in 1928.

The floods of 1927 came as a final blow to further stagger these courageous American citizens. But most discouraging of all has been the extremely low price of sugar brought about by the unjustified dumping of foreign sugars on the American market. These discouragements have tried the very souls of my people, but through it all they have looked with confidence to the future based upon their faith in the Government of the United States and its policy of protection to industry and to agriculture alike. They have a right to expect the sympathetic consideration of Congress, already fully justified by the action of the House of Representatives, and I trust their existence as farmers will not be denied them by the Senate. They need at least 2.4 cents per pound and have a right to expect it.

Possibly the Senator from Utah is correct when he says that the beet-sugar farmer can live and not make money on 2.2 cents a pound, but I say the Louisiana cane grower can not live, can not exist on that rate. He must go out of business if he does not receive at least 2.4 cents per pound.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Jardine, appeared before the Senate Finance Committee to make a plea for more than 100,000 farmers who grew sugar beets and cane. He reviewed the work that had been done by his department in ascertaining the remedies for mosaic, borer, and root diseases and providing resistant varieties of cane. The Bureau of Entomology has made an extensive study of the sugarcane borer in recent years, an insect which has caused losses of as high as 25 per cent of the crop. Parasites have been brought in to exterminate this pest. A similar work was done in the beet fields, where the insect pests were cutting down production. The Secretary reviewed the work of the department in regard to diversification and crop rotation, to which both beets and cane lend themselves very profitably. In addition to this there have been the improved methods resulting from research, soil survey, and fertilizer tests, experiments in juice clarification for the production of sirups and molasses, and laboratory controlled methods seeking to obtain better quality in production and greater efficiency in processes. To this must be added the scientific work looking to the utilization of by-products of beets and cane.

All of these features show a development with magnificent possibilities, and the large sums of money appropriated by Congress for this purpose and judiciously spent by the Department of Agriculture, have been entirely justified. But, as Secretary Jardine suggests, all of these accomplishments and this work, which is still going on, can serve little purpose unless the farmer is reasonably sure of being able to meet foreign competition, with its low costs and cheap labor, on an equal basis in the American market.

SUGAR CHEAPEST FOOD

Sugar provides about 13 per cent of all the energy obtained from food consumed by the people of the United States. This includes sugar used in candies, sweet drinks, and foods not prepared in the home. When used in proper proportions to other foods sugar is a valuable article of diet. As a source of fuel, sugar is extremely economical, a pound yielding 1,820 calories of energy. At 6 cents a pound it provides 100 calories of energy for one-third of a cent, a figure which is lower than that for almost any other familiar food material. The next cheapest staple food commodity, potatoes, may be had at a cost of 1 cent for 203 calories. The cost for roast beef is 1 cent for 80 calories; cheese 1 cent for 83 calories.

While sugar supplies 13 per cent of the energy or fuel value of the foods consumed in the United States, the retail cost is only 6 per cent of the total expenditures for food, as shown by chart hereto attached as Exhibit F.

To bring home the importance of these facts, attention is called to the figures which show that while meats provide 22 per cent of energy, they cost 29 per cent of the total expenditure. Milk and dairy products, producing 15 per cent energy, cost 19 per cent. Poultry and eggs, while furnishing only 2 per cent of energy, cost 7 per cent of the total spent.

In fact, bread and cereals are the only foods which compare favorably with sugar in this regard, as they represent 35 per cent of the energy value and cost 13 per cent of the money value.

It would be well for those who are so solicitous as to the welfare of the consumer to make a careful study of these facts, remembering that, based on the price of 1913, prior to the World War, sugar is one of the very few foods used daily on the dinner table that does not show a large increase.

Raw sugar to-day is relatively the cheapest food commodity the American householder purchases. The price commodity index of sugar stands at the pre-war (1913) commodity index of 100, whereas general commodities which the farmer must buy—fertilizer, agricultural implements, labor, clothing, household utensils—register 140. It insults the intelligence of the producer to tell him to increase his output of sugar for which you are willing to pay him 100 and demand that he pay the public which consumes his sugar 140 for everything he buys. Reduced to its simplest terms, it is a proposition of either encouraging through tariff help a languishing industry which is indispensable to the prosperity of 20 States, or allowing this branch of American agriculture to be submerged by the foreign tide of cheap tropical sugars. Such a course is quite inconsistent as judged by the tariff aid demanded and freely given to American industrial enterprises threatened with extinction by the impact of foreign competition.

The per capita consumption of sugar in the United States in 1928 was approximately 104 pounds; the average retail price was 7.1 cents, according to the latest reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The average size of family was 4.3 persons, according to the census of 1920. Sugar for such a family, figured on the above basis, would cost \$31.73. A comparison between the expenditures for sugar and other articles of food can be quite readily made for farm families, and it will be interesting to show the cost of sugar compared with other articles of human food.

The average quantity and value of the various foodstuffs consumed in one year by 1,331 farm families of selected localities in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, and Ohio during 1922 and 1923 has been computed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and is published on page 1154 of the 1927 Yearbook of Agriculture. These families averaged 332 pounds of sugar per year, valued at \$32.35. This was 5.2 per cent of the total value of foodstuffs of \$615.97. The value of sugar was about that of wheat flour and less than that of pork, poultry, eggs, milk, cream, or butter. The value of foodstuffs in this analysis includes both farm-grown and purchased articles. Purchased foods constituted 33 per cent of the total value; consequently, on the basis of purchased goods alone sugar would be about 15 per cent.

The comparison in the case of urban families can not be so readily made. The last nation-wide survey of the cost of living was made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1918-19. This covered 12,096 families in 92 communities. The average quantities of foodstuffs which these families used in a year are given

in Bulletin 357 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Cost of Living in the United States, on pages 118-119. This gives the average quantity of granulated sugar purchased per family as 147.5 pounds. There are no published corresponding value figures.

If, however, the average retail price of sugar of 9.7 cents for the United States in that year, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is taken as the purchase price of this sugar, the total expenditure for sugar was about \$14.31 per family. This would be about 2.6 per cent of the total expenditures for food of \$548.51, reported on page 5 of the bulletin. Since the period covered by this survey, the consumption of sugar has increased markedly in the United States, but the retail price of sugar is now almost one-half of the 1918 price and about the same as its lowest level in 1913.

As previously noted the price of sugar to-day is approximately at the pre-war—1913—level, while the general commodity price ranges around 140. That is to say, in the general upsurge of prices following the outbreak of the Great War sugar is the one important food commodity which displays no upward movement in price. It is more than a question of economic expediency, it is a question of social justice. Fair-minded people do not ask a profit at the expense of sweated labor, whether in factories or on farms. How much longer are we willing to consume cheap sugar to the detriment of fellow Americans who produce it?

COST OF PRESERVING THE DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY

Granting that the domestic sugar industry must be preserved, what price shall we have to pay? The present tariff on sugar costs the ultimate consumer \$221,000,000, but it brings in an annual net revenue to the Government of \$133,000,000, which is the average for the 5-year period of 1923-1928. The cost under the Hawley bill to the ultimate consumer would approximate \$298,000,000 with estimated revenue \$160,000,000. Under the Senate bill, the cost would be \$273,000,000, with estimated revenue \$146,000,000. Authorities who ought to know better have assessed the increased cost of sugar under the House and Senate bill as an intolerable burden laid upon the consumer.

One hundred and twenty million consumers of sugar in this country, in one form or another, are obtaining refined sugar now at about 5 cents per pound, the cheapest important commodity which can be obtained on the American market. One asks, however, if we are really interested in adjusting the balance of inequality to the American farmer as contrasted with the industrialist up to the point of making the small sacrifice of paying a fair price for one of the farmer's products. The present price is unfair to the domestic producer. Sixty-four hundredths of 1 cent a pound represents the difference between treating him fairly and treating him unfairly.

On the basis of a population in the United States of 120,000,000, and a per capita consumption of around 100 pounds per year, the total United States sugar bill under the present law when the cost and freight price of raw sugar is 2 cents, which is approximately correct, and the rate of duty 1.7648 would be about \$607,000,000 refined basis. If the cost and freight price were 2 cents and the rate 2.40, as in the House bill, the sugar bill would be about \$684,000,000; and with the cost and freight price of sugar 2 cents and the rate of duty 2.20 cents, as in the Senate bill, the total sugar bill would be about \$660,000,000. That is, the total approximate cost of sugar in the United States under the Senate bill would be \$53,000,000 more than under the present law and \$77,000,000 more under the House bill.

The above calculation is based upon the assumption that each individual in the United States actually consumes, in round figures, 100 pounds of sugar per year and that the entire duty is reflected in the cost of sugar. As a matter of fact, about one-third of the sugar consumed in the United States enters into the manufacture of confectionery, canned goods, carbonated beverages, and so forth, the prices of which, according to the testimony before the committee, will not be advanced by an increase in the rates of duty on sugar. The following testimony was offered before the Senate Finance Committee by Mr. Junior Owens, Washington, D. C., representative of the American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages:

Senator SMOOT. In these 5-cent bottles what is the content?

Mr. OWENS. Six and one-half ounces up to nine ounces. That is per bottle.

Senator WATSON. Six and one-half ounces to the bottle, and there are 12 bottles in a case?

Mr. OWENS. Twenty-four bottles in a case.

Senator SMOOT. Now, in that 6½ ounces how much sugar is in weight?

Mr. OWENS. There is 6 pounds of sugar used to a gallon of syrup, and a gallon of syrup will make 5 cases of beverages, which is 120 bottles.

Senator SMOOT. That is 1½ pounds of sugar?

Mr. OWENS. To the case.

Senator SMOOT. And a case is 24 bottles?

Mr. OWENS. Yes, sir.

Senator SMOOT. That would be about five one-hundredths of an ounce in a bottle?

Mr. OWENS. I did not figure it.

Senator SMOOT. I was trying to figure out what the 64-cent increase in sugar would cost per bottle, that is all; and it got so small that I could not do it.

This testimony remains uncontradicted.

Only about two-thirds of the consumption of sugar, or 65 pounds per capita, the average quantity consumed per person in the home, will be increased in price to the consumer, making the cost of sugar per individual in the home approximately \$3.28 per year under the present law, \$3.70 under the House bill, and \$3.58 under the Senate bill. Therefore, the rate in the House bill will cost each consumer about 42 cents per year more than the present rate, and the Senate bill will cost him about 30 cents per year more than the present rate, or an increase of less than 1 cent per week under either bill. Considering the cost of sugar per annum on the basis of a family of five, the sugar bill under the present law is approximately \$16.40; under the House bill it would be \$18.50; and under the Senate bill \$17.90, an annual increase for the entire family of \$2.10 under the House bill and \$1.50 under the Senate bill. This very small amount of less than a cent a week means the difference between disaster and prosperity to our domestic sugar producers. Surely no one will begrudge such a small amount to them.

Referring again to the statement that the proposed increases in rates of duty on sugar will not be reflected in the price of certain products the following evidence is submitted:

According to the testimony before the Finance Committee of the Senate about 12,000,000,000 bottles of carbonated beverages are made and consumed annually in the United States. Three hundred thousand tons of granulated sugar are used annually in this industry, or 6 pounds of sugar for each 120 bottles of carbonated beverages made, or one-twentieth of a pound of sugar per bottle. At a cost of 6 cents per pound of sugar, which is a little above the present wholesale price, the sugar per bottle would cost about three-tenths of a cent. The increase proposed in the Senate rate of duty would increase the cost of sugar per bottle only twenty-two one-thousandths of 1 cent and in the House bill only thirty-two one-thousandths of 1 cent, an increase in either case so small that it could not possibly be added to the price per bottle.

Again assuming that on an average one-half pound of sugar is used in making 1 pound of the various kinds of candies and confectionery produced in the United States, the sugar cost per pound of candy and confectionery averages approximately 3 cents, an increase of forty-four one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound in the rate of duty on sugar in the Senate bill would add twenty-two one-hundredths of 1 cent to the cost per pound, and the increased rate of sixty-four one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound in the House bill would add thirty-two one-hundredths of a cent per pound to the cost of the finished products. The witnesses before the committees admitted that these insignificant increases in cost would not be added to the prices of candy and confectionery.

RELATION OF CONSUMER TO PROTECTIVE TARIFF

The general proposition of the relation of the consumer to the protective tariff and the effect that increased costs might have upon him was the subject of a timely statement recently issued by representatives of six national agricultural organizations, aggregating in membership over 2,000,000 farmers, entitled "The Consumer and the Protective Tariff." I ask that this statement be printed as Exhibit E to my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed as an exhibit.

THE CUBAN ATTITUDE

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, there is a menace to domestic sugar production that has developed through the evident determination of Cuban sugar producers to deluge the United States market with their output, whether or not they sell it here for less than cost. Competition of such a character is similar to the assault of a man who has decided that he will inflict injury on his opponents regardless of coincident injury to himself.

Ordinary protective measures do not effectually guard an industry against such competition. All the protection which Congress gave the domestic sugar industry in 1922, on the assumption that costs of production were being equalized, has been nullified by this insensate and sacrificial assault on the United States sugar market. It must be apparent that a tariff on sugar

adequate to protect the American industry when the duty equalizes the difference in costs of production, must prove disastrously inadequate if the foreign competitors disregard their costs and dump their sugar into this country as they are doing to-day.

Congress has been called together in special session to formulate legislation of benefit to the farmers of the United States. This special session represents a conscientious attempt on the part of President Hoover to fulfill his most important campaign pledge. And a similar pledge was made by his opponent, Governor Smith, in accord with the platform of his party.

In a direct sense the sugar producers are farmers. I represent, in part, several thousand Louisiana cane growers, with whose problems I am familiar. My father was a sugar planter, and in my young manhood I assisted in the cultivation of cane and the manufacture of sugar. Some of these farmers cultivate large acreages; most of them are men who cultivate small areas in sugarcane, who work in the fields with their own hands, and so do their sons. They are absolutely typical of that industrious, inarticulate farming element in our country that is recognized as entitled to relief at the hands of Congress.

A policy that coddles the Cubans on the one hand, and, on the other, leads our United States farmers to grow surpluses with all the difficulties attendant upon the disposal of such surplus production is indefensible, illogical, and uneconomic. Why the wishes of the Cuban sugar producers should receive the distinguished consideration they obtain is beyond my comprehension. The island of Cuba is as completely a foreign country as is the island of Java. The Cubans pay no taxes in the United States; they are bound by no United States laws in restraint of their exploitation.

Through the enjoyment of a low, inadequate, and preferential tariff Cuba pours its sugars into this country and throws out of employment our laborers and farmers quite as effectively as if their low-grade workers of all hues and shades came in here themselves and did the work of production in the United States.

They stultify our immigration laws; they appear before our Congress and plead for themselves as against American farmers and producers; by preventing sugar production in the United States and thus encouraging production of crops of which we have a surplus, they involve us in intricate problems of legislation so difficult that the skeletons of efforts at their solution mark the congressional trail of the past 26 years. What Cuba has cost the people of the United States since we gave it freedom from the Spanish yoke at the cost of our blood and treasure is beyond computation.

Unless Cuba expects to throttle the domestic sugar industry there is no just basis for its opposition to the rates which are proposed in this measure. Cuba, as everyone in this Chamber knows, is granted a reduction of 20 per cent under the rates of duty which are imposed against other sugar-producing nations of the world. Under the Fordney-McCumber rates this preferential amounts to 44 cents a hundred pounds—perhaps a fraction more. Under the rates carried in this bill the preferential is extended to 55 cents a hundred. In short, the virtual monopoly which Cuba exercises in the import sugar market is strengthened still further.

Except, possibly for Java, this island already produces sugar cheaper than any other country in the world. She could compete with profit even if the entire world rate of duty were levied against her product. But we make no such proposal. We make no attempt to cripple Cuba or her industries. On the contrary, it is proposed to enlarge the measure of solicitude which we have bestowed upon the island for more than a quarter of a century.

Cuba has been receiving preferential treatment at the hands of our Government since 1903. During that time she has reaped a harvest of gold through our policy, but should she arrogate to herself the right to monopolize the American market she may shut in her own face the floodgates of that golden harvest. The same power which placed Cuba in her present favored position may remove her from it. Rumblings of such a sentiment were heard in this body recently when a motion was offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] to recall our reciprocity agreement with Cuba. It is well known that such a bill, if offered under appropriate circumstances, may receive favorable consideration.

I submit, Mr. President, that Cuba can object to the rates embraced in this schedule only if she has evolved some sinister plan to dominate not only the world import market but the American market as well. To put it briefly, Cuba can object only if she intends to kill the domestic sugar industry in the United States.

Mr. President, I desire now to mention some features of the sugar industry which seem to have been overlooked in the con-

troversy raging around the sugar schedule. They relate to the industry's value to the railroads of the country—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I take it from the Senator's remarks that he has concluded that portion of his speech which deals with Cuba?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Is the Senator going to discuss the Philippine situation with reference to sugar?

Mr. RANSDELL. I had not intended to do so at this time. If the Senator wishes to ask me any questions about it I will try to answer them, but otherwise I do not intend to go into it at this time.

Mr. BORAH. The only question I would ask at this time is a general one and that is, How can we make a duty on sugar effective for producers in the United States when we have free trade with the Philippines?

Mr. RANSDELL. I understand from supposedly well-informed persons that the Philippines can not make a great deal more sugar than they are making now. That was recently testified before the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, by Secretary of State Stimson, confirmed by Gen. Frank McIntyre, who went on to say that in their judgment at present, unless there is a very material change, the Philippines have about reached the maximum of their production of sugar. They gave a recital about some very powerful companies which had tried to produce cane sugar there on a large scale, but had not been successful.

I do not look upon the Philippine situation with anything like the dread that I do upon the Cuban. As I understand it, Cuba makes about ten times as much sugar as the Philippines at the present time and is susceptible of making perhaps a good deal more. I have in my hand a table showing the production of the Philippine Islands in 1927 as 567,000 tons. In the same year Hawaii produced 745,000 tons, Porto Rico 596,000 tons, Java 2,359,000 tons, and Cuba 5,000,000 tons. If those proportions are going to be continued, the Senator will see the danger is very much greater from Cuba at the present time than from the Philippines.

Some very learned gentlemen contend that the Philippines can produce a great deal more sugar, and the Secretary of State may be entirely wrong in his view of it. My colleague presented a learned discussion of this subject on the floor of the Senate some time ago, in which he expressed the view that the Philippines could and would produce a great deal more sugar if we do not have restrictions against them. I would like to add to that statement that, whether they can or not, they can get my vote to-morrow to be entirely separated from this country. I am willing to vote for their independence at once. I would be delighted to vote freedom for the Philippines, entirely aside from the sugar question; as I believe they desire it and are entitled to it.

Mr. BORAH. Without desiring to continue the discussion unduly at this time, it will be recalled that General Wood was of the opinion that the Philippines could, if they so desired and were encouraged properly, produce 5,000,000 tons of sugar.

Mr. RANSDELL. I recall that statement.

Mr. BORAH. While General Wood's figures may have been large, I do not see why the Philippines can not increase their production to a very great figure. They have the labor; they have the soil. All they need would be the market, and with our added duty to sugar there would be every reason for them to be encouraged to go forward.

Mr. RANSDELL. I do not know, but as a matter of fact they have not increased their production.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes, they have.

Mr. RANSDELL. Not very materially. They have not gone forward like Cuba has, for instance. They have increased it somewhat.

Mr. BORAH. They have increased it from about 150,000 tons to something like 650,000 tons.

Mr. RANSDELL. My latest figures were 567,000 tons.

Mr. BORAH. But there was a reason why they could not increase it at that time and under those circumstances. If the market were at hand, there is no reason why they should not increase it.

Mr. RANSDELL. Possibly so, and anything I can do to remove Philippine sugar from competing with our domestic sugar will be done.

Mr. BORAH. The thought that is in my mind is that the sugar-beet men in the United States can not produce sugar in competition with the raiser of sugar cane in the Philippines.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator is probably right.

Mr. BORAH. And therefore laying on a duty, so long as we have free trade with Philippines, does not seem to me to be of any great benefit to the American producer.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator is possibly right in that statement.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. With pleasure.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I wish to state in connection with the question asked by the Senator from Idaho that I studied the question and delivered a speech here on it some time ago. I found that although the Secretary of State testified before the Finance Committee along the lines my colleague has stated, still that statement did not at all agree with the documents issued by the Philippine government officials themselves, wherein they claim their ability to produce sugar is almost limitless. The reason why they did not develop it, I will say to my colleague, is not that they could not do it, but that for years there had been a deadlock between the legislature and the governor in the Philippine Islands.

There is still pending here the question of whether or not and when we shall give them their independence. American capital would not go out there to develop the sugar industry with the legislature in discord with the highest officials sent there by the United States Government, and otherwise there could be no development. But if we were to declare a policy or if we were to procrastinate in our present policy since Governor Stimson has adjusted all the differences between the legislature and the head of the government sent there from the United States, and if the idea gains ground that we are going to keep them any length of time, there will be a rapid and drastic development, as was shown in the case of Cuba when our Cuban policy in this country was adopted and clearly defined.

Mr. RANSDELL. I thank my colleague for his contribution to my remarks.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit me to ask his colleague a question?

Mr. RANSDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to ask how we can help the American producer of sugar by levying a duty on that commodity so long as the Philippines are sending it into this country free? Can we hope to compete with the Philippines with their rich soil, tropical climate, and the cheap and abundant labor?

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator will recall that I made every effort I could to provide a solution for that situation. The conclusion I reached was that until we grant the Philippines their independence we ought to tax them and refund the money thus obtained to their treasury. Of course, that proposal did not carry here, but I have said that I would urge it again.

I think that we can afford temporary protection to our people by increasing the present rate, and then proceed with the hearings which the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs is to hold, beginning on the 15th of the present month, looking to granting the Philippines their independence as quickly as we can. In the face of the hearings soon to be held, I will say to the Senator from Idaho that capital can not be induced to go over to the Philippines and develop the sugar industry there. We should redeem the pledges made by so many Senators to grant the Philippines their freedom. That could be done within 12 months or 18 months or 2 years or 3 years; if the time were fixed, no capital would go there; and in the meantime we would be protecting our people if we should levy increased tariff rates.

We must either get rid of the Philippine Islands or we must tax them. I do not think the American farmers are going to continue to be satisfied to be in competition with the agricultural products of the Philippines and at the same time being made to pay for the privilege granted the manufacturers to deal with them. We ought to turn the Philippines loose or, if not, we should tax them.

Mr. BORAH. But, as a practical proposition, Mr. President, I see very little chance of independence; and, as a practical proposition, I see no chance of taxing them while we are controlling them. The former I would like to see, but we could hardly lay a duty so long as they are under our control.

Mr. BROUSSARD. What is the solution the Senator would propose?

Mr. BORAH. From my viewpoint, I do not think the American producer of sugar can compete with the Philippines in the production of sugar. I think the Philippines have the acreage, the labor, and the capacity to produce sugar upon a stupendous scale.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. BORAH. Therefore I find some difficulty in justifying a vote for increasing a duty which the Philippines and the Hawaiians and the Porto Ricans do not need and the benefit of which the Americans will not get.

Mr. RANSDELL. May I ask the Senator if he is prepared at this time to suggest a method that would make the increased duty effective, and if he would apply such method now not only to the Philippines but to our other insular possessions, such as Porto Rico and Hawaii?

Mr. BORAH. I take it the only way we could reach it would be through a bounty. Of course, we could not discriminate in that respect against Porto Rico and Hawaii, but we could apply it as against the Philippines; that is to say, we could apply the bounty to our production.

Mr. RANSDELL. Personally I would be very much opposed to a bounty, and I should dislike very much to see our possessions such as Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands treated differently from continental United States. However, we may be able to work that out.

Mr. BORAH. I do not contemplate treating them differently, because I regard them as part of the United States; but the Philippines are in an entirely different situation, and it is the Philippines which are the disturbing factor.

I understand that the Senator does not want a bounty, and I understand that generally a bounty is not desired, but what I want to ask those who are requesting us to vote for an increased duty is to show us how it is going to benefit the American producer so long as we have free trade with the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Philippine Islands could expand their sugar industry, as some people think they can, of course that would always be a menace to the industry in the United States, but there has been no increase so far as production is concerned in that new lands in the Philippine Islands are being utilized, but they are putting in new mills. At the present time one of the largest mills is going up in the Philippines that has ever been erected there—a mill of 5,000 tons capacity a day.

I have the identical feeling that the Senator from Idaho has in relation to the Philippines, but if we are to believe the testimony which has been given, the reports which have come of late to the State Department, and the statements of those who have visited the islands, there is not very much chance of greatly increased sugar production in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, upon what theory does the Senator so assume?

Mr. SMOOT. Upon the theory—

Mr. BORAH. However, we are taking the time of the Senator from Louisiana, which I do not desire to do.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am very glad to yield. The discussion is throwing a great deal of light upon a very dark subject.

Mr. BORAH. It is a very dark subject, but I am not so sure about light being thrown upon it.

Mr. RANSDELL. Well, I hope the Senator's remarks will be productive of good. I myself would join the Senator in giving independence to the Philippines. We would all get relief if that could be done, including our other insular possessions, and I will join the Senator from Idaho whenever he moves in that direction.

Mr. President, I have just a few words more to say.

FAR-REACHING IMPORTANCE OF SUGAR INDUSTRY

I desire to mention some features of the sugar industry which seem to have been overlooked in the controversy raging around the sugar schedule. They relate to the industry's value to the railroads of the country, to the reduction of our farm surplus crops, thus aiding in farm relief, the close tie between beet growing and livestock production, and the great importance of sugar beets on the western reclamation projects.

For every acre of sugar beets harvested the railroads receive from \$35 to \$40 gross revenue in freight charges on beets, sugar, molasses, pulp, lime rock, and other supplies used in the process.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. The Senator referred to the connection between the beet-sugar industry and reclamation. I believe that every representative of the West on this floor will agree to the statement that the beet-sugar crop is the most important agricultural crop in the Rocky Mountain region. It is proving to be one of the very few agricultural crops through which the people of the arid-land States can return to the Federal Government the cost of the reclamation projects.

Mr. RANSDELL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I do not disagree with the statement just made by the Senator from Wyoming that sugar beets are an important crop and that beet sugar is entitled to protection. The only thing I want to be sure of is that it gets the protection which I may vote. I do not wish to increase the duty if the benefit to the producer in the United States is not apparent.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have no doubt that is the Senator's attitude.

I should like to say a word further, Mr. President, as to the connection of this particular crop with other agricultural crops, and especially the grain crops.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield further to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. There was in the morning newspaper a statement made, I believe, by Mr. Stone, a member of the Federal Farm Board, in which he pointed out that one of the fundamental policies necessary in bringing relief to agriculture was through a reduction of the acreage of grain. Here is a crop, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out a few moments ago, that will stand an expansion of 80 per cent, and nearly every bit of the land used in the production of sugar beets may be substituted for lands used in the production of grain.

Mr. RANSDELL. And it will furnish a great deal of traffic for our railroads, as I shall proceed further to show. Speaking about the railroads, I say what I have mentioned does not include the revenues realized by the carriers from the tremendous livestock feeding operations centering in the sugar-beet raising districts. The pulp and beet tops together with alfalfa hay, corn, beet molasses, barley, and cottonseed cake make an excellent fattening ration for lambs and steers. A conservative estimate places at 2,500,000 lambs and steers the livestock annually finished for market with beet by-products in the sugar-growing districts of the United States. The value of the resultant fertilizer for maintenance of soil productivity hardly need be pointed out, nor the market thus afforded to growers of livestock and of alfalfa hay. All these things add enormously to the earnings of the railroads, and the destruction of the beet-sugar industry would mean their destruction.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, recurring to the reference made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] to the statement of Mr. Stone, a member of the Federal Farm Board, I observe that Mr. Stone has exactly the same kind of a remedy for the troubles of the cotton growers; he has the same solution; that is to grow less cotton, to restrict the acreage of cotton. That is the same remedy which has been tendered by the opponents of farm relief ever since we have had the problem before us here—to grow less wheat. That is very good advice, but I wonder what kind of substitute these experts can offer as a product of the dry lands of the West which are not capable of irrigation or which have not yet been irrigated, if they are even capable of irrigation?

In my State of the 80,000,000 bushels of grain which we raise about 65,000,000 bushels are raised on dry land. The amount of grain that is raised on irrigated farms is rather inconsequential. The farmers who raise wheat throughout the entire Northwest would be very glad to find some other possible crop, but those who are familiar with the situation, as is the Senator from Wyoming, realize that sugar factories will not be established in any localities except localities where irrigated lands may be made productive. They will take no chances whatever upon the establishment of sugar factories in localities where dependence must be had upon the produce of dry farms.

I always thought that the suggestion, frequently emanating from people doing business in Wall Street and adjacent thereto,

that the proper solution for the farmer's trouble is to grow less wheat or to grow less cotton was a rather cold-blooded kind of suggestion.

The same difficulty has arisen, Mr. President, in connection with the effort to suppress the production of opium. Estimable people, with the very best intentions, would like to prohibit the production of opium all over the world except in such quantities as are essential for medicinal purposes, and the problem is presented as to what the producers of that article in Turkey, in Persia, and in India will grow in place of opium. One of the great problems that confront the governments of those countries is as to what kind of crop can be substituted.

What are we going to do with a man who is operating a grain farm in the northern part of the State of Montana, where there is no such thing as an irrigated farm at all? What shall we do as to him? We are making some progress, Mr. President, in the matter of the development of a variety of corn that will stand that climate and will mature within the limited growing period that we there enjoy; we are making some progress in that direction; but we have not yet arrived at a stage where anybody in northern North Dakota or in northern Montana can rely on the raising of corn as a crop. Here is a man with his farm and his equipment. What is he going to do? We can not advise him to raise sugar beets, because he can not raise sugar beets.

Mr. KENDRICK and Mr. SMOOTH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RANSDELL. I want to answer the Senator from Montana for a moment, and then I will yield.

If the Senator had been in the Chamber when I made the first part of my remarks, he would have found that I suggested that if we produced in continental United States anything like enough sugar to supply our people, it would put in cultivation in the State of Louisiana and several other Southern States, especially Florida, at least 2,000,000 acres in sugarcane that is now producing other crops.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. RANSDELL. Pardon me; wait a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. RANSDELL. I want to answer the Senator first. Then I will yield. I also tried to show that a very large increase in beet production would result. According to your own figures, you say there are 15,000,000 bushels of grain raised on irrigated lands. Montana is only one of 17 States that produce wheat. Suppose each one of the 17 States producing wheat should turn its 15,000,000 bushels of wheat into beets and beet sugar: That would probably give us enough sugar to supply the country, and it would materially reduce the production of wheat in the entire United States, just as Mr. Stone suggests. It would amount to a very considerable reduction.

If, instead of going to Cuba to pay Cuba for two and one-half million tons of sugar, as we do now, we raised that sugar in the United States, it would certainly take away from cotton production a great many hundred thousand acres of land now devoted to cotton production, and it would take away from wheat production many, many acres devoted to it, and thereby give us some of the change which Mr. Stone suggests. Does not the Senator think there is something in that?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It was far from my purpose to engage in any controversy with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANSDELL. This is no controversy. This is just a pleasant exchange of views.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, of course; but I say, it was far from my purpose to engage in anything like a controversy with the Senator from Louisiana concerning the argument of his paper. I was prompted to rise by reason of the reference to the solution of the farmer's troubles that Mr. Stone had to propose, and that is to raise less cotton and to raise less wheat; to restrict the acreage of cotton and to restrict the acreage of wheat.

This is not by any means a new thing to the people of the cotton-growing States. They have been advised from the same sources for years to restrict the production of cotton. I rose merely to say that so far as the wheat country is concerned, the Senator would not get very far in restricting the production of wheat in the wheat country by proposing the substitution of sugar-beets.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, pursuing what I was saying about the beet industry of the West, these side-lines of the beet industry and the acreage of beets make a material contribution

to the reduction of grain tonnage of which the country produces a surplus. The West is at a terrific disadvantage to grow grain. I hope the Senator from Montana will listen to my argument on this point. If beet production should not be encouraged to expand and present sugar acreage should be thrown into grain growing, with the latter encouraged by a debenture or similar plan, the West would tend toward increased wheat output. The movement of grain, hay, and vegetables, due to their bulky character, is uneconomical for the West due to freight rates.

Agricultural economists continually advise our western farmers to produce more concentrated commodities which can stand the freight cost of reaching the more populous eastern markets. Sugar production fits in admirably with this idea, since the cost of shipping sugar east is a smaller fraction of the value of the refined product than is the freight on wheat to its value. And the beet itself, of course, could not be hauled any long distance, because of its perishable nature and the necessity of slicing it as soon as possible after being dug.

The irrigated reclamation projects of the West are founded on this principle of diversification of crops and production of high-value products of relatively small bulk. Without sugar beets many of the projects would be worse off than they are to-day; and even now the irrigation farmers on the Government lands are in need of higher prices for their sugar beets in order to carry on against increased costs and depressed markets for their other products.

When we make a ton of sugar from cane a great many factors are employed. For every ton of cane sugar that is turned out the railroad hauls 12 to 15 tons directly connected with the sugar business, which is in addition to the groceries, shoes, clothes, and all things necessary for the shelter and protection of people engaged in sugarcane farming, aggregating another 8 to 10 tons, or a total of 20 to 25 tons. But when a ton of sugar is imported from Cuba, railroads haul 1 ton and nothing else. Here in the United States is a normally self-relying, self-sustaining people; and sugar, being one of the most important food commodities, with half of our consumption imported into the country, it is difficult to imagine a defense for a governmental policy which would not encourage domestic production to the slight extent of giving producers of that food commodity within the United States a reasonable chance to prosper with the rest of the United States.

Diversification in the South can be greatly aided by pursuing a policy of raising more cane for sugar. Large areas that are now planted in cotton, of which we are producing a surplus, would be devoted to sugarcane culture if given proper protection.

CONCLUSION

No amount of propaganda can convince the farmers and the residents of beet, corn, and cane producing communities in the United States that they should use a shorter yardstick to measure the protection they enjoy compared to other citizens and industries in this country. No amount of Cuban propaganda can convince them that they, as American citizens, have less right to expect fair and just treatment in tariff matters before Congress than residents and investors in foreign countries.

The facts are unrefuted that a serious, critical condition exists in the beet, corn, and cane industries of the United States; that sugars are being dumped on the American market below production costs; that the present tariff is inadequate to protect the domestic industry, under any just principle of rate making; that Cuba is both producing too much sugar for its own good and is attempting to market too large a percentage of its output in the United States to the detriment of the American sugar industry; that the expansion of sugar acreage in the United States—cane, beets, and corn—fits into the need for a more diversified agriculture in this country with the object of aiding in the relief of the farm surplus problem; and that the domestic industry is distinctly worth preserving.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RANSDELL. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I venture to interrupt the Senator again, because he asked attention to the argument he was making and he has now passed from that particular subject, merely to remark that there is abundant room in the State of Montana and in adjacent States for the expansion of the beet-sugar industry. There are irrigated lands not now devoted to beet culture that, no doubt, could be profitably devoted to that culture if there were factories, and if proper inducements were held out. I would not have anything that I said lead to

any different conclusion; but when it is suggested that the expansion of the beet-sugar industry is a solution of the troubles of the grain farmer, the suggestion can be made only by some one who does not know anything at all about the situation.

As I said, the sugar beets are grown only upon the irrigated lands, and the grain is grown to the extent of 75 to 80 per cent upon dry farm lands that are not irrigated at all. If you take a map of the State of Montana upon which are marked in colors the irrigated areas, including the great areas under the Government irrigation projects, they appear as mere little ribbon strips along the streams as compared with the vast area of the State, and the vast area of the State capable of cultivation to grain crops. The area that is irrigated and that is capable of irrigation by any reasonable expenditure of money is only a fraction of the area of the State; and sugar beets can not be grown outside of the irrigated area.

That is all I intended by my argument. Everybody hopes that the industry will expand. Everybody appreciates the value of it. It affords no kind of a solution at all of the troubles of the grain farmer, however.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana further yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RANSDELL. I do.

Mr. KENDRICK. While the statement made by the Senator from Montana is literally true, he will agree, no doubt, that the growing of sugar beets on the irrigated sections does have a direct influence on these drier territories, in which there is no irrigation.

As an illustration, the Senator from Louisiana pointed out a moment ago the hundreds of thousands of lambs and the thousands of cattle that are finished on the by-products of beet sugar. The majority of that livestock comes from the drier sections of the country, and through the operation of the beet-sugar factories and the production of this by-product this livestock is sent from our Western States to market as a finished product rather than a half-finished product.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. There is no doubt at all about that. In that sense the beet-sugar industry is undoubtedly an aid to the adjacent dry lands upon which cattle and sheep are raised. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Montana did not get the impression from my remarks that I thought an increase of duty on sugar would be a complete solution of the troubles of the grain growers and the cotton growers. I do not think so. I think we need something in addition to that; but I am fully convinced that if we could so increase sugar production in the United States as to make here at home a very large portion of the two and a half million tons we are now bringing in annually from Cuba it would put in cultivation in beets and cane a great deal of land that would be extremely beneficial to us, and would reduce somewhat the grain surplus and the cotton surplus. That was all I meant, and I do not think there is any serious difference between us on this point.

Mr. President, I have occupied a good deal of the time of the Senate. I wish to say in conclusion that I strongly recommend the rejection of the Finance Committee amendment and ask that the House rate of 2.4 cents per pound against Cuban sugar be enacted into law.

EXHIBIT A

Foreign duties on imports of refined sugar from the United States

COUNTRY AND UNITED STATES EQUIVALENT OF FOREIGN RATES OF DUTY, PER POUND, JULY 10, 1929

Brazil	\$0.1750
Italy	.1270
Spain	.0919
Peru	.0660
Japan	.0453
France	.0403
Germany	.0384
Mexico	.0380
Argentina	.0360
England (plus 0.2 cent bounty)	.0253
Australia	.0202
Canada	.0189
Belgium	.0101

The above information is contained in a mimeographed statement, page 16, dated July 10, 1929, and issued by the United States Tariff Commission. The statement is entitled "Duties Levied in Foreign Countries on Agricultural Commodities from the United States."

EXHIBIT B

HISTORY OF IMPORT DUTY ON SUGAR FROM 1789 TO DATE

George Washington's administration

By the act of July 4, 1789, duties were assessed against imported sugar in the amount of 1 cent per pound on brown sugars, 3 cents per pound on loaf sugars, and 1½ cents per pound on all other sugars.

On August 10, 1790, the duty on loaf sugar was raised to 5 cents per pound, on brown sugar to 1½ cents per pound, and on all other sugar to 2½ cents per pound.

On June 5, 1794, the act of August 10, 1790, was amended to include an additional 4 cents on refined sugar.

A proclamation was issued by Mr. Washington on January 29, 1795, stating: "That after the said last day of March next, the present duties payable upon clayed sugars shall cease, and there shall be paid upon all white clayed or white powdered sugars 3 cents per pound, and upon all other clayed or powdered sugars 1½ cents per pound."

John Adams's administration (act of May 13, 1800)

The rates on sugar were not disturbed during Mr. Adams's administration, except that an additional half cent was levied against all brown sugar.

James Madison's administration (act of April 27, 1816)

During the administration of Mr. Madison sugar duties were greatly increased. The duty on brown sugar was raised to 3 cents, on white clayed or powdered sugar to 4 cents, on lump sugar to 10 cents, and on loaf or candy sugar to 12 cents.

Andrew Jackson's administration (act of July 14, 1832)

Jackson's term saw a slight reduction on only two of the classes of sugar, all others remaining as they had been fixed during Madison's administration. Brown-sugar duties were pared down to 2½ cents, a reduction of one-half cent, and white clayed sugar was made dutiable at the rate of 3½ cents, a reduction of two-thirds cent.

John Tyler's administration (act of August 30, 1842)

During Tyler's tenure of office raw sugar was placed on the dutiable list on the same basis as brown clayed sugar. It was made dutiable at 2½ cents per pound. Refined sugar received a rate of 6 cents per pound, while all other sugars were placed on the dutiable list at 4 cents per pound.

James K. Polk's administration (July 30, 1846—Walker tariff)

A duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on sugars of all kinds was levied in this act.

James Buchanan's administration (act of March 2, 1851)

The Walker bill was revised and a three-fourths cent duty was placed on raw sugar, a duty of 2 cents on refined sugar, and a duty of 4 cents on refined sugar when tintured, colored, or adulterated.

Abraham Lincoln's administration

August 5, 1861: Under the Dutch standard of color test sugars not above this standard were dutiable at 2 cents, sugars above the standard were dutiable at 2½ cents, refined sugars drew a levy of 4 cents, and refined sugar when tintured, colored, or adulterated, 6 cents.

July 14, 1862: Sugars not above the Dutch standard received a duty of 2½ cents, sugars above the standard ranged from 3 to 3½ cents, while duties on refined sugar remained stationary at 4 cents.

June 30, 1864: The duties on sugar not above the Dutch standard were raised to 3 cents, above Dutch standard the duty ranged from 3½ to 4 cents, while refined sugar received an additional cent and was placed on the list at 5 cents.

Ulysses S. Grant's administration (July 14, 1870)

The protection to sugar under Grant's administration, after the trying days of the Civil War, was continued. Duties ranged from 1½ cents per pound on sugars not above the Dutch standard to 4 cents on refined sugars.

Chester A. Arthur's administration (March 3, 1883—Morrill bill)

Under the Morrill bill the polariscope test was adopted in combination with the Dutch standard of color test. Duties on sugars not above Dutch standard of color and not testing above 75 degrees by the polariscope were placed at 1.4 cents. For each degree above 75 degrees an additional four one-hundredths cent per pound was added; 96-degree sugar (raw) received a duty of 2.24, while sugars above the Dutch standard of color were made dutiable at from 2½ cents per pound to 3½ cents.

Benjamin Harrison's administration (October 1, 1890—McKinley bill)

It was under the McKinley bill that a bounty was first granted to home-produced sugar. Two cents per pound was fixed as the bounty. Sugar below the Dutch standard was placed on the free list, while sugar above the standard was made dutiable at one-half cent per pound.

Grover Cleveland's administration (August 27, 1894—Wilson bill)

Under the Wilson bill the bounty granted by the McKinley bill was repealed. In place of the bounty a duty of one-eighth of a cent was placed on sugar above the Dutch standard with an additional 40 per cent ad valorem rate. Sugar under the standard was placed on the dutiable list and granted a rate of 40 per cent ad valorem.

William McKinley's administration (July 24, 1897—Dingley bill)

The Dingley bill granted protection to sugars not above the Dutch standard, and not above 75 degrees by the polariscope, to the extent of ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent per pound; for each degree above 75 degrees an additional thirty-five one-thousandths of a cent protection was granted. The duty on 96-degree sugar was placed at 1.685 cents per pound.

Theodore Roosevelt's administration (December 17, 1903—Cuban reciprocity treaty)

The reciprocity treaty reduced the United States duty 20 per cent on sugar imports from Cuba, making the duty on 96-degree sugar 1.348 cents.

William H. Taft's administration (August 9, 1909—Payne-Aldrich bill)

Under the Payne-Aldrich bill the rates of the Dingley bill were restored, except on refined sugar and sugar above the Dutch standard, which was placed at 1.90, an increase of ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent.

Woodrow Wilson's administration (October 3, 1913—Underwood-Simmons bill)

The duty on all sugar was reduced 25 per cent from and after March 1, 1914, and it was provided that all sugar be transferred to the free list on May 1, 1916. The duty on 96-degree sugar from Cuba was placed at 1.0048 cents per pound, from foreign countries it was 1.256, and the duty on refined sugar from foreign countries other than Cuba was placed at 1.38.

On April 27, 1916, the free-sugar clause was repealed on account of the World War.

Warren G. Harding's administration

Emergency tariff bill, May 27, 1921: Sugars not above 75 degrees by the polariscope, 1.16 cents per pound. For each degree above 75 degrees an additional four one-hundredths cent per pound. The duty on 96-degree sugar from Cuba was placed at 1.60, while the full duty was 2 for 96-degree sugar. The full duty on refined sugar was 2.16.

Fordney-McCumber bill, September 22, 1922: Sugars not above 75 degrees by the polariscope, 1.24 cents per pound. For each degree above 75 degrees an additional forty-six one-thousandths cent per pound. The duty on 96-degree sugar from Cuba was placed at 1.7648; the full duty at 2.206. The full duty on refined sugar is 2.390.

EXHIBIT C

Beet-sugar production in United Kingdom, including England, Scotland, and Irish Free State

Year	Acreage	Production in long tons
1920	3,017	1,870
1921	8,333	6,300
1922	8,409	7,011
1923	16,919	13,280
1924	22,441	23,384
1925	54,750	51,452
1926	125,814	165,467
1927	222,566	208,089
1928	176,000	214,643
1929 (estimated)	1229,000	223,000

¹U. S. Department of Agriculture.

²Willett & Gray.

These figures were furnished by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Sources: Acreage, British Ministry of Agriculture; production, Tate & Lyle (Ltd.).

EXHIBIT D

Acreage and production of cane sugar in the United States, 1911-1928

Year	Acreage	Sugar made
1911	310,000	342,720
1912	197,000	352,874
1913	248,000	153,573
1914	213,000	292,698
1915	183,000	242,700
1916	221,000	137,500
1917	244,000	303,900

Acreage and production of cane sugar in the United States, 1911-1928—
Continued

Year	Acreage	Sugar made
1918	231,000	243,600
1919	179,000	280,898
1920	182,000	220,999
1921	226,000	169,116
1922	241,000	324,429
1923	217,000	295,096
1924	163,000	162,024
1925	190,000	88,482
1926	80,000	47,185
1927	128,000	70,792
1928	138,000	139,381
1929 ¹	214,000	218,000

¹ Estimated Louisiana crop, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Basic data from Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, converted to short tons.

EXHIBIT E

THE CONSUMER AND THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF

Present criticism of a proposed tariff on agricultural products is a direct attack on the American protective-tariff system. It is an attack hiding behind the cloak of an appeal to the "consuming public."

Certain interests as yet veiled, but easily identified by their self-evident purpose, say that the "consumer" will pay heavily for certain foods—beef, butter, sugar, bread, fruit, and vegetables—if tariff rates are levied as now proposed by Congress. These foods, the consumer is told, can be produced more cheaply in other countries, and he has the right to buy where he can buy cheapest—the Argentines for cheap beef, New Zealand cheap butter, Cuba cheap sugar, Canada cheap wheat, and Mexico cheap vegetables.

This broadside of half truth needs a vigorous all-American analysis. The rest of the truth needs to be told, for every "producer" is a consumer; every "consumer" except the tramp is a "producer."

A tariff on these commodities is justified by a broader principle of fairness and general national interest than that which actuates this narrow selfishness of the critics.

If a foreign country can produce a product at a somewhat lower cost than it can be produced on American farms—take beef for example—then the absence of a tariff on beef would lead to two direct results.

The first would be the flow of a vast amount of American money—consumer's money, if you will—to a place where it can be produced more cheaply—money once sent away never to come back, except as interest and profits, for the rich American capitalist and investor in foreign industry.

The second would be the ruin of the American beef-producing industry—a source of production of natural wealth and of employment of some million men; in fact, the destruction of a national self-sufficiency, indispensable to national defense and national honor. If that is not sufficient, then let it be also understood that these millions of men would cease buying the products of urban industries—automobiles, furniture, carpets, clothing, boots and shoes, etc., which they would purchase as prosperous producers and would flock into the urban industries, creating a veritable frame of underemployment.

This is the reverse side of these half truths and it should be shouted from every house-top.

In the campaign of half truth going on the consumer is very certainly not reminded of that period following the World War when he paid 30 cents a pound for sugar because he had to, because the foreign sugar producers were in control and temporarily without competition from domestic producers.

The industrial worker wants his job, needs his job, and the present wage or a larger one, or he is ruined. And his interest in that job far exceeds his interest in a cent or two more for even his beef or his fruit or his sugar. And that job and its price is subject to just the same law of supply and demand as the price of the beef or the fruit or the sugar. He needs to know what will happen to the labor supply of the farmers and the men in the plants and factories if a foreign-food invasion, which completes the ruin of these agricultural industries, forces them to seek urban employment.

To summarize: If the consumer-producer would benefit by the maintenance of a steady market for his industry, he necessarily must be a purchaser of the products of others. For you can not be a consumer and not be a producer or the dependent of a producer.

The established policy in America to-day, regardless of partisan politics, is for protection through tariff and through restricted immigration. This principle of protection to all classes, for all products, agricultural or industrial, must be applied with even-handed justice, or that same justice, plus the most evident self-interest, demands that all bars of all

kinds be let down, and we have a free-trade Nation, without exclusion laws against cheap labor or tariff restrictions against the products of cheap labor.

Without tariff protection, "consumers" would buy steel, tractors, cream separators, and factory equipment more cheaply from Germany, shipping equipment from England, textiles from Czechoslovakia, paper products from Japan and China, sugar and starches from Java (where labor is paid 15 cents a day), crockery and dishes from Belgium and Sweden, dairy products from New Zealand and Denmark, fruits from the Tropics, fuel oil from Mexico, and on down the line, until our "consumers" would each and severally be either out of a job or working at the price of the cheap labor of the rest of the world, and buying nothing because they would not have the money with which to buy.

The American protective tariff has enabled the consumer to be a consumer by making it possible for him to be a producer.

You can not eat your pie and have it. You can not send your beef money to the Argentines and sell your products to American producers. It is impossible to conceive our giving the keys of an American city to a foreign invader and then allow him to use his gunfire to destroy the men, women, and children of that city.

It is equally impossible for a government to invite foreign trade, built upon low standards and costs, into any branch of American industry, agricultural or nonagricultural.

Sugar is a farm product which has been especially singled out for attack in this campaign of half truth, so let us consider closely the difference in cost under a reasonable protective tariff.

Using accepted statistics, the average person's consumption of sugar is 100 pounds of sugar a year, and the proposed tariff would increase the cost 64 cents a year per person. However, this does not mean a direct consumption by each individual of 100 pounds a year or 64 cents a year increase, because included in the 100 pounds is the sugar used in bakery products, candy, soft drinks, ice cream, and the sugar served free to the consumer in hotels and restaurants.

Solely in the household, it has been estimated that the average sugar consumption is from 40 to 60 pounds a year per person. On this basis then, the average cost of the increased tariff on sugar to the individual consumer in his own home is 38 cents a year.

The consumer must know this, and must determine whether this insurance premium of 38 cents a year is worth the guarantee of protection from foreign control of the sugar market in the United States; a control, the absence of which in 1920, cost him 30 cents a pound for sugar, or the rate of \$12 to \$18 a year per consumer. He must determine whether it is worth 38 cents a year to obtain the security of domestic sugar production at all times, including changes in international relations or trade, or even war, plus the profitable employment of a million farmers and the development of a sugar industry to employ perhaps a million more.

The purchasing power of the farmer determines the success of many factories and of the wage earners in the consuming centers. And the urban consumer depends upon the buying power of farmers.

So it is all an interlocking and interdependent nation-wide organization. Plain horse sense shows that any industry wiped out by a foreign competition dangerously damages every other domestic industry, and that American high standards and the welfare of the consuming public depends upon the protection of all domestic industry. The dust storm raised about a few cents on sugar, butter, beef, etc., is not for the benefit of the "consumer" but for the benefit of the importers who collect the toll and of the foreign capitalists whose investments are in these cheap-labor foreign fields.

Protection of the farmers is a consumer's guaranty of continued employment, wages and ability to pay, safety from foreign trusts and cartels, and finally a balanced national industrial fabric.

National self-sufficiency is national safety.

You can not be a consumer and not be a producer or the dependent of a producer.

These are thoughts that the consumer of America must know, fight for, and reverence.

Respectfully submitted by the undersigned organizations, representing growers of commodities mentioned in this communication.

FRED BRECKMAN,

Washington Representative, National Grange.

CHESTER H. GRAY,

Washington Representative, American Farm Bureau Federation.

ERNEST A. BURGIERES,

President Domestic Sugar Producers Association.

C. B. DEUMAN,

President National Live Stock Producers Association.

A. M. LOOMIS,

Secretary National Dairy Union.

C. E. DURST,

Secretary National Horticultural Council.

products for American markets against the ruinous competition of products produced by coolie labor and in areas especially favored by nature: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge immediate and helpful action by Congress for the beet-sugar industry of the United States by increasing the import duty on raw sugar to 3 cents and by restricting the duty-free importations of cane sugar from the Philippine Islands, and that copies of this urgent appeal be sent to the President of the United States, to the Michigan delegation in Congress, to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of Congress, and the United States Tariff Commission in Washington, D. C.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I also present for the RECORD the form of a petition from citizens of the State of Michigan, which has been widely circulated and widely signed, again supporting the proposition that if sugar-beet production and the beet-sugar industry are to survive another year, they can only survive upon the strength of adequate protection voted by the Congress of the United States, and praying that legitimate and rational protection shall be given. The petition is long, but illuminating in its detail, and I shall not read it, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

A petition from citizens of the State of Michigan to change legislation which has proven harmful to American agriculture

That whereas we, farmers and business men of the State of Michigan, have learned through 25 years of practical production of sugar upon our lands, the benefits to us and to our community of its production; and

Whereas we have had to continue growing the crop for the last four or five years without a reasonable remuneration, and only because we have discovered it to be a most valuable crop in our rotation, and, further, because it has proved to be the greatest crop as an economic one, benefiting alike the laborers in our cities as well as the farmers on the land; and

Whereas that for the last nine years great distress has come to a large portion of the farming region of this country, notably in the Dakotas, Minnesota, Iowa, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan; and

Whereas these States have all been proven to be able to grow sugar in such quantities, if thoroughly developed, to fill our own country's demand for the same; and

Whereas that if only one-half the sugar bought and shipped into this country from only one of the foreign countries furnishing the same, had been produced on the lands of the States mentioned, it would have taken so much land out of the production of the ordinary crops now produced in those States as to have effectually saved those States from the distress and disaster they have passed through during the last nine years, there would have been no such thing as a surplus of their crops; and

Whereas that if our Representatives in Congress had been versed in the agricultural science as practiced by every European nation, they would have under no circumstances have legislated as they did in 1903, whereby it protected a foreign country in the production and sale of a commodity and against the production of that same crop on our own soil;

Now, therefore, we, farmers and citizens of the State of Michigan in meeting assembled, petition your honorable body, on behalf of ourselves and others, but more particularly on behalf of our farmer friends and neighbors in the Northwest who have suffered so severely during the last nine years, that you, before passing any legislation during the special session called by President Hoover for April 15, 1929, seeking to help the farmers of the Northwest, study attentively and deeply the great economic benefits European countries have found in the production and sale of sugar produced from sugar beets;

Furthermore, we desire to call your attention that since the World War, Great Britain, the one great exponent of free trade among the nations of the earth, has reversed its policy of over a hundred years as far as sugar is concerned and passed such legislation as made a protective tariff of nearly \$5 a hundred pounds on sugar imported into that country; that in consequence of this over \$40,000,000 has been invested in the necessary threshing machinery to take care of this new crop of the farmers of that country, and that the great statesmen of Great Britain did this for one reason and one reason only, viz, to rehabilitate the depressed and ruined condition of English agriculture.

Furthermore, we desire to call your honorable body's attention to the prosperity that inured to our sister republic because of the protection awarded her in our markets by the legislation of 1903 when they were suffering from disaster, which changed Cuba's production of sugar in 1901 of less than 700,000 tons to 5,825,000 tons this year. We now desire to call your attention to the fact that the tables are now turned and our own people are suffering at the present time, and that we therefore ask that we, and our friends and neighbors, have as much consideration at your hands as was given them.

Furthermore, it has been proven by testimony before the Tariff Commission in or about 1922-23 that the tariff of \$1.76 a hundred pounds

on sugar shipped from Cuba to this country was not a protective tariff, but instead, because of its cheaper agricultural costs in Cuba, it lacked \$1 per hundred pounds of meeting our cost of production, thereby giving Cuban sugar a protection against our farmers of \$1 a hundred pounds.

Now, in simple justice to our own people, who have suffered disaster which would not have come upon them if these conditions had not been forced upon them by the legislation of the preceding Congresses, we ask that an equally high tariff, giving as much protection to us as it did to Cuba, be placed upon sugar coming from this country so highly favored during the last 30 years. This would mean a tariff of \$3.76 a hundred pounds.

With such a protective tariff of \$3.76 a hundred pounds, it will change disaster and ruin to prosperity and plenty to our own depressed agriculture, and at the same time build up an agriculture which could not be excelled in any country.

We, farmers and citizens of this country, who are at the same time producers of sugar derived from beets, ask that sufficient study and examination of our assertions be made, confident of the result and the action of your honorable body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I make no claims whatever to being an expert in the matter of beet sugar. I can not speak as a technician. The only thing I can do is to reflect the conditions as I see them with my own eyes in the State of Michigan and the adjacent territory, and as testimony is given me by honorable men of industry in whose statements I have absolute confidence.

I think the situation in Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio is incontrovertibly summarized in the following sentences from a letter written by George W. McCormick, president of the Menominee Sugar Co. of Menominee, Mich.:

If present conditions continue to prevail and no relief is granted by Congress, there would be no object in the several beet-sugar companies of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio attempting to operate another year. This will mean the simultaneous closing of 22 beet-sugar factories in this area, involving an investment of thirty-five million in round numbers, and the closing of a market for sugar beets to fully 20,000 farmers who are growing that crop.

Mr. President, that is the deliberate verdict of one of the best-informed men in the United States upon the condition confronted to-day by the sugar-beet farmer and the beet-sugar industry in the great area of which Michigan happens to be the geographical center. The curtain is about to be rung down upon this factor in agriculture; it is about to be rung down upon this factor in industry, except as out of this tariff situation can come economic salvation. Whether it is worth while to provide this salvation may be a matter of argument, but it is not a matter of argument that except this protection is given the industry disappears.

When I say it may be a matter of argument as to whether the protection ought to be given, I do not concede for a moment that there are two sides of the question so far as I view it. But I am endeavoring primarily to establish an incontrovertible premise. It is such a premise when I state that unless the pending tariff measure provides adequate sugar protection, the sugar industry is dead in at least three States, and it is dead upon the fields of 20,000 farmers in these States. Similar conditions also exist in other States, I apprehend.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield gladly to my genial friend from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator was not quite so concerned, was he, about the farmers other than the beet-sugar farmers? He did not vote for the debenture, I take it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not care to be sidetracked at the moment.

Mr. COPELAND. I will withdraw the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At the same time I want to meet the Senator's question. No; I did not vote for the debenture, as the Senator did, holding his nose, as he said. I do not like nose-holding votes. I did vote for the equalization fee without holding my nose. I still believe in the principle, and I expect yet to see the day when it will be applied. My interest in the farmer is just as great an interest, I apprehend, as that of my very able friend from New York, and I believe there is ample available proofs to this end.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it is not going to detour me into general economics, I am glad to yield. I am very anxious to pursue the particular objective which I had in mind when I launched these observations.

Mr. BROOKHART. I am glad to hear the Senator say that he voted for the equalization fee. If the debenture were paid to the farmer, would it not do everything the equalization fee would do?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Whether it would or not—I prefer to discuss that question at some other time, if the Senator will permit. The sugar question is complex enough without dragging in any extraneous matters.

When interrupted I was laying down the proposition that except as adequate protection for sugar is provided in the pending bill, the industry, that of sugar beets and that of beet sugar, automatically disappears in Michigan and a number of surrounding States. Even a momentary consultation of the economic status of the beet-sugar companies in my area will disclose why this must be true. A tabulation of the invested capital in 18 companies, showing a total investment of \$126,000,000 in 1929, discloses a net earning the same year of but four-tenths of 1 per cent upon that invested capital in the sugar-beet companies. The capital stock of the particular companies in round numbers is \$90,000,000. The earnings in 1929 upon that capital stock are 0.6 of 1 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. Is the Great Western Sugar Co. included in the list?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am about to discuss that, if the Senator will permit me to proceed.

This list, as I have tried to indicate, is a list probably as typical as possible of the particular section of the country concerning which I am talking. There can be no question in the world that the company to which the Senator refers is tremendously prosperous. That, however, is not the status of sugar beets or beet sugar in this great sector of the country the condition of which I am now trying to present. It is not a typical status. I invite the particular attention of the Senate to the corporation tax statements, which have been submitted and which are now available to Senators, for all of the beet-sugar companies operating in the State of Michigan. There is not one of them that is justified in keeping its wheels turning for one minute. It is perfectly obvious from the nature of their returns. If they are making any profit at all in their annual balance sheets, not only to-day but for a number of years past, it is such a narrow margin that it amounts to absolutely nothing in the final net result.

These factories, Mr. President, in my judgment, reached after listening to the testimony of honest men who operate them, are keeping open solely for the purpose of awaiting relief from the Congress, and if they do not receive this relief the end has come.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to have the Senator discuss the question which moves him in the main to favor the increase. As I take it from what he has just said, his anxiety is not for the men who produce the beets, but the factories who manufacture the beets into sugar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will abide for a moment I hope I will be able to satisfy his curiosity regarding my position upon that score also.

Mr. NORRIS. I take it from the figures the Senator gave that he was for the time being at least making an argument in favor of an increased tariff on sugar because the factories in his section of the country have to have it in order to survive.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct. My only difficulty is that I can not answer both phases of the problem simultaneously. No farmer ever finds it worth while to raise one sugar beet if there is no factory to which he can take that sugar beet. Therefore if there are no factories there can be no sugar-beet industry. There can be no sugar-beet farmers.

It is said that the Michigan factories probably are inefficiently operated, otherwise they would make a profit commensurate with that made by one great and favored company in the West. My observation is that the efficiency of a beet-sugar factory is dependent entirely upon the continuity and the sufficiency of its supply of beets. The supply of beets in turn depends entirely upon the adequacy of the price the farmer can get for his beets. In the State of Michigan, for instance, in 1921, when the industry was in reasonably healthy condition, we had 850,000 tons of sugar beets raised in the State, whereas in 1929 the maximum tonnage probably was not over 400,000 tons. This makes efficient factory operation impossible. If any factor on earth could affect the ultimate balance sheet of the factory itself, it is such a reduction in the bulk of sugar beets as came to these factories. The operation is an endless chain. If a sufficient price can be procured for the sugar beets in the hands of the farmer then there will be an adequate supply of sugar beets furnished to the

factory and the factory in turn can operate upon what may be called an economical and efficient basis.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. How does the Senator figure that a high rate on sugar would encourage the farmer to increase his acreage of beets?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to discuss that when I come to it, I shall try to answer it.

Mr. BROOKHART. If the Senator will reach it in the regular order of his discussion, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator said there were 800,000 tons of sugar beets raised in Michigan in 1921 and only 400,000 tons in 1929.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The tariff on sugar was just as high in 1929 as it was in 1921 and, if I recollect the facts correctly, it was higher, was it not? Has not the tariff been increased since 1921?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct about it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. So I am wondering how it happens that after increasing the tariff on sugar beets the price continued to go down.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator knows there was a world shortage of sugar in 1920 and that is a factor which had a great deal more to do than the tariff with the condition of the sugar market.

Mr. President, as I said when I began, I have no disposition or desire to attempt to discuss this problem in technical detail, because I frankly confess my own limitations in these directions. It seems to me, however, as a layman, that there is just one fundamental question involved. Is it worth while, is it necessary to maintain and retain a domestic sugar industry? In the last analysis everything comes down to this final proposition. Is it worth the price to maintain a domestic sugar industry?

I submit, in the first place, Mr. President, that it is worth while from an agrarian viewpoint because of the admitted agricultural advantage in this particular crop. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the petitions which were widely circulated in Michigan and signed by sugar-beet farmers praying for an increased tariff protection they make the specific statement that they would not have persisted in the sugar-beet culture except for the great advantage that culture itself affords as an agricultural asset. I am sure there is no argument against the utility of the sugar beet from a farming standpoint. I suppose the major argument as to the utility of maintaining a domestic industry involves the standpoint of the ultimate sugar consumer in the United States. Is it worth to the ultimate consumer whatever it costs at the immediate moment to maintain a domestic sugar industry in the United States?

Mr. President, it occurs to me that the experience we had in 1920 is the final and conclusive answer to that question. In 1920 there was a world shortage in sugar and the domestic market did not have the saving grace of competitive protection. In 1920 the retail prices of sugar in the United States went as high as 36 cents a pound. Last year the United States consumed twelve and a half billion pounds of sugar, a per capita consumption of 104 pounds. On the basis of those 1920 prices, as I have figured the arithmetic, our sugar bill in 1929 would have been \$3,700,000,000, or a per capita sugar bill of \$31.28. That is what can happen to the price of retail sugar in the United States when the retail sugar market in the United States does not confront a controlling competitive factor in the form of domestic production.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will not forget that at that very time American sugar was never allowed to go over 12 cents a pound; the farmer himself was paid \$12 a ton for his beets; that just as soon as the sugar manufactured in the United States was consumed, Cuba charged as high as from 27 to 30 cents a pound; and that it cost the American people for just that one year as much money as it cost to erect and to put into operation all the sugar factories in the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator puts his emphasis precisely at the point where the American people as a whole

ought to put their emphasis when they are answering the question as to whether or not a sugar tariff is worth what it costs.

What does it cost? As nearly as I can figure, if all of the proposed increases recommended by the Senate Finance Committee were to become effective, the increased per capita cost of sugar in the United States, assuming for the sake of the argument that all of the tariff is reflected in the retail price—which it is not, the net total effect would be 57 cents per capita, making a per capita sugar bill of \$5.78.

Mr. President, this is the proposition I am trying to establish: Let us not get lost in a maze of statistics, for statistics are too treacherous, but let us not get our eyes off these two figures. The per capita sugar bill under the proposed tariff, if all the tariff were reflected in the price of sugar, might show an increase of 57 cents and become \$5.78 per capita in the United States, but the per capita price of sugar in 1920 did go to \$31.28, showing what can happen when the competitive element is removed. If there is no denial of the arithmetic, then the question, as I see it, is not a question of what the tariff costs the ultimate consumer of American sugar, but what it saves the ultimate consumer of American sugar by way not only of actual present advantage but by way of permanent insurance.

So, Mr. President, I insist that the ultimate consumer of sugar in the United States buys an insurance policy for himself when he helps maintain a healthy domestic sugar industry which can compete with sugar importations. Nor is it necessary that this insurance should be expensive. Quite the contrary. It is really astounding what a stabilized 7 cent retail price for sugar would do in this respect. Here is typical arithmetic—typical at least in my sector of the country. The sugar-beet farmer's costs, exclusive of labor, are \$1.79 per 100 pounds of ultimate sugar. Labor, at \$23 an acre, figures 97 cents more per 100 pounds. Farmers' profit at 20 per cent—because he has to plow under at least one crop in five—is 55 cents per 100 pounds. So much for the farmer—whom none of us should begrudge a decent living. Beet-sugar factory costs are \$2.27 per 100 pounds; and 10 per cent profits call for 49 cents additional. This grand total is \$6.07 per 100 pounds. Add a standard selling cost of 48 cents. Add the 10-cent differential which beet sugar suffers as compared with cane sugar. This totals \$6.65 per 100 pounds. Sugar is sold on the New York basis, plus freight to destination. The freight item in the Michigan area is about 45 cents. Therefore the New York wholesale price must be \$6.20 to permit our beet-sugar industry to survive. Now add one final item. If farmers can pay \$30 per acre instead of \$23 to beet-field workers they can compete successfully for American labor at American standards of industrial wage. This is prerequisite to a permanent answer to the sugar problem. This differential adds 36 cents per 100 pounds to sugar costs. Thus we reach a final New York price of \$6.56; and since sugar always sells at a close retail margin, we reach a retail price in the neighborhood of 7 cents.

Personally, I have regretted that it seemed to be impractical to develop a sliding-scale tariff which would stabilize the retail price of sugar around this price. In lieu thereof, I am bound to believe in a fixed tariff which will best accommodate this net result. The American people have paid much more than 7 cents for sugar many, many times in the past decade. They have done it without complaint. If anything like 7-cent sugar can protect the ultimate consumer against the higher prices which would be all but inevitable if beet-sugar competition disappears from the domestic market; if it can assure the farmer a healthy profit on his beets and permit him to compete with industry for American labor at American levels; if it can provide the American sugar manufacturers with cost and a living margin beyond; then the American people—with an eye to the best welfare of themselves and their country—are poor economists if they repudiate such a prospectus. I can not convince myself that the ultimate consumer is robbed by an adequate sugar tariff. But I am convinced that he most certainly will be robbed, by prices dictated by closely organized foreign importers, if sugar tariffs continue inadequate.

Mr. President, before I discuss the utility of the maintenance of a sugar industry as a national asset, let me present just one additional exhibit in line with the argument I have just been making. I never heard any better summary than that contained in a few sentences in an editorial from the Grand Rapids Press, an independent newspaper published in my home city, and in the heart of that beet-sugar State. I quote as follows:

It [the sugar tariff] is the margin between life and death for our beet-sugar industry, and for the competition it offers the importing refiners who own or have close connection with the Americans producing 60 per cent of all Cuban sugar. Leave the business entirely in the hands of the billion-dollar Cuban combine, and the result may be easily conjectured from our experience shortly after the World War, when exactly that monopoly existed and the cane-sugar interests ran

the price up to 30 cents a pound. Leave domestic production in the competitive market, and a buffer is provided against this situation. With a proper tariff, it is impossible for outsiders to dump sugar early in the market season, force sale of the domestic sugar at a loss and all at once, and then recoup for themselves by boosting the price when the home product is out of the way. The sugar tariff has often been called the only tariff which benefits the consumer as well as keeping the producer on his feet.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. If I am not mistaken, in Michigan, as in other States, the beet-sugar manufacturers divide whatever profits are made with the sugar-beet producers?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. SMOOT. In Michigan, as I understand, the contract price is \$7.75 a ton, and whatever profits are made are divided between the company and the beet grower. In my State, of course, the price is \$7 a ton, with one-half, 50 per cent, going to the beet grower. I know of no sugar companies but have that same division of profits with the man who produces the beets.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is entirely correct regarding the Michigan situation. All sugar-beet contracts with Michigan farmers are on a sliding scale, which makes these farmers participants in the profits of the ultimate operation. It is a type of tangible cooperation which should find great favor in the eyes of Senators who believe in cooperation.

Mr. President, the utility of the sugar industry as a national asset, as a matter of general public policy, certainly is too obvious to require any argument whatever. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] presented a table of statistics showing that practically every civilized country in the world charges a higher sugar tariff than is proposed by the highest rate that has ever been suggested in this forum. Why do they do that? It is not only because of the necessity for the immediate commodity itself in the everyday life of the Nation but because of the importance of the commodity as a prime asset in the economic structure of a self-sufficient and self-sustaining people. When we undertake to provide a very limited increase in the amount of sugar tariff, for the purpose merely of keeping the industry alive, as the Senator from Utah correctly stated a little while ago, when we propose that limited means of maintenance for this essential national asset, it occurs to me that there can be precious little rational argument against the policy involved. When it is disclosed, as it has been disclosed in the so-called lobby investigation by the lobby committee of the Senate, to what vicious length the organized importers of sugar are willing to go, lengths that involve even the national friendships of the United States in the Pan-American area—when it is understood to what length the foreign sugar industry is willing to go in its effort to strangle the domestic sugar production, I think we are indeed put upon notice as to what might happen to us if we ever were wholly at the mercy of the price dictation of foreign sugar importations; and we are put upon notice as to what a vital factor in the economic structure of a self-sufficient people sugar production, in an adequate degree, actually has become. The rottenest chapter in all contemporary lobby disclosures is the chapter which relates to the conspiracies to defeat adequate sugar tariffs in the pending bill. At some points this lobby has approached close to treason.

Mr. President, I would not undertake to discuss the question of rates, because of its technicalities; I would not undertake to set my judgment against the judgment of any other man as to the precise rate that ought to be applied in order to save the situation. I know it is the opinion of Michigan sugar farmers and manufacturers that the 3-cent base rate levied by the House of Representatives is absolutely necessary in order to achieve a safe operation; but, much as I sympathize with that view, and happy as I should be to have that view prevail on account of its equity, still, so far as the rate is concerned, I subordinate my judgment to that of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], the chairman of the Finance Committee. I think he is entitled to testify, as he has, that if the Finance Committee rate shall be maintained in the new bill the industry at least will have a chance to fight for its life, and it will have an opportunity at last to proceed with some degree of optimism in the direction of profitable and stabilized operation.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] raised the question of Philippine exposure. I want to be entirely frank in responding to that inquiry. I entirely agree that the greatest single exposure which American sugar, as well as many other farm commodities, confronts is exposure on the West from free trade

in Philippine sugar. As a matter of fact, it is not only an exposure in free trade but it is an exposure, Mr. President, in subsidized shipping, which, as has been disclosed in the investigation of the Commerce Committee, provides not only preferential rates for bringing Philippine sugar from Manila to New York but actually provides Government ships in which to do it and pays any operating deficit out of the Treasury of the United States. The exposure is tremendous. It can not be minimized. It is utterly important.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. Conceding that situation to be true as the Senator has frankly stated it, is it not a fact that we would not be justified in putting on a high rate that would simply add to the great profits of the Great Western Sugar Co. without protecting us against the exposure or menace that the Senator has described?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to discuss that with equal frankness, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator starts on that, will he yield?

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I could not hear the question. I wish the Senator would, in substance, restate it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Iowa is inquiring whether, in view of that exposure, it is worth while to undertake, by increased tariff protection, to save the domestic situation.

Mr. President, in the final analysis there probably never can be complete protection against this exposure from the Pacific until the Philippine Islands are independent in themselves. I would not be willing for one moment to discuss the propriety or the utility or the desirability of independence on the basis of our own domestic economic need. I think that would be utterly sordid. Nevertheless, the exposure exists, and the domestic need for some type of protection exists; and how can it be secured?

Let us see how it can be secured.

It can not be secured through this measure. That is perfectly obvious. I suppose it could be secured through a bounty which excluded Philippine sugar from its operations. If one is willing to support a bounty program, I think an excellent argument can be presented in favor of it in this circumstance. I am opposed to bounties. But, Mr. President, from my viewpoint, the very discussion of Philippine independence which is now running up and down the land, and which is having acute consideration in Congress itself, automatically puts a practical limitation upon the further development at the present time of Philippine sugar production. In other words, I think for a number of years to come, at least, we have reached the limit of that exposure.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan further yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to conclude this thought first.

When the sugar schedule was discussed out of order several weeks ago it involved this question of independence for the Philippine Islands. At that time I introduced a resolution seeking an investigation by the Commerce Committee of the advisability of extending America's coastwise shipping laws to the Philippine Islands for the purpose of reducing the transportation differential which Philippine products and farm products enjoy at the expense of the American production. The committee inquired very faithfully into that proposition; and, while it has made no report, I think I am entitled to say that our minds meet, first, upon the proposition that the exposure does exist; second, upon the proposition that American agriculture, including American sugar, never can be adequately protected so long as it does exist; but, third, that it can not be cured in any appropriate degree through the medium of our coastwise laws.

How can it be cured?

I venture this suggestion:

Before the Philippine Islands can ever be entitled to their independence the United States must be assured, so far as possible, that the islands will be equal to the responsibility of maintaining themselves in their own independence permanently thereafter. What is the greatest difficulty they will confront in that respect? I do not think the greatest exposure that will be confronted by the Philippine Islands when they are independent is Japan, or China, or some other hostile nation in the surrounding oriental rim. I think the greatest hazard that the Philippines then will confront is the hazard of losing the free American market in which they have been selling practically all of their economic production. Overnight they will lose the

free markets of the United States. Overnight they will confront the sudden necessity for a complete readjustment of their entire economic production and their entire economic market.

Mr. KING and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment. If that is true, then it occurs to me that there is perfect logic, and a logic that is wholly sympathetic with Philippine independence aspirations, in proposing tariff autonomy for the Philippine Islands pending their independence, so that they can discover for themselves what must be done by way of fitting their ultimate free economic status into the world trade conditions that they must then confront.

Tariff autonomy for the Philippine Islands would permit a laboratory test, as it were, of Philippine economic self-sufficiency. It would help to answer the question as to whether or not the Philippine Islands are self-sufficient, and are equal to the problem of maintaining themselves, and are equal to the problem of finding markets in the face of the common competition that is involved in world trade. By some such process as that, Mr. President, I conceive that an advantage can come, in the ultimate, to the Philippine Islands.

Tariff autonomy would permit the Philippines tariff independence ahead of political independence. As a practical proposition the sufficiency of the former must precede the latter. No friend of the Philippines would contend otherwise. The moment these islands have complete severance from the United States they lose our free American markets into which they are sending \$46,000,000 of cane sugar annually; also \$16,000,000 of copra; also \$23,000,000 of coconut oil; also \$4,000,000 of tobacco products. They must then confront our tariff barriers. Can they survive economically under such circumstances? If they can, then the greatest doubt upon their self-sufficiency for self-government is removed. Why not find out whether they can thus survive; why not find it out without invoking the awful consequences which would come to them if it should be discovered after independence that they can not survive? We can find it out—they can find it out—by the establishment of tariff autonomy ahead of their independence. Let the native legislature build its own tariff system—now. Let the native exports to the United States confront our tariff system with the same differential which we concede to Cuba. If the experiment succeeds, then the Philippines are incalculably nearer political independence, because the question mark upon their economic self-sufficiency is answered.

If the experiment succeeds, then the economic exposure now suffered by American agriculture—an almost fatal exposure in many commodities—is saved. There is a common and mutual advantage. It is not a sordid adventure, dictated solely by the consultation of our own economic needs. It is an adventure which invites the speediest possible demonstration of the eligibility of the Philippines for early independence. Such a proposition probably can not be written into this pending bill because it requires careful evolution. But it can be seriously canvassed in connection with the general survey of the independence problem which begins on January 15 before the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. It is the only answer I can see, meanwhile, to that phase of our own domestic tariff difficulties which are inseverably linked with this exposure in the far Pacific. We can not be rigidly criticized for giving some attention to this matter in connection with the tariff debates. Indeed, we are bound to consult enlightened selfishness. The Philippines already have tax autonomy. Why not kill two birds with one stone and give them tariff autonomy pending their ultimate complete political independence?

I beg of you to remember that I am speaking, not from the selfish aspect of American economic need, but from the aspect of a broad and final answer to the Philippine problem, in keeping with our responsibilities to them. It occurs to me that in some such fashion as through tariff autonomy it may be possible, as a by-product of the plan, to reduce our own economic exposure upon the West.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. Let us assume that that is done; and I am in agreement with the Senator upon that proposition. I will vote for such an amendment to this bill if he will offer it. Suppose it is done now. Still, we have in Michigan all these factories that the Senator has described, making only a little over 1 per cent return on their capital. At the same time we have the Great Western making 20 or 30 per cent or more; I forget the figures. Would we be justified, then, in putting upon the American people a tariff rate that would make the return of

the Michigan factories remunerative and make those of the Great Western extortionate?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator probably was out of the Chamber when that matter was discussed earlier in the afternoon.

I would not be willing to subscribe to the proposition that the prosperity of one supereconomic unit in the community should be the standard by which prosperity should be measured for all of its competitors. If so, then the United States Steel Corporation, as has been pointed out, would be the standard by which prosperity should be measured in the entire steel industry.

Mr. BROOKHART. Why should it not be? It is producing half of the steel.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now, the Senator is about to draw me into a discussion of his favorite economic theory. I can see that coming. I should prefer, if the Senator does not object, to discuss that matter with him at some other time.

Mr. BROOKHART. I wanted to bring keenly home here the fact that by the mere raising or lowering of a tariff rate we can not do justice to the American people in tariff making. We might improve it somewhat by the bounty, as the Senator has admitted; but I think we can only perfect it by a control of the profits of these industries that come to us and ask the protection of the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now, I want to conclude in just a word, Mr. President. I have detained the Senate much longer than I had expected when I started.

I submit this general proposition:

It is incontrovertible that we can not have a domestic sugar industry without increased protection of this domestic sugar industry. It seems to me that it is equally incontrovertible that this country dare not let its domestic sugar industry die. Therefore Congress confronts the proposition that it must decide, yes or no, whether the domestic sugar industry shall live; and my answer is yes.

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment in connection with what the Senator from Michigan has been saying?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Senator will agree that it developed in the hearings before the Commerce Committee and subcommittee that the situation with reference to the Philippines is somewhat of this character:

First, that there is no danger of extending very much the production of sugar in the Philippines, by reason of the fact that the land laws prevent large holdings. That is one thing that would interfere.

In the next place, the area that is best suited for the production of sugar there has already been practically occupied; so the testimony indicates that there is not the danger in the Philippines of extending production to any great extent.

Then the proposal to extend the coastwise laws of the United States to the Philippines, so that only American vessels would do business between the Philippines and the ports of the United States, would not accomplish what is aimed at, because it would not keep foreign vessels from carrying Philippine sugar to Vancouver, for instance, and then coming into the United States through there. So that would not accomplish the result.

It developed that some 75 per cent of the exports of the Philippines find their market in the United States, so that they are very vitally interested in this question of the tariff; and whether or not it is wise to give them tariff autonomy, as has been suggested, it is important to consider. I believe Congress has the power to do it if it sees fit to do it.

It would be contrary to precedent, but we could do it. We could impose a tariff on the products of Porto Rico if we wanted to. We have the authority to do it. We have not been doing it, and I do not know whether that would be regarded as a precedent for the Philippines or not; but, at any rate, I do not believe there is any very great danger of extending production in the Philippines.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a limitation on the amount of sugar that can come into the United States from the Philippines. If we took this action now, it would be only following the precedent that has been set by Congress heretofore.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BOULDER DAM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, some important events are taking place in this body which are likely to escape the attention of the public. Of course, those of us who are here in the trenches know about them, we can visualize the happenings, but the great rank and file of the people might not hear of them.

Of course, the event that happened yesterday the people are familiar with, because they have read it in the papers of this

morning, how the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], has acted as the great pacifier of the Republican Party, has smoothed the troubled waters, and taken into the fold of the Old Guard, in order to have peace and harmony, one of the younger guard. It mattered not with the Senator from Utah, because he was working in the interest of the Republican Party, that he had murmured under his breath, as the newspaper gentlemen state, that he would resign from the Committee on Finance if "Bob" La Follette should be put on his committee by the Republican committee on committees. Of course, I take it that the Senator from Utah never said anything like that, because he is friendly to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, he knows his worth, and he appreciates how the Senator from Wisconsin has labored in order to save the Republican Party from its mistakes and errors during this tariff controversy.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the Senator's ground for assuming that the Senator from Utah did not say just what the newspapers state he said? The Senator from Utah has not denied it, and he is sitting here.

Mr. HARRISON. When I stated that he did not, he remained quiet and did not respond. I take it his silence gives consent.

Mr. NORRIS. And when I question the Senator as to his authority, the Senator from Utah still remains quiet.

Mr. HARRISON. But he has brought harmony back into the fold. He may have made some of his colleagues of the Old Guard a little angry by his actions, they do not like his policy, they do not agree with him when he refuses to kick members out of the Republican organization, but he wants to invite them in.

I notice in the paper that the chairman of the senatorial campaign committee does not agree with the Senator from Utah; but the Senator from Utah is always working to promote some interest and the welfare of his party. He does not care how much punishment he takes in order to do it—and he takes a good deal.

Mr. President, to substantiate what I have just stated, the Senator from Utah this month, on the very first day of this session, began the new year—I presume it was the first measure he introduced this year—by introducing a Senate bill, in which he wanted to angle for favor with the President of the United States. Let me read this remarkable measure.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the dam authorized to be constructed under the provisions of the Boulder Canyon project act, approved December 21, 1928, and heretofore known as Boulder Dam, shall be known and designated on the public records as Hoover Dam.

SEC. 2. All records, surveys, maps, and public documents of the United States in which such dam is mentioned or referred to under the name of Boulder Dam, or otherwise, shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Hoover Dam.

It comes with fine grace from the Senator from Utah, who is laboring so zealously here now with his colleagues to increase the tariff on sugar, and after he has written into the bill higher rates on wool, knowing that the bill is going to the President of the United States, either for his approval or rejection, to court friendship with the President of the United States.

Of course, I know the Senator from Utah did not have that in mind when he introduced the resolution, that is far from him, he does not play the game that way. There will naturally be some people in the country, however, who will think that, but that is not the real reason why the great leader in the matter of finances on the other side of the Chamber has offered this resolution to style, name, designate, and dedicate henceforth and forever Boulder Dam as the Hoover Dam. His reasons are based upon logic. Those who now do me the honor to hear me will remember those long, long hours when the Senator from Utah imposed upon us, for days, in one instance, speaking against the Boulder Dam. Of all those who opposed it, with the exception of the distinguished Senators from Arizona, I dare say it had no opponent who evinced greater interest and displayed more earnestness in opposition to the passage of the Boulder Dam legislation and the erection of that great dam out there in the Southwest, henceforth, now, and forever to be called, at the instance of the senior Senator from Utah, the Hoover Dam.

I recall, and other Senators will remember, how in those fine speeches spun day after day during the many months that it took to pass that legislation he pictured the work after it should have been finished. He told about the unsafeness of the proposition. He said it was a visionary dream, that it was chimerical, that it was a myth, that it was a wild-goose chase, to erect this Boulder Dam, henceforth to be known as the Hoover Dam.

He said it would be like building a house upon the sands; the waves would come and would wash it away, and the storms would beat upon it, and it would crumble to pieces. He pictured it as a pretty poor proposition. That is the reason why the Senator from Utah wants to name Boulder Dam the Hoover Dam. He thinks because of its alleged unsafeness, its undurability, that it is most appropriate to name it after his President.

Of course, he could have selected other names. I am sure if it should be left to the Senate and to the people of California, if it should not receive the name of Boulder Dam, the right designation, the right name to call it, would be the Johnson Dam. What was the reason for the Senator from Utah wanting to name this particular project after Hoover? It may be that the reason why he did not call it the Hoover-Johnson Dam was because he knew that the Senator from California did everything for it and the President of the United States did nothing for it, and the twin appellation would not be appropriate. Then, too, he might have thought for the two names to be coupled together would be too much of a curiosity to the people of California. Ah, Mr. President, if ever a man labored in this body to put over a piece of legislation against the most tremendous odds it was the senior Senator from California. It was over stupendous opposition, it was against men in this Chamber who had ability and influence and who never failed to exert it in opposition to the movements of the Senator from California. Throughout that controversy I dare say that not a Senator now present, or a Member of the other House, ever received, in his efforts to pass that legislation, a word of approval or commendation or encouragement from the present President of the United States. Indeed, during the ides of the last national campaign, when he visited the State of California and spoke from the steps of the city hall of Los Angeles, he created such confusion and doubt in the minds of the people of the great Southwest as to his real position on the Boulder Dam proposition that it raised hopes in the breasts of those who were fighting for the Democratic cause that we might win the electoral votes of either Arizona or California because of his utterance or lack of utterance. One speech put hopes in the breasts of the people of Arizona, although it brought disapproval from the people of California, and the next speech he made in California won back the people of California to the disgust of the people of Arizona. Nobody knew how Mr. Hoover stood in those days on Boulder Dam.

It is not often, Mr. President, when one who refuses to attend the birth of a child is permitted to name the child.

Our ever present and energetic friend from Utah desires to do that. I hope that at a very early date, because this is a most important resolution, the Senator from Utah will find time from his many arduous labors to explain to the Senate just why he wants to change the name of Boulder to that of Hoover.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all that I said in relation to a dam being built in Boulder Canyon, the eminent engineers who were sent there to make investigation justify. There is to be no dam at Boulder Canyon. That is changed entirely. Why call it Boulder Dam when it is not to be in Boulder Canyon? It was moved to Black Canyon.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment. I am going to take only a moment.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator thinks it should not be named "Boulder" because it is not in Boulder Canyon, why does he try to convince us that it ought to be named "Hoover"? Is it in Hoover Canyon?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not trying to convince the Senate at all. I think the name ought to be changed.

I know what the Senator from Mississippi had in mind. It was not what I had done, it is not the bill to which he is objecting. He wanted to take a poke at the President, that is all. You can not fool anybody here at all by getting up and making such a talk as that.

Mr. President, I care not whether it is called Boulder Dam or Black Canyon Dam, but I do think that it is a perfect farce to take the name of that great canyon and call the dam "Boulder Dam" after what has transpired in this body. It is a very good thing for California, I will say now, that the Senator from Arizona and a few other Senators called attention to the conditions and brought about the change from that dangerous location.

The Senator from California knows I never said a single solitary word, after the bill was passed, about the building of the dam and going ahead with it. I hope and trust that every advantage which has ever been spoken of for California will come from the building of the dam. But I called the attention of the

Senate to the fact that the spillways as provided in the contemplated construction of the dam would never permit the water to go through. I called attention to the fact that it was a dangerous proposition, and three great engineers of the United States said so with such force that the location of the dam was changed and moved farther down the river.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator said I was poking at the President.

Mr. SMOOT. I think so.

Mr. HARRISON. I said nothing about the President.

Mr. SMOOT. I had rather state right out straight what I have to say than to make any insinuations. When I have anything to say I try to say it; I do not try to beat around the bush. If I have anything to say about the President, I am going to say it about him and not try to whip him over somebody else's shoulder.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator answer a question? He flew off and did not give me an opportunity to ask my question. Does he not think he does the President an injustice when he says that this farce, this failure as he termed it, should be named after the President?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not said it was a failure.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator said it was a farce.

Mr. SMOOT. It would have been a farce and a failure if it had been constructed in Boulder Canyon, but its location has been changed.

Mr. JOHNSON obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to ask both the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Utah a question. The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Mississippi has used the introduction of the bill as an instrumentality by means of which to "take a poke" at the President, I am wondering whether there was possibly a conspiracy between the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Utah by which it was agreed that the Senator from Utah should introduce the bill in order to give the Senator from Mississippi an opportunity to take the poke? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to remind the Senator that we have the Roosevelt Dam, we have the Wilson Dam, and we have the Coolidge Dam, and I thought it was no more than right and proper that this great dam should be named after President Hoover. It certainly ought not to be called Boulder Dam, because it is not to be located in Boulder Canyon.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I express my very deep gratification at the solicitude of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] for the proper naming of this particular institution and construction? May I express, too, to the Senator from Mississippi my thanks for his very kindly personal references? May I say, too, in clearing the geographical atmosphere, that the dam has been located at a single definite point from the time the first bill was introduced until the time of its passage? It just happened, as the Senator from Utah said, that there are two canyons which were never heard of, I presume, except possibly in their immediate vicinity, until the bill was introduced, one designated Black Canyon and the other Boulder Canyon, and interchangeably Boulder Canyon has been called Black Canyon during the long, long progress of the legislation.

But I wish to add that I am delighted to call this, if I had anything to do with it, the Hoover Dam or the Smoot Dam, or any other appellation that might be applied to it. I am interested, Mr. President, in building the dam under the terms of the bill which was enacted into law by the Congress of the United States. When that shall have been done, whether it be designated the Hoover Dam, to which I have not the slightest objection, or the Smoot Dam—and I have not a bit of objection to that designation, either—or the dam in response to the necessities of any particular locality with any kind of a name that might be applied to it, either profane or otherwise, I shall be very happy, indeed. When it shall have been constructed it will, indeed, have done such a marvelous work in the Southwest that every individual in the Congress or elsewhere who honestly contributed to the legislation will be delighted at the work that is done and will feel sufficiently commended by the results which will flow from the construction.

I repeat, because I want no misunderstanding in that regard, that I do not oppose the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah, not in the slightest. I am very glad to confer any honor upon any individual in any position that will honestly contribute to the construction of this great work, and I trust that if we change the name which has been accorded this dam during the past seven years to any other name we may find that it will

facilitate the construction work and will contribute to the great Southwest of the Nation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the honorable Secretary of the Interior shall carry out, as evidently he proposes to do, some of the plans he has announced respecting the operation and maintenance of the dam, it will throughout the Nation carry a more opprobrious epithet than any applied to it here to-day. [Laughter.]

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Allen	Frazier	Kean	Sheppard
Ashurst	George	Kendrick	Shortridge
Baird	Gillett	Keyes	Simmons
Bingham	Glass	King	Smoot
Black	Glenn	La Follette	Steck
Blaine	Goff	McCulloch	Stevens
Blease	Gould	McKellar	Sullivan
Borah	Greene	McMaster	Swanson
Bratton	Grundy	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harris	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Hastings	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Oddie	Wagner
Copeland	Hawes	Overman	Walcott
Couzens	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Deneen	Heflin	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Fess	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Fletcher	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler

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

NOMINATION OF JAMES WALDRON REMICK

Mr. MOSES. As in open executive session, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to report a nomination from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

James Waldron Remick, of New Hampshire, to be war claims arbiter, vice Edwin B. Parker, deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

As in legislative session,

SANTA ROSA SOUND BRIDGE, FLORIDA

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 2675) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, in the State of Florida, authorized to be built by the boards of county commissioners of the counties of Escambia and Santa Rosa, in the

State of Florida, and I submit a report (No. 71) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. There is no objection to it from any quarter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, is it in the regular form?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is in the regular form, and merely extends the time for beginning the construction of the bridge.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments reported by the committee were, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to strike out the comma and "notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906"; in line 7, after the name "Santa Rosa Sound," to strike out "in the State of" and insert "at or near Deer Point, Santa Rosa County"; and after line 12 to insert a new section, as follows: "Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across Santa Rosa Sound at or near Deer Point, Santa Rosa County, Fla., authorized to be built by the boards of county commissioners of the counties of Escambia and Santa Rosa, in the State of Florida, by the act of Congress approved May 26, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, Fla."

COMPARISON OF LABOR LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA WITH THOSE OF OTHER STATES

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I have before me a comparison of the labor laws of South Carolina with those of other States. The table has been prepared by the Cotton Manufacturers' Association of South Carolina, and on account of the textile industry being discussed so frequently, I ask that the table may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the South Carolina Gazette, Columbia, S. C.]

SOUTH CAROLINA LABOR LAWS AS COMPARED WITH OTHER STATES

Below is presented a chart showing a brief analysis of important laws affecting labor in South Carolina as compared with those of other Southern States. No elaboration is necessary; the chart speaks for itself. It is interesting, however, to note the completeness of the South Carolina code on this subject. It is believed that the laws affecting labor are scrupulously obeyed and rigidly enforced.

State	Hours of labor, male adults	Night work, adults	Contracts, employer and employee	Making up lost time (of mill)	Child labor	Hours of labor, female adults
South Carolina	55 hours per week limit (except engineers, firemen, watchmen, teamsters, yardmen, clerical, mechanics); 10 hours per day limit, except making up lost time; posting notice of hours required.	55 hours per week limit.	Contracts beyond hour limits not allowed.	Loss of time of mill due to unavoidable causes may be made up to extent of 60 hours per year; must be made up within 3 months after loss; printed notices required; record of time made up required to be kept.	Limit 14 years age; under 16 allowed only by sworn statement of birth and age from parents, and permit from commissioner; under 16 can not work between 8 p. m. and 6 a. m., except to make up lost time of mill; under 16 can never work later than 9 p. m.; notices required forbidding under 16 to clean machinery while in motion.	55 hours per week limit; 10 hours per day limit; posting notice of hours required.
Georgia	60 hours per week limit (except engineers, firemen, watchmen, mechanics, teamsters, yardmen, clerical); 10 hours limit per day.	60 hours per week limit (except engineers, firemen, watchmen, mechanics, teamsters, yardmen, clerical).		Loss of time of mill due to unavoidable causes may be made up to extent of 10 days.	Limit 14 years age; under 16 allowed only by certificate from superintendent of schools; under 16 can not work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m., unless all requirements compulsory education law are met; between 16 and 18 can not work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m., except by certificate from school superintendent; under 16 can not operate machines for picking wool, cotton or hair.	Same as adult male.

State	Hours of labor, male adults	Night work, adults	Contracts, employer and employee	Making up lost time (of mill)	Child labor	Hours of labor, female adults
Mississippi.....	60 hours per week limit (opinion attorney general); 10 hours per day limit, except in emergencies, may work 30 minutes additional each day if amount additional is deducted from last day of week.	80 hours per week limit; 11½ hours first 5 nights and 3½ hours Saturday night.			Limit 14 years age; under 16 can not work except on parents' affidavit as to birth and age, and extent of education; under 16 years age can not work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.; under 16 years age only 8 hours per day or total 44 hours per week.	Same as adult male.
North Carolina.....	60 hours per week limit; 11 hours per day limit (except engineers, firemen, superintendents, overseers, section and yard hands, office, watchmen, and repair men).	No law governing night work.	Any male adult may enter into written contract to work longer than 60 hours provided he receives extra pay for extra time.		Limit 14 years age; under 16 years age allowed only by certificate from State child-welfare commission; under 16 years age can not work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.; under 16 years age only 8 hours per day, total 48 hours per week; under 16 can work 6 a. m. to 7 p. m. if completed fourth grade in school.	60 hours limit per week; 11 hours limit per day.
Tennessee.....	No law.				Limit 14 years age; under 16 can not work except by certificate from school superintendent, and statement of birth and age; under 16 can not work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.; under 16 limited to 8 hours per day, 6 days in 1 week; under 16 may not clean or operate machinery used for picking cotton, wool, or hair; posting notice of hours required.	57 hours per week limit; 10½ hours per day limit (but only for purpose of allowing 1 short day); posting notice of hours required.
Alabama.....	do.				Limit 14 years age; under 16 can not work except by certificate from school superintendent; under 16 can not work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.; under 16 limited to 8 hours per day, 6 days in one week, 48 hours in one week; under 16 can not work around machine used in picking cotton, wool, or hair.	No law.
Texas.....	do.				Limit 15 years age.	60 hours limit per week; 10 hours limit per day; over 9 hours per day pay at double rate.
Virginia.....	do.	No law.	No contract female workers permitted beyond 10 hours per day.		Limit 14 years age; under 16 can not work except by certificate from school attendance officers; under 16 can not work between 6 p. m. and 7 a. m.; under 16 limited to 8 hours per day, 6 days per week, 48 hours per week; posting notice of hours required; posting list of employees under 16 required, also keeping record of list.	60 hours limit per week; 10 hours limit per day; no contract permitted beyond 10 hours per day.
Louisiana.....	do.				Limit 14 years age; under 16 can not work except by certificate from proper officers of parish; no boy under 16 or girl under 18 shall work between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.; under 16 limited to 8 hours per day, 48 hours per week; between 16 and 18 limited to 10 hours per day, 60 hours per week; no child shall be required to clean machinery while in motion; list of employed children required to be kept by mill.	60 hours limit per week; 10 hours limit per day; women shall not be required to clean machinery while in motion.

Explanation: Space prohibits details. The above chart gives only a brief digest of the general meaning of important legislative enactments on the subject. In the different States there are many laws which affect labor. For example: Compulsory education laws, laws defining the terms used in the statutes, laws providing methods of enforcement, laws concerning factory inspection, laws setting forth penalties for violations, laws defining the powers and duties of enforcement officers, and many others. No attempt has been made to include such collateral subjects. The above, however, is an authentic outline of the principal laws in force to-day. It is interesting to note that the child labor laws in all the States except one are almost identical. On the whole, South Carolina laws are more rigid than the average.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business to-day the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. WATSON. I suggest that the Senator make the hour 12 o'clock. Our conference is to meet at 11 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. What conference?

Mr. WATSON. The Republican conference.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the conference was going to meet at 10.30.

Mr. WATSON. No; we could not hold it at that time. Notices were sent out yesterday for a meeting at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well. I will change my request and ask that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow; but I wish to give notice that to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to remain in session so long as may be possible, in view of the 12 o'clock meeting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BADGE OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. WATERMAN. From the Committee on Patents I report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2657) granting a renewal of patent No. 21053 relating to the badge of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is a unanimous report. The bill proposes to extend the life of a design patent upon the pin used by the organization known as the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is merely to prevent infringements upon the emblem used by this patriotic association. I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

MR. SMOOT. Mr. President, when I was chairman of the Committee on Patents I refused to recommend the extension of patents, and that has likewise been the attitude of the Senate.

MR. WATERMAN. Mr. President, this patent has been once extended.

MR. SMOOT. I understand that, and I merely wish to make a statement for the RECORD. The only patents that have ever been extended, as I recall, are the one covered by the bill reported by the Senator from Colorado and one other in a similar case applying to another national organization. I am not going to object to the consideration of the bill, but I want to say that I hope the Senate never will extend the term of any other patent. That has been the policy which has heretofore been pursued since I have been in the Senate. Senator Platt, of Connecticut, who was chairman of the Committee on Patents for such a long time in this body, said to me when I was first appointed chairman of that committee, "Senator Smoot, do not ever consent to the extension of a patent."

MR. GLASS. But the Senator from Utah is not taking his advice.

MR. SMOOT. This design patent has been extended once before and is for the Daughters of the American Revolution. I make the statement I have made for the RECORD, so that our action in this instance will not be pointed to as a precedent in the future.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date September 22, 1891, being patent No. 21053, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as the badge of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MR. WATSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in open session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business in open session.

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate sundry messages from the President transmitting executive nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees and which appear at the end of to-day's proceedings.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports, the calendar is in order.

SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl Theile to be secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles C. Eberhardt to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Costa Rica.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Myrl S. Myers to be consul general.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lester Maynard to be consul general.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert D. Coe to be secretary in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fayette J. Flexer to be secretary in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

MR. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] present, but I ask unanimous consent that the postal nominations may be confirmed en bloc.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

NAVAL NOMINATIONS

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations in the Navy.

MR. HALE. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

MR. WATSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until to-morrow, Friday, January 10, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 9 (legislative day of January 6), 1930

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Frederic M. Sackett, of Kentucky, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Germany.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY

Abraham C. Ratschesky, of Massachusetts, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia.

Gilchrist Baker Stockton, of Florida, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER

William E. Lee, of Idaho, to be an interstate commerce commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1931, vice Campbell, resigned.

WAR CLAIMS ARBITER

James Waldron Remick, of New Hampshire, to be war claims arbiter, under section 3 of the act of Congress approved March 10, 1928, entitled "Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928," vice Edwin B. Parker, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Albert H. Tarleton, of Honolulu, Hawaii, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Thomas L. Walker, of Lexington, Ky., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Orin G. Murfin to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 7th day of January, 1930.

Lieut. Commander Earle C. Metz to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1929.

Lieut. William I. Lehrfeld to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 7th day of November, 1929.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank Akers to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of January, 1930.

Ensign Harold M. Shanahan to be a Lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1929.

Medical Director Charles E. Riggs to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, from the 13th day of November, 1923.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 23d day of December, 1929:

George H. Mills, a citizen of Ohio.

Thomas E. Crowley, a citizen of California.

Jesse B. Bancroft, a citizen of Wisconsin.

Edwin A. Thomas, a citizen of Wisconsin.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 13th day of October, 1929:

Hugh C. Adams.

Ernest L. Rairdon.

Harold L. Whiteacre.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9 (legislative day of January 6), 1930

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Frederic M. Sackett, to Germany.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Charles C. Eberhardt, to Costa Rica.

DIPLOMATIC SECRETARIES

Robert D. Coe.

Fayette J. Flexer.

CONSULS GENERAL

Myrl S. Myers.

Lester Maynard.

SECRETARY OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Karl Theile.

WAR CLAIMS ARBITER

James Waldron Remick.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

William L. Calhoun to be captain.
 Franklin S. Steinwachs to be commander.
 Lowe H. Bibby to be lieutenant.
 Lloyd D. Follmer to be lieutenant.
 Horatio D. Smith to be lieutenant.
 Edward H. Pierce to be lieutenant.
 Charles J. H. Frerksen to be chief machinist.
 George C. Walsh to be chief machinist.
 Harry E. Millard to be chief machinist.
 Fay O. Huntsinger to be chief pharmacist.
 Chester S. Fay to be chief pharmacist.
 Clyde M. Lane to be chief pharmacist.
 George E. Palmer to be lieutenant.
 Clifford M. Alvord to be lieutenant.
 Emory P. Hylant to be lieutenant.
 Charles A. Havard to be lieutenant.
 Thomas T. Beattie to be lieutenant.
 Alfred R. Mead to be lieutenant.
 Charles O. Humphreys to be lieutenant.
 Valvin R. Sinclair to be lieutenant.
 Harry Keeler, jr., to be lieutenant.
 Augustus D. Clark to be lieutenant.
 Vernon Huber to be lieutenant.
 Peter J. Nelmo to be lieutenant.
 Horace B. Butterfield to be lieutenant.
 John P. Cady to be lieutenant.
 Harry W. Wienberg to be chief boatswain.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Ross H. Cunningham, Jerome.
 Oregon D. M. Gaddis, Kingman.
 Charles L. Beatty, Nogales.

ARKANSAS

Albert E. Townsend, Little Rock.
 Robert Dail, Ravenden.
 Mary L. Beeson, Waldo.

COLORADO

Dollie P. Young, Agate.
 Alice Estes, Lafayette.

CONNECTICUT

Edward R. Bailey, Danbury.
 Levi C. Frost, Milldale.
 Nellie A. Byrnes, Pomfret.
 Lincoln Taylor, Stamford.
 Robert A. Dunning, Thompson.

FLORIDA

Fred H. Gibbons, Archer.
 Herbert L. Eiland, Baker.
 Pauline B. James, Beresford.
 James E. Still, Bonifay.
 Eugene D. Lounds, Crescent City.
 Fred Brett, Crestview.
 Charles A. Miller, Crystal River.
 Frank Dean, Delray Beach.
 Wesley S. Moe, Fort Pierce.
 Raymon J. Sweezey, Frostproof.
 Jesse E. Franklin, Glen St. Mary.
 James T. Phillips, Greenville.
 Emma S. Fletcher, Havana.
 William H. Downing, High Springs.
 William L. Bryan, Jasper.
 Nathan J. Lewis, Newberry.
 Shelly L. Hayes, New Smyrna.
 David R. Laycock, Orlando.
 Ethel C. McPherson, Passagralle.
 Henry A. Drake, Port St. Joe.
 Dudley H. Morgan, River Junction.

Abraham H. Lasher, Safety Harbor.
 Arthur L. Stevens, Waldo.

MICHIGAN

Glen H. Doyle, Cedar Springs.
 Orrin T. Hoover, Chelsea.
 Thomas M. Melvin, Detour.
 Glenn B. Swiler, Mecosta.
 Nathaniel Lobb, Munising.
 Fred E. Heath, Plainwell.
 Ralph W. Clapp, Saugatuck.

NEW YORK

J. Fred Hammond, Canton.
 Stanley D. Cornish, Carmel.
 Carrie De Revere, Eastview.
 Charles L. Dix, Forestville.
 Katheryn M. Oley, Jamesville.
 Warren H. Curtis, Marion.
 Ivan L. Connor, Natural Bridge.
 Jacob C. Kopperger, Stottville.
 A. T. Smith, Tully.

OHIO

Emory W. Henderson, Dunkirk.
 Charles S. Brown, Glenmont.
 Charles W. Evans, Huntsville.
 Asa D. McCoy, Marietta.
 Mayme C. Reed, Metamora.
 William E. Lehman, Payne.
 Mary B. Craig, Russells Point.
 John G. Daub, Trenton.

TENNESSEE

William S. Gentry, McEwen.

WEST VIRGINIA

John A. Ferguson, Hollidays Cove.
 Ray Merrifield, Smithfield.

WYOMING

Blanche Sutton, Hulett.
 Frances P. Youngberg, Lyman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, January 9, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O pitying, loving God, how marvelous is Thy patience. Thou art our Creator; be Thou our Comforter and our Savior. Out of discipline and out of limitation do Thou call us, that we may praise and magnify Thee in thought, feeling, and will. Take our affections, and may they be swallowed up in Thine. Thou, who canst bring forth from the mute, unpromising earth, bring forth out of our hearts the blossom and fruit of love and peace. Look with rich blessing upon Thy people of every name. Let all darkness flee, and with it ignorance, cruelty, and every evil thing. O let our whole land see Thy salvation. Our Father, hear our prayer as it falls through muted lips. She has gone and left him. As she lay in his loving arms, so pure and tender, her spiritual and immortal loveliness was as fair and rich as the angels'. Remember him with the weeping face, the breaking heart, marred and bruised with the experience of long suffering. Chant for him the sublime strains of peace and victory as they come through the winding shadows of the tomb. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal 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. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Poland.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JONES and Mr. OVERMAN members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the General Accounting Office.