long-and-short-haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8460. Also, petition of the Minnesota Bankers Association, opposing amendments to House bill 7617, providing for extension of branch banking privileges to national banks or coercing State nonmember banks to join the Federal Reserve System in order to continue as insured banks, and favoring an assessment of one-twelfth of 1 percent instead of one-eighth of 1 percent to be paid to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8461. By Mr. REILLY: Joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President to adequately increase the protective tariff on butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8462. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and vicinity, concerning the Mead shorter-work-week bill (H. R. 6990); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8463. By Mr. SAUTHOFF: Joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President to adequately increase the protective tariff on butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8464. Also, joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to provide for the continuance of aid in lime and marl production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8465. Also, joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin, petitioning the National Emergency Council and the Works Allotment Board to create a mining works project in the dormant southwestern Wisconsin mineral area; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

8466. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, commending the President of the United States for his courage in urging Congress to take the profits out of war, and requesting that the President and Congress take the profits out of the manufacture of munitions by way of preparedness for war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8467. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Union Grange, No. 2342, Butler County, Ohio, by V. D. Campbell, West Chester, Ohio, urging support of House bill 7160, providing sufficient revenue for agriculture extension and land-grant colleges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8468. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Charles V. Disney, Manila Camp, No. 50, United Spanish War Veterans, Cleveland, Ohio, urging support of House bill 6995, restoring benefits to Spanish War veterans, their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

8469. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, district no. 1, State association, by their financial secretary, Earl C. Boyer, of Canton, Ohio, urging support of House bill 5583, as they believe that they are more able to give the Department and the public in general better and more efficient service than what they are now receiving by contract service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8470. Also, petition of the Hancock County Corn-Hog Control Association, Findlay, Ohio, by Lester Fink, urging support of House bill 7160; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8471. Also, petition of Jemina Lavely and other women of Galloway, Ohio, being interested in the extension work being promoted by the O. S. U. College of Agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the county farm bureaus, urging support of House bill 7160; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8472. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, commending the President of the United States for his courage in urging Congress to take the profits out of war, and requesting that the President and Congress take the profits out of the manufacture of munitions by way of preparedness for war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, May 14, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, appointed by the Governor of New Mexico to be a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Bronson Cutting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of New Mexico, I, Clyde Tingley, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint DENNIS CHAVEZ a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Bronson M. Cutting, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Clyde Tingley, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., this 11th day of May, A. D. 1935.

CLYDE TINGLEY, *Governor.*

By the Governor:
[SEAL]

ELIZABETH F. GONZALES,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator designate [Mr. CHAVEZ] will arrive shortly to take the oath. He is not at this time in the city.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia, praying for an investigation as to the eligibility of Rush D. Holt to be a Senator from the State of West Virginia in the Seventy-fourth Congress (oath not yet administered), and further that the seat referred to in the Senate be declared vacant so that the Governor of the State may immediately appoint a duly qualified person to serve as Senator from West Virginia until the next regular election, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I note the absence of a quorum, and move a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH] are unavoidably detained from the Senate, and I repeat the announcement that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is absent on an official mission to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 98) to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth for the purpose of establishing a permanent library at the Walter Reed General Hospital to be known as the "Fred C. Ainsworth Endowment Library."

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1384) to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act, and to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, Mr. DOXEY, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. KINZER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5159) to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for air mail service in Alaska, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the current session on the bill S. 1130, the Economic Security Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill (H. R. 6084) entitled "An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed $1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes", and that the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit the same to the President of the United States.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 61)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, fiscal year 1936, in the sum of $12,750, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SO-CALLED "HARRISON NARCOTIC LAW"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 1 and 6 of the so-called "Harrison narcotic law", which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ACTING ASSISTANT TREASURER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 304 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relative to the appointment of an Acting Assistant Treasurer of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

Senate Joint Resolution 15

Whereas a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day in commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending before the present session of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas October 11, 1779, is the date, in American history, of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski which resulted from wounds sustained on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the United States have, by legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the anniversary of this day be remembered with suitable and fitting patriotic and public exercises in commemoration of the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has, by legislative enactment, designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1934, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly of Illinois (the house of representatives concurring herein), That this assembly respectfully importunes the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day Resolution now pending in Congress: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and to each United States Senator and Representative from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, urgently requested to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for an additional Delegate to the Congress from this Territory, the said additional Delegate to be elected for a term of 2 years in the same manner as in the case of the present Delegate to Congress from this Territory; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the petition of M. B. Eller, of North Wilkesboro, N. C., praying for the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate papers in the nature of memorials of several citizens of New York City and vicinity, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation imposing a special tax of one-half cent per gallon on heating oil, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for an investigation of charges filed by the Women's Committee of Louisiana relative to the qualification of the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. LONG and Mr. OVERTON], which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also laid before the Senate letters, papers, and telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens and veterans' organizations of the United States, praying for the enactment of the so-called "Patman bonus bill", which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Louisiana State

Federation of Labor, the New Orleans Central Trades and Labor Council, the New Orleans Building Trades Council, and affiliated unions, in the State of Louisiana, favoring the enactment of the so-called "Wagner labor-disputes bill" and the "Black 30-hour work-week bill", and also favoring the extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act and other legislation in the interest of labor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution adopted by a meeting of Regional District No. 2 of the Royal Order of Moose, at Salem, Mass., protesting against the imposition of the cotton processing tax and favoring the making of adequate tariff duties to protect the textile industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Greater Lawrence, Mass., remonstrating against a 48-hour work week and the importation of goods to compete with American industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions, and letters and papers in the nature of petitions, from sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the so-called "Patman bonus bill", which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials from the Andover Service Club, of Andover, and sundry citizens of Waltham, in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called "Patman bonus bill", which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Aerie No. 1445, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Hyde Park, Mass., favoring the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Home City Lodge No. 793, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and Railroad Lodge No. 487, International Association of Machinists, both of Springfield, and B. and M. F. H. Lodge No. 1286, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, of Somerville, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation extending the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PROCESSING TAX ON COTTON

Mr. GERRY presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Providence, R. I., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cotton-textile industry, upon which thousands of residents of the city of Providence are dependent for their livelihood, is in a serious plight and in danger of destruction as a result of the processing tax on cotton and lack of adequate protection against the importation of goods manufactured by cheap labor abroad; and

Whereas many mills in the State of Rhode Island and other New England States have been closed, never to open again, and it is quite probable that other mills will be obliged to close, and as a result thousands of people will lose their employment and the very existence of whole communities is endangered; and

Whereas the city of Providence is already experiencing the disastrous effects of the break-down of the cotton textile industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city council hereby petitions the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the processing tax on cotton and to enact legislation which will give adequate protection to the cotton-textile industry against importations of goods manufactured by cheap labor abroad; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the proceedings of the day the telegram which I hold in my hand from Charles A. Peterson, commander Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New Jersey.

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

The Department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, respectfully requests that you speak favorably for H. R. No. 1, known as the "Patman bill." We want you to know that veterans' civil sentiment in your State is overwhelmingly in favor of the Patman bill. Never before has there been so much demand in your State for this piece of legislation. You are requested to read this telegram on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, so it can be recorded in the proceedings of that body.

Mr. WHEELER presented a telegram from R. E. Kelly, department commander for Montana, V. F. W., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLINGS, MONT., *May 14, 1935.*

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER:

Just returned from a trip over the State, and find our entire membership and 90 percent of the other veterans in favor of Patman bill. Our membership believe that the passage of this bill would do more to return prosperity than any other measure yet adopted. Eighteen thousand veterans in Montana are anxiously watching this bill. I am authorized by department council of administration to thank you for supporting the Patman bill. Your further support will be highly appreciated. You may read this wire on the floor.

R. E. KELLY,
Department Commander for Montana, V. F. W.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been asked to have read to the Senate a telegram from a gentleman of my State relative to the soldiers' bonus. I send the telegram to the desk and ask to have it read, and ask that it may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read the telegram, as follows:

FARMINGTON, N. MEX., *May 14, 1935.*

Hon. CARL A. HATCH:

Have interviewed practically all business people, individuals, school board, county commissioners, chamber-of-commerce officials, and many others who wired and wrote you support Patman bill, and no one has changed his mind, and all want to see this bill enacted into law and respectfully urge you to override veto if necessary. There is no doubt that 75 percent of people this State and Nation want the soldier paid, and they honestly and sincerely believe that Patman way the sane and best way to discharge this obligation. Again thanking you for your loyal support on behalf of 16,000 veterans of this State, and you know that 98 percent of them in dire need of their money. Please read this message on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

CASH AUSTIN,
Commander Department of New Mexico,
Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4239) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 623) thereon.

Mr. GORE, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to which was referred the bill (S. 2288) to provide for the measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 624) thereon.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS AND AFFILIATES

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 71) authorizing an investigation of interstate railroads and affiliates with respect to financing, reorganizations, mergers, and certain other matters (submitted by Mr. WHEELER on Feb. 4, 1935), reported it with additional amendments.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 2826) to authorize the payment of $2,388.61 that was due the Central Railway Co. of Arkansas under section 602 (a) of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act of 1933; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 2827) for the relief of Margaret Scott Bayley; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill 2828, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2829) granting a pension to Patrick T. Tucker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2830) to repeal sections 1, 2, and 3 of Public Law No. 203, Sixtieth Congress, approved February 3, 1909; and

A bill (S. 2831) to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 2832) to provide a preliminary examination of Goldsborough Creek, in Mason County, State of Washington, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2833) for the relief of Mrs. Jack J. O'Connell; and

A bill (S. 2834) to provide for the appointment of Ira E. Porter as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERTON:

A bill (S. 2835) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

A bill (S. 2836) to provide for insurance by the Farm Credit Administration of mortgages on farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) making immediately available the appropriation for the fiscal year 1936 for the construction, repair, and maintenance of Indian-reservation roads; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a bill and to make a very brief statement regarding it.

The bill which I introduce is offered as a substitute for title 2 and title 8 or so much of title 8 as is pertinent and necessary to title 2 of the social-security bill now pending before the Finance Committee of the Senate. I offer it at this time in order that it may be printed and referred to the Finance Committee for the consideration of that committee.

I desire to say that I do not submit this proposed substitute in a spirit of hostility to, or criticism of, the general objectives of title 2 or of the social-security bill, but by way of cooperating with what I deem to be the essential objectives of this proposed legislation.

The bill before the Finance Committee, which has already passed the House of Representatives, contains two distinct groups of provisions, and these groups deal with essentially different methods of financing and administration and should, in my opinion, be covered in separate bills.

There is the group of provisions which grants emergency benefits in cooperation with a State to meet present needs on the part of the indigent aged, dependent children, and crippled children, to promote maternity welfare, and to develop public-health service. These are emergency benefits, and it is, of course, hoped that the need for them will progressively decrease. A separate bill containing these provisions as they now stand would probably be approved by the Senate with little, in any, opposition.

The other group of provisions covers permanent industrial hazards in organized industry. These provisions should, in my opinion, be included in a separate bill, and it should be regarded as a permanent social-security measure, and it is these provisions and some additional ones with regard to similar permanent hazards, which are embodied in the substitute bill I am now submitting.

These provisions are essentially reorganized in order to make this industrial protection plan less burdensome to industry, less burdensome financially to the Federal Government, and more effective in operation. The substitute bill aims to furnish social security without delay. It proposes to make the plan entirely self supporting, and no permanent increase in the public debt or any Federal taxes, which is in harmony with the President's expressed desire.

An emergency measure by which the Government, out of current income, pays relief benefits to the unemployed, is one thing, and may become a very dangerous thing. A permanent relief plan by which industry, as an operation cost, pays for the depreciation of human machinery is quite a different thing, and deserves the name of social security. Only that measure merits the title of "social security" which furnishes not only relief from unemployment but the means to prevent its recurrence.

I wish to make it clear that I think the proposed social security legislation is the most important submitted to this session of Congress in its far-reaching and permanent consequences to industry and to the general welfare. I am a convinced believer in its objectives, and the substitute now offered is offered as a better way, in my opinion, or at least as suggesting a better way, to secure permanent social security.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to go into any discussion of the provisions of the bill I am introducing, but it is my hope that when it is in printed form, it may have the benefit of the scrutiny and criticism of the members of the Finance Committee.

While I think it may be critically important to adopt a social-security act in the near future, yet this measure involves a new national and industrial policy of such large consequences, extending over so long a period of years, that it seems eminently wise and advisable to exercise forethought, and to take sufficient time before final action to convince ourselves that the measure we finally adopt is sound and socially usable.

I, therefore, ask consent to introduce the bill, and request to have it printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received, printed, and referred as indicated by the Senator from Georgia.

The bill (S. 2828) to encourage industrial protection plans in private industry, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5159) to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for air mail service in Alaska was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. MCNARY, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 624) for the relief of Edward M. Brown, and it was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

AWARD OF PUBLIC-BUILDING CONTRACTS

Mr. LONG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That for the purpose of securing information so that the Congress of the United States may determine whether there is or is not need for legislation, and the nature and extent of such legislation as may be needed, the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate shall conduct an investigation on the following matters, viz: (1) The awarding of building contracts and the works of public construction, including any and all matters and things connected with or growing out of the same; (2) the acts of officers of the United States and the agents of departments of the United States, either direct or indirect, in person or through their agents or emissaries, undertaking to influence awarding of contracts and the handling of public construction work in any manner calculated to show an unfair advantage, to favor contractors or materials or to allow changes or alterations in plans or specifications so as to show favoritism or make an undue profit; (3) the making, exhibiting, or giving away of things of value or the use of property or functions of the United States by any officer of the United States

for the purpose of paying private rewards or securing a profit to any Government officer or person; (4) the solicitation of funds from persons charged with crime by agents and officers of the United States, or by persons who were expected to become officers of the United States; and (5) the interferences with agents of departments of the United States in their efforts to make investigations into affairs of the United States and matters and concerns connected therewith; that the said Judiciary Committee or subcommittee thereof may make and conduct said investigations and hearings and may summons and compel the attendance of witnesses and compel the production of books and papers and employ agents as may be necessary for said investigation hereby authorized; that said Judiciary Committee or any subcommittee thereof shall have right to authorize the perusal of files and records having to do with matters covered in said investigations and hearings during the session of the Congress or during adjournment.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN DUPLICATE COPY OF AN ENROLLED BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill (H. R. 6084) entitled "An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed $1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes", and that the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit the same to the President of the United States.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

DISPOSITION OF LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATIONS

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 625, being House bill 7131.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let us have the bill reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7131) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and for other purposes, reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

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

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, there was a unanimous report from the Committee on Commerce. The bill merely authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of about 35 lighthouse sites. I do not know of any opposition to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio if the report of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes; the report is unanimous.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio spoke to me about the bill. Of course, I disapprove of the general practice, but under the statement made by the Senator from Ohio, I presume it is all right. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7131) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, there are about a dozen committee amendments to this bill. All the amendments are to correct section numbers and errors in descriptions of property. I ask that they be agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be agreed to en bloc.

The amendments of the Committee on Commerce, which were agreed en bloc, were, on page 2, line 4, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on page 3, line 8, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 18, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on page 4, line 5, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 21, after the word "minutes", to strike out "forty" and insert "ten"; on page 5, line 10, after the word "thence", to strike out "turning, runs south seventy-five degrees thirty-four minutes twenty seconds west to a stone bound; then"; in line 21, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on page 6, line 14, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 23, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on page 7, line 7, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 17, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36", on page 9, line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 18, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on page 10, line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on the same page, line 19, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; on page 11, line 6, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 12, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; in line 22, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36"; and on page 12, line 20, after the word "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36."

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a further committee amendment which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 4, after the word "transferred", it is proposed to insert "and the conditions imposed by section 36 of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NEUTRALITY OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR—ADDRESS BY JAMES BROWN SCOTT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James Brown Scott, president of the American Society of International Law on the subject of The Neutrality of the Good Neighbor before the twenty-ninth annual meeting, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1935. This request is accompanied by an estimate of the cost from the Government Printing Office.

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

THE NEUTRALITY OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR

Who is our neighbor? Everybody. Who is the good neighbor? Everybody who does right, helps others to do right, and knowingly and conscientiously refrains from any and all wrongdoing.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have a twofold confession to make: First, as a Presbyterian I am, as you know, in the habit of referring to the New Testament for a standard of good morals; and, second, as a Romanist—that is, a teacher of Roman law—I have developed the habit of referring to Justinian's Digest for the foundations of law for the future.

Therefore the thesis which I have the honor to maintain this evening is that of the Emperor Justinian, to be found in the Authentic or New Constitutions of Our Lord the Most Holy Emperor Justinian, Sixth Collection, issued some 14 centuries ago under date of the Seventh of the Kalends of July 539 A. D. [June 26], "Title XIV, Concerning Arms."

"Chapter I. * * * desiring to prevent men from killing each other, we have thought it proper to decree that no private person shall engage in the manufacture of weapons, and that only those shall be authorized to do so who are employed in the public arsenals, or are called 'armorers'; and also that manufacturers of arms should not sell them to any private individual. * * *

"Chapter III. Therefore, God directing our thoughts, we decree by the present law that no private individual, or anyone else whosoever shall, in any Province or city of our Empire, have the right to make or sell arms, or deal in them in any way, but only such as are authorized to manufacture them can do so, and deposit them in our armory. * * *

"Chapter IV But in order that what has been forbidden by us to private persons and all others may become clear, we have taken pains to enumerate in this law the different kinds of weapons whose manufacture is forbidden. Therefore, we prohibit private individuals from either making or buying bows, arrows, double-edged swords, ordinary swords, weapons usually called hunting knives, those styled "zabes", breastplates, javelins, lances, and spears of every shape whatever, arms called by the Isaurians

"monocopia", others called "sitinnes", or missiles, shields, and helmets; for we do not permit anything of this kind to be manufactured except by those who are appointed for that purpose in our arsenals, and only small knives which no one uses in fighting shall be allowed to be made and sold by private persons."

Here we have a clean-cut statement of a complete governmental control of the manufacture of arms and munitions, the only exception being what we would today call, I opine, "penknives" for the sharpening of pencils or the removing of blots from a manuscript.

There is a generally recognized law of neutrality, but it is an old law—younger than that of Justinian but yet an outworn law—adequate to circumstances which once existed but which no longer obtain. Since law should be in touch with actual conditions, it should change with changing circumstances, the circumstances in the case of neutrality being that, terrible as have been the wars of our century, those of tomorrow will be wars in which the entire populations of the belligerents will be directly engaged or affected, instead of being only remotely touched by war—as was the case when the existing law of neutrality came into being. But before considering what these circumstances are, it is desirable to refer to a more fundamental circumstance and its consequences.

It is unfortunately a fact that treaties ending wars are imposed rather than negotiated, although the forms of negotiation are ordinarily observed. But as in politics, so in war: to the victors belong the spoils—a precedent not established but followed by Brennus, when demanding a larger amount of gold from the defeated Romans as he threw his sword on the balance of the scales. Woe to the conquered! Force is not permissible in the making of agreements between man and man; unfortunately it prevails between nation and nation, especially in treaties ending war. In this regard, nations large and small are tarred with the same brush, but precedents of the larger nations appear to have the greater vogue in the international community. Two of these may be mentioned in passing.

In 1856 the Crimean War was ended by a treaty negotiated in Paris by the representatives of the belligerents. One of the terms of the victors was that Russia should keep no armed vessels on the Black Sea. In 1870, Russia took advantage of the Franco-Prussian War to denounce—that is to say, abrogate—the Treaty of Paris insofar as the prohibition of Russian ships of war on the Black Sea was concerned. This action aroused protest, and the signatories of the Treaty of Paris, meeting in London to consider the issue thus raised, signed a remarkable pronouncement on January 17, 1871, declaring it to be the public law of Europe that treaties could not be abrogated, nor their provisions changed, without the consent, amicably obtained, of the parties to the treaties. To this declaration France formally adhered on March 30 of the same year. Within a few months, the German Empire negotiated a treaty of peace with France—with which country Germany had been at war—by the terms of which France was to pay the then enormous sum of 5,000,000,000 gold francs (1,000,000,000 gold dollars) within a period of 3 years, during which German troops were to occupy a certain portion of France. Within 18 months the entire indebtedness was liquidated to the satisfaction of the German Empire. The treaty was thus lived up to by both the contracting parties—and both, it is to be noted, had also signed the declaration formulated at the London conference.

On the 10th day of January, 1920, the so-called "Treaty of Versailles" went into effect, the contracting parties being, on the one hand, Germany, and, on the other, the majority of the European powers signatory of the Declaration of London, which had prescribed that treaties could not be modified without the consent of the parties amicably had. The 15 years which have run since the 10th day of January, 1920, may truly be considered a period both of the making and of the remaking of treaties.[1] Why, then, make treaties, if they are to be made and remade but to be violated? For the violation of any treaty is not merely a violation of its terms but a repudiation of that good faith which is the essence of all agreements, whether they be words of mouth, written contracts, or solemn treaties.

The point which we have especially in mind is the question of good faith, which we venture to call the life of international relations, and the violation of which sounds the death knell of all friendly relations, whether between men or nations. Good faith, in short, is the essential trait of the good neighbor.

In no phase of international intercourse is good faith more essential than in the law and the practice of neutrality. Now neutrality permits nations to remain neutral in a war to which they have not declared themselves to be parties, and to carry on the commerce of peace in all commodities with all other neutral nations, and also with the belligerent nations, on the condition that each of the latter be treated impartially, that is to say, that the neutral nation does not limit its trade to one of the belligerents to the exclusion of the other but offers its wares to both alike.

There was a time, long since past but existing throughout the centuries, when a nation could not of right be neutral—"He that is not with me is against me"—but in the course of time, the neutrals being many and the actual belligerents of the moment few (leaving out of account the so-called "world wars", of which there have been a number), each belligerent welcomed a neutral trading with it, although objecting to such neutral trading with its enemy.

The United States came into being, both on land and sea, on the 4th day of July 1776, and were engaged in their first war with Great Britain from that period until some 7 years later, when a treaty of peace was signed by the erstwhile belligerents—one of the few peace treaties in history which was really negotiated and not imposed. During this 7 years of war, several of the European states, annoyed by what they were pleased to consider the violations of their neutral rights by Great Britain, formed an international organization which came to be known as the "Armed Neutrality", of which the Empress Catherine, of Russia, was the leading spirit. Before it became a belligerent in the World War, the Government of the United States, it may be added, was much in favor of the policy of armed neutrality as a means of protecting its neutral commerce.

Now the hope of the founders of our Republic was that we would keep out of foreign entanglements, and, therefore, out of foreign wars. Nevertheless our first—and not our least—Secretary of State under the Constitution, Thomas Jefferson, declared as the neutral policy of the young Republic:

"Our citizens have been always free to make, vend, and export arms. It is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings, the only means perhaps of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries, in which we have no concern, would scarcely be expected. It would be hard in principle and impossible in practice. The law of nations, therefore, respecting the rights of those at peace does not require from them such an internal disarrangement in their occupations" * * *[2]

Thus was formulated the policy of the United States as a neutral—the fullest possible trade for neutrals that the law of nations allowed, meaning the greatest possible restriction in the list of contraband. When, however, the Government of the United States was a belligerent, it trimmed its policy to the "needs" of war as a vessel trims its sails to the winds, demanding an increase in contraband and the maximum restriction of neutral trade with belligerents. This shift of policy was admitted by Secretary of State Bryan in a letter of January 20, 1915, to Senator Stone, then Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations: "The record of the United States in the past is not free from criticism. When neutral, this Government has stood for a restricted list of absolute and conditional contraband. As a belligerent, we have contended for a liberal list, according to our conception of the necessities of the case."[3]

Whatever our attitude toward commerce in times of war, neutrality was to be our policy when we were at peace. And we began early. Indeed, the United States gave to neutrality its statutory form and effect. For was not a proclamation issued—the first neutrality proclamation in the history of the United States—on April 22, 1793, by President Washington? In it, however, out of regard for France, he did not mention the word "neutrality." In the next year (1794), the first statute of neutrality of the United States—indeed the first statute of neutrality of any country—was passed and became a law. So anxious were we to keep out of war that the duties of neutrals were specifically defined both in the proclamation and in the act of Congress and appropriate penalties provided for their violation. It may fairly be said, therefore, that the United States has emphasized neutral duties as well as neutral rights; but it is the insistence upon rights of neutrality rather than upon duties which draws neutral nations into war.

Our neutral trade with Great Britain got us into a passing trouble with France, resulting in an undeclared war, an imperfect war, or, as stated officially, in a leading case,[4] in a "prolonged series of reprisals"; our insistence upon neutral rights during the Napoleonic wars got us into a second war with Great Britain in 1812 to 1814; and likewise our insistence upon neutral rights in the recent World War caused the Congress of the United States to declare war on the 6th of April 1917 against the Imperial German Government, and on December 7, 1917, against Austria-Hungary. In all the other wars waged by foreign belligerents, between the date of our independence and our participation in the World War, the United States remained a neutral nation, able to maintain its neutrality.

What would seem to be the conclusion to be drawn from such instances? The answer is that we are confronted with a choice: In the future we must decide whether we shall have war without former neutral rights or peace with neutral duties, for no matter if it was possible for the United States to maintain, with two exceptions, their neutral rights in the past, circumstances have so changed that today it is difficult—and tomorrow it will be still more difficult—to have intercourse with belligerents and preserve our older form of neutrality. The world changes, and with it international relations, both of war and of peace. It is high time for us to examine the old conceptions of neutral rights and duties

[1] For an admirable statement on the making and remaking of treaties in Europe since the World War, see an editorial comment, A Pact of Non-Aggression, in the October 1933 number of the American Journal of International Law (vol. 27, pp. 725–32), from the pen of Mr. George A. Finch, managing editor of the Journal, assistant secretary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and assistant director of its division of international law.

[2] Secretary of State Jefferson to the British Minister, May 15, 1793, 5 MS. Dom. Let. 105; Am. State Papers, I. 69, 147; 3 Jefferson's Works, 558, 560—quoted from John Bassett Moore, A Digest of International Law (Washington, 1906), vol. vii, p. 955.

[3] The American Journal of International Law (1915), vol. 9, p. 446.

[4] *Gray* v. *United States* (decided May 17, 1886), 21 Court of Claims Reports, pp. 340, 375.

so as to see whether the neutrality of the past can reasonably be expected to be the neutrality of the future.

Centuries ago wars were largely dynastic or monarchical affairs, due to the ruler's hope of enlarging his territory at the expense of a brother sovereign, the underlying motive being the personal desire for increase of power of emperor or of king. Standing armies had come in, and standing armies were for the most part found to be sufficient for dynastic wars. There were ports of military and of naval equipment, and commodities destined for them passed directly into the hands of the military or naval authorities and were used for military or naval purposes. Commodities sent to nonmilitary or nonnaval ports reached the civil population and were consumed without passing to the military authorities.

At the present day commodities reaching any port of a belligerent, or entering by way of an adjoining neutral power, become fuel for the war machine, because war is no longer a matter of standing armies. The belligerents are, in very fact, nations in arms, and commodities, whether they be solely for warlike purposes or whether they be commodities intended for the peaceful population as in earlier times, are now likely to be commandeered by the government and handed over to the armed forces, leaving the civilian population to starve or to shift for itself.

There is another aspect of this question resulting from the increased dependence of nations, both belligerent and neutral, upon the products not of their own lands but of other lands. In a word, nations today live largely by foreign trade, where in the past they lived largely without it. At the present time few, if any, nations could long exist even in peace time without exchanging their commodities by means of foreign commerce. And warring nations are especially dependent on the commodities which reach them through the channels of international trade, for the belligerent cannot feed the civilian population, since the nation is under arms; that is to say, those who can bear arms are conscripted into the service and the supplies of food produced are diverted to the armed forces of the belligerent.

Then, too, objects which in the past did not have a warlike use have become, by the progress of science, usable for warlike purposes, with the result that contraband articles directly usable for war—and therefore imported for warlike purposes—and articles of conditional contraband (conditioned upon reaching a port of naval equipment and then the armed forces) have vastly increased in number and variety. They may pass directly to the armed forces, in the form in which they are imported, or they may go to war industries for use in the manufacture of articles susceptible of a warlike use; but in either event these articles are used for the purposes of war and their number is legion. In other words, almost all of the imports of the belligerent have become, directly or indirectly, instruments of war, and in consequence are viewed by the opposing belligerent as contraband of war, the items included within that classification being increased with every war.

The growth of this classification has been rapid beyond belief. In 1909, for example, at the London Naval Conference, there were three lists of commodities: absolute contraband, consisting of articles solely useful in war; conditional contraband, consisting of commodities susceptible of warlike use; and free commodities, considered as not capable of warlike use. The first article of this last list—insisted upon by the American delegation to the Conference—was raw cotton, which today is the very essence of explosives! Indeed it has been said, with more truth than humor, that the only commodity not susceptible of a warlike purpose is "ostrich feathers"; but human ingenuity may eventually convert an ostrich into contraband by using his plumage for camouflage. Warfare being now upon an unprecedented scale, and future wars likely to be still more unprecedented, and nations being unable to grow and produce the elements essential for the carrying on of future conflicts, it should be evident without argument that belligerent nations, not merely the large but the small ones—witness the Chaco war between Bolivia and Paraguay—are dependent upon supplies from the outside world, if they are to be enabled to carry on wars.

Without mentioning the resources of foreign nations—which for present purposes would be invidious—we are justified in saying that the vast territory and the immense resources of the United States of America have made our country and our people to no small degree the source of the world's sinews of war and therefore the base, as it were, of hostile operations of the future. For if the warring nations cannot produce their own supplies or obtain them elsewhere than through importation from the United States, that fact in a very real sense makes of the United States a base of hostile operations, which is inconsistent even with the most rudimentary conception of neutrality.

Nor is this all. War being on such a stupendous scale, the nations at war are not able to obtain the commodities essential for the prosecution of their wars without money borrowed from neutral countries; and of all neutral countries, the United States of America apparently is best in position to supply moneys for a warlike purpose. This is plain fact, not theory. Before the Government of the United States declared war against Germany and Austria-Hungary, in order to protect its neutral commerce, the people of the United States were supplying not only the materials and the manufactured articles by virtue whereof the belligerents were enabled to carry on the war, but also the moneys to purchase them. In a word, the United States was financing or subsidizing the war, and we have learned by experience after the war that, having accomplished their purpose, the belligerent nations are unable to pay their indebtedness. The result is that we have not merely been a base of hostile operations but, by furnishing to the belligerent countries moneys for the conduct of warfare, we have been, while at peace, what might be called the supporters of war.

It cannot be gainsaid, much less successfully contradicted, that the Government of the United States declared itself to be in a state of war with the Imperial German Government because of Germany's violation of American neutral rights. The question arises and must have an answer: Are we to be dragged into foreign wars by a continuation of a policy of neutrality, a policy which brought us into a state of war with Great Britain in 1812, then the most powerful nation in the world, and which policy—in fact a veiled participation in the conflict—brought us into the World War against two of the countries which, before the outbreak of hostilities, were regarded as among the most powerful of nations? The remedy may be drastic; but the choice, it would appear, is between the drastic remedy and a still more drastic loss of human life.

In the conflict between commerce and human life, which is to prevail?

Let us consider, however briefly, what the protection of neutral rights of commerce really means. It means that certain manufacturers or producers of arms, ammunition, and, indeed, of all the various commodities which can be used in war, shall be permitted to receive enormous profits for the goods which they sell and export to the belligerent powers; and that this privilege of making money out of war is considered worthy of protection by the Government of the United States, even to the point of war. No commercial operation or profit can be weighed for a moment in the balance with human life. The profits protected under the law of neutrality are, in very truth, the profits from death. If a merchant trade in arms or ammunition indifferently with one or other of the belligerents, it is an indication that he is not interested in the triumph or failure of one or the other belligerent, or in the right or wrong of either side. Without having the United States as the base of hostile operations from which to obtain an ever-increasing supply of arms and ammunition, and, indeed, foodstuffs, would the World War have lasted as long as it did, or would the destruction of life have been so unbelievable? Can the American traveler visiting the graveyards in foreign countries put his hand on his heart and honestly say, "At least my country was not a party to this crime"?

Should the Government of the United States protect the trade of its citizens or residents in arms and ammunition and in all commodities (whose name, as we have said before, is legion) usable for warlike purposes?

Upon the answer depends in large measure the future of the United States, and the facts and their consequences should be well pondered before a decision is reached.

Ladies and gentlemen, I feel myself not only justified in stating but compelled to assure you that I do not discuss this matter from a purely academic point of view, inasmuch as during the entire period of our neutrality in the World War, from August 1914 to April 1917, I was Chairman of the State, War, and Navy Neutrality Board; and I therefore deem it appropriate to say that I am speaking under a deep sense of responsibility.

Without maintaining that money is the root of all evil, we know by experience that money got through participation, direct or indirect, in war is fraught with danger to life and to the soul. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided more than one case in which citizens of the United States have been taxed with and found guilty of trade with the enemy in a war to which the Government of the United States was a party. If during war some of our citizens would, for material profit, furnish commodities to the enemy of the United States, we can imagine how many more of our citizens would engage in furnishing supplies to one or other of the belligerents in a war to which the Government of the United States was a neutral, lured by even greater material profits which, according to statistics, are measured by incredible percentages and by hundreds of millions of dollars. Against this profit, however great, should be weighed the toll of human lives which follows in war's train. For in very truth, if we are not a party to the war in the technical sense of the word, are we not, in insisting on our traditional neutral rights, actually parties to the destruction of life—not to speak of property? Is this the role of the good neighbor?

Another and not unimportant reason why we should prevent American citizens and foreigners resident in the United States from manufacturing arms and ammunition and supplying foreign countries with them, is that these munitions might conceivably be used against us, if by any mischance we should become involved in war with a foreign nation whose arms and ammunition had been supplied by American manufacturers. The European press has recently had much to say of the munitions supplied, either in times past or during hostilities, by one or other of the belligerents to the enemy. The question, therefore, is not wholly academic.

What, then, should be the policy of the United States as an enlightened nation? Assuredly the Government of the United States should not make itself a party to wars in fact if not in form, as it does by permitting its citizens and residents to manufacture and to export commodities, the sole or indirect purpose of which is the destruction of the lives of persons who are not in the slightest degree our enemies. Nor should it become an actual party to the war for the mere protection of such commerce. If war we are to have, it should be strictly in self-defense, not in defense of commerce with belligerents, whether that commerce be in arms or ammunition, or in hitherto peaceful commodities such as we now know are useful for the continuance of warfare.

Now, in case of a war of self-defense, the Government of the United States would be in need of arms and ammunition. It should be in a position to supply that need itself so as to meet effectively any aggression which menaced its existence. If it be said that the manufacture of munitions and of other commodities usable in war is a private undertaking, and has been so treated in times past, an answer is that the Government of the United States has taken charge of the Postal Service of the United States, which was also in times past a private enterprise. If it be maintained that the exclusive governmental manufacture of arms and ammunition would be more expensive than manufacture by commercial firms, it may be said that the arms and ammunition manufactured by the United States would not be supplied to belligerents, because no neutral government as such can, even under the existing law of nations, lawfully supply belligerents with such commodities, and there would consequently be no question of meeting the competition of private industry in other lands.

The Government of the United States, as regards the much-discussed question of munitions, would thus be neutral in fact as well as in theory; and even if the cost of the manufacture of munitions under such circumstances should be greater, such munitions would, in any event, be made only for use against our enemies and not against our friends.

Although, under such an arrangement, our citizens would be prevented from manufacturing and trading in arms and munitions, they could still trade with the neutral nations in everything but arms and munitions; and, due to the fact that the belligerent nations would be for the most part unable to engage in exports, American merchants would have larger markets in other neutral countries, so that what our countrymen lost in the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions they would doubtless gain in the normal markets of the belligerents.

How could this policy, then, be inaugurated?

(1) By vesting in the Government of the United States the manufacture of arms and munitions and other commodities, if such there be, which the Government from time to time should consider as necessary solely for its defense;

(2) By denying the right to private citizens to manufacture any and all such commodities as are thus reserved for exclusive manufacture by the United States.

In the absence of treaties or other agreements providing what commodities are necessary in warfare, the Government of the United States should decide for itself what it considers to be commodities essential for the carrying on of war, and should deny to its citizens, and to foreigners within its jurisdiction, the right to trade directly or indirectly in such commodities with the belligerent powers. American citizens or foreigners subject to the jurisdiction of the United States might properly trade in all other commodities with the belligerents, but they would do so at their own risk and should be so warned by the Government of the United States in its proclamation of neutrality.

In this way the Government of the United States would be relieved of the dangerous task of protecting American commerce except in those cases where the belligerent interfered with legitimate trade from the United States to neutral countries. We readily admit that the belligerent may properly exercise the right of stopping and searching a suspected neutral vessel on the high seas for articles directly or ultimately destined to its enemy, but if no commodities destined directly or indirectly to the enemy are found in the cargo, and there is no other evidence of unneutral conduct, any further interference with the neutral ship is unjustified. In a word, no neutral vessel should, under any circumstances, be captured and taken into the jurisdiction of the captor unless such action has been fully warranted by the findings resulting from visit and search under the rules of international law.

Performance of neutral duties by the Government of the United States has kept us out of European wars. Insistence upon so-called "neutral rights" has more than once dragged us into European wars, and may do so again unless, like Washington, we lay the emphasis upon neutral duties rather than upon neutral rights.

May the neutrality of the future be based upon the impartiality of justice and humanity, and not upon the impartiality of profits wrung indifferently from the warring peoples. In a word, may the neutrality of the future be the neutrality of the good neighbor.

SALE OF "BABY BONDS" BY THE TREASURY

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, in reference to remarks made by me on infantile bonds, and my reply thereto.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 9, 1935.

Hon. THOMAS D. SCHALL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is my feeling that your remarks in the Senate on May 7, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are likely to create an erroneous impression, with reference to the United States savings bonds, which I feel it my duty to correct.

Briefly and simply, the situation is that a bond of $25 maturity value (and redeemable for that face value amount 10 years after its issuance and sale) can now be purchased for $18.75. The redeemable value of the bond increases gradually during the 10-year period. and that value as of various dates up to maturity is clearly imprinted on the bond, so that purchasers are fully informed. The bonds cannot be resold by purchasers as they are not transferable.

Your remarks seem to me to create two equally erroneous impressions: First, that those who have purchased United States savings bonds have suffered a 25-percent depreciation in the value of the securities; and, second, that a Wall Street syndicate might purchase them in quantity and resell them for a higher price with a 25-percent profit.

Your statement that the bonds are "already infected 25 percent" seems to me a clear intimation that they have declined in value from $25 to $18.75 since issuance, which is, of course, not the case. Your statement that "one-fourth of their face is gone, eaten up" seems to me to create a similarly erroneous impression.

Your statement as to the possibility of profit to a Wall Street syndicate, through the purchase of United States savings bonds, is in error. The maximum amount of the bonds which can be purchased by any one person or for any one account is $10,000 a year. But if such a syndicate could purchase $25 maturity value United States savings bonds for $18.75 they could not redeem them for $25 until 10 years later. Your statement seems clearly to imply that they could do so immediately. To make an investment which returns a yield averaging approximately 2.9 percent per annum can scarcely be referred to as making "a rake-off of 25 percent."

While the Treasury welcomes well-founded criticism of its policies and activities, I feel that I should state the facts as to these securities, as there seems to be some misunderstanding as to them.

Respectfully yours,

H. MORGENTHAU,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MAY 14, 1935.

Hon. H. MORGENTHAU,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I thank you for your letter of May 9, 1935, with regard to the "baby bonds" you are offering to small investors at the bargain price of $18.75 for a $25 bond—the bond being deprived of the customary privilege of being transferable as a liquid asset, and therefore a "frozen asset" unavailable to the investor in time of need during the 10-year period to maturity.

You raise the point that a Wall Street syndicate could not purchase these bonds in quantity for a "rake-off of 25 percent" because "they could not redeem them until 10 years later." Certainly you are not unaware—living in a city where Wall Street controls the finances and where for so many years Tammany Hall owned both the executive and legislative functions of the city government, as well as much of the municipal court, if not most of the machinery of local "justice"—that the syndicate system for handling supposed "nontransferable" equities has a hoary history.

If your experience has been in law or banking you scarcely can be unaware of that system, which applied to your 10-year "infantile" issue, would be, perhaps, as follows:

In time of urgent need, as in sickness and death in the family, unemployment and business failure, accidents and other disaster, such as may occur in the 10-year period of the average small investor, he must go to what is known in most large cities as a "shave shop" to part with his $18.75 of saved earnings at such discount as the "shave shop" may exact.

The small investor signs a power of attorney to the "shave shop", makes it his fiduciary trustee, signs a mortgage contract of 10 years and one day to the maturity date of the 10-year bond. Thereby your Wall Street syndicate gets the $25, including the $2.90 per annum, and your small investor gets what his necessity and the greed of the "shave shop" may generously allow.

If we suppose that the small investor has a funeral in his family or loses his job, say, 2 years after paying you his $18.75, and the "baby" equity has 8 years before the trustee can collect, then the "shave shop" which discounts the equity will charge at least 5 percent a year, or, in this case, a total of 40 percent, besides its administrative expense and overhead and a profit on the deal. Instead of a "25-percent rake-off", the amount of your advance bonus, it may run to any amount the "shave shop" agency of the syndicate is able to wring from the victim "sucker."

"Unmoral" is the term applied to it by your fellow townsman, Frank Vanderlip, the noted ex-banker, who, I believe, has formerly approved some of your administrative program. I am not surprised that he pronounces this one "unmoral." Behold the list of its immoralities:

It piles up as "frozen assets" for a period of 10 years the small savings of the country needed to finance industry, aid industrial employment, and pay taxes to support government.

It aims to undermine the Postal Savings System, which 2 years ago carried over $1,000,000,000 to meet the emergencies of small investors, and every postmaster in the United States is made your agency to rape this billion for the support of a Federal bureaucracy.

It aims to undermine and demoralize the lifelong service of the mutual savings banks of the United States, which in 1932 numbered 594, had 12,500,000 depositors, and carried over $10,000,000,000 in savings deposits.

Your glittering bait of $18.75 for a $25 bond, or a ground bait of 25 percent to hook the small investors to your Federal fish wagon, is just another phase—is it not?—of your Fabian plan for political control of the banking and savings of the 48 States and 3,000 counties—the savings which hitherto financed useful productive industry to employ American labor in conversion of raw materials into finished necessities of life.

Your bait of $18.75 for a $25 bond is likewise "unmoral" in destroying the parity of all American bond securities. It injects the "cut price" evil into the American bond standard, sets up "cutthroat competition" with all other securities—an evil which the Government pretends to be fighting under the 731 codes of the "blue-eagled" N. R. A. You demonetize gold and pay $35 for an ounce, worth $20.67, as a bonus to destroy the gold standard, and hang up a 25-percent bonus to destroy the bond standard, thereby placing all the foundations of American finance under the political control of a Federal Tammany Hall and, if your bank bill passes, a centralized banking system in which the new Fabius Maximus sits as president with you as cashier and Postmaster General Farley as bank teller at the receiving window.

For information, may I ask you this question with regard to the investment use to be made with the billions you hope to raise by this campaign through the 48,000 post offices of the United States?

Will these deposits be available for investment in the socialistic enterprises of the Delaware corporation to which, on October 16, 1933, you and H. A. Wallace, and Oscar Johnston, set your hands and seals under oath before John P. Wenchel, notary public of the District of Columbia, as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1935, the corporation which in article seventh is to "have perpetual existence", and of which you, Wallace, and Johnston, are the first board of directors with a resident office at no. 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del., with branch offices (see subsection "(1)")—

" * * * to carry on all or any of its operations and business without restriction or limit as to amount, in any of the States, districts, territories, or colonies of the United States, and in any and all foreign countries."

For information, I am asking if the investment deposits will be available for investment in the enterprises of this Delaware corporation having "perpetual existence" with a resident agent at no. 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del., and engaged in such socialistic enterprises as designated in the following subsection of the articles of incorporation:

"(1) To acquire by purchase, lease, or construction, or in any other manner, storage and other physical facilities for the handling, carrying, processing, manufacturing, storing, preparing for market, and marketing agricultural and/or other commodities, and/or other products thereof."

I heartily agree with you, Mr. Morgenthau, that criticisms should be constructive, and likewise that the answers should be constructive. And to that end I look forward to your further letter of enlightenment with regard to the investment of the deposit advances pursuant to your "infantile" bond issues with 25 percent of their face missing.

With best wishes.

Cordially yours,

THOS. D. SCHALL.

THE BIG FOUR "NEW DEALS"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SCHALL

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me in Chicago at the Chicago Bar Association luncheon, on May 13, 1935, together with an article from the Chicago Daily News of the same date.

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

About every third generation through history there is a relapse to some form of autocracy, when "government by men" is resorted to as a substitute for "government by law."

War, panic, depression, famine, and pestilence are the usual predecessors and handy pretexts for the autocratic cycle.

In time of "war or exigency", as provided in the constitution of the early Republic of Rome, a dictator could be chosen, whose will took the place of law. Thus Rome had its Sulla and Marius, its Pompey and its Caesars, its conquering eagles and its poverty, its deserted fields and its rabble of street beggars, following the dissolute Cataline and his reckless distribution of doles.

The term of a dictator under the Roman constitution was 6 months. A permanent dictator received the name of emperor. That is how the job of emperor came into political vogue. It was when the temporary dictator succeeded in his demand to have his autocratic tenure made permanent.

Some of the dictators of history are not so bad, but most of them are worse. All of them are characterized by certain marks of conduct and policy and viewpoint.

All the world dictators, Caesars, emperors, kaisers, tsars, down to the "new dealers" of today use conquering eagles to symbolize the fear they wish to create in the hearts of those they seek to subjugate.

Dictatorships imply suspension of constitutions. The denial of the Bill of Rights, except to favorites, a certain degree of censorship over the instruments of communication, the control of the highways, industries, and commerce, the domination of subject provinces and municipalities by the paternalistic power above, and the consolidation of both executive and legislative functions in the eagle-bearing commander in chief of the army and navy, the purse strings, and affairs of state.

All dictatorships, moreover, demand control of the lives, liberty, and industries of the inhabitants; the supreme rights over property; the power to dispossess of property those who oppose the imperial will; the power to tax, which implies the power to destroy; the power to borrow without retriction or limit, which implies the power to pile up mountainous debt, which means the taxation of future generations to come.

In short, the badge of the eagle, the suspension of the Constitution, the absence of a dependable bill of rights, the subjection of the legislative powers to the will of the executive, the control of industry and commerce, the control of transportation and communications, the control of the tax power and appropriations, a high public debt and reckless expenditure, and the complete sway of the public forum to command the worship of followers—marks all the autocrats of history, from the Caesars and Charlemagne, William the Conqueror, and Napoleon, down to the "new dealers" of today in Rome and Berlin, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America.

World dictatorships are classified into two main types: First, those who maintain their dominance by physical force, the superior might of arms, the ruthlessness of slaughter; the sudden sweep of fire and sword upon the helpless peasantry and trembling townspeople.

Such was Sulla of Rome, the Hun chieftains of Mongolia, the Mohammedan chiefs of Asia Minor, some of the kaisers and tsars, and all Indian chiefs of uncivilized tribes. There is something of that in vogue still in modern times, as witness Chancellor Hitler and his storm troops, the soviet rule in Russia, and the machinations of the war lords in all countries.

But the more effective and seductive method is that of the so-called "Fabian school", the method of "gradual approach" by securing control and possession of the public resources and means of subsistence, the avenues of communication, the commerce and lands, the functions of government, and the power to tax, and then capture the imaginations of a subservient following by erecting huge public works and amassing a mountain of public debt chargeable to future generations, sometimes paid but usually passed along or defaulted or wiped out by revolution.

In 221 to 216 B. C., over a century before the birth of Julius Cæsar, and 170 years before Cæsar's assassination at the foot of Pompey's statue, Fabius Quintus, known to history as "Fabius Maximus", a renowned Roman general, five times consul, twice censor and dictator, was dictator of Rome during the Second Punic War. Hannibal of Carthage had conquered Spain, crossed the Alps, and given the Romans two defeats before his great triumph at the Battle of Cannae.

So Rome had both "war and exigency", the two conditions which under the Roman constitution provided for a dictator. Fabius Maximus defeated Hannibal by those famous tactics later known as the "Fabian method." He harassed the enemy by feints and artful dodges, destroying the bridges and food supplies, facing north while backing south, aiming west while retreating east, delaying and delaying the frontal attack, which earned for him the Roman title of "Cunctator."

Thereby he gradually undermined and harassed and starved the army of Hannibal into demoralization and ultimate defeat until Rome became world conqueror when its eagles surmounted Capua, Corinth, and New Carthage in the Third Punic War.

Fabius Maximus was the first "new dealer" of the dictatorships of Rome, before Christ, to lay the foundations of Rome's world conquest. That was about the time the Chinese began building the Great Wall against the Mongolian barbarians of the north. Two generations before Fabius, Euclid, the famous mathematician, had begun teaching at Alexandria and the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament had begun. It was not until a century after Fabius that Marius became temporary dictator, to be succeeded in turn by the bloody Sulla in the social war, and he in turn by Pompey and Crassus, and they in turn by Caesar, who crossed the Rubicon in 49 B. C.

It was not until 150 years after the administration of Fabius Maximus, that Cicero, the leading orator of the Roman bar, delivered in the forum his famous speech against the conspiracy of Cataline. It seems that Cataline was the first "left wing" leader of note in Roman history. He built up a powerful political following by gladiatorial shows, distribution of street doles, and organizing not only the street rabble and the underworld, but also the slaves, the unemployed, and the landless farmers who had fought the battles of Rome and been dispossessed both of their fields and of their means of livelihood. Cataline used the same dole system and publicity system, though on the smaller scale of 2,000 years ago, that is employed in the United States today, to buy the discontented and stir up the malcontents, and teach them all Rome owed them a living, and that he, Cataline, was their only Santa Claus and political savior.

Cataline, however, had not learned two angles of the political game which the Fabians of recent history have developed on such a vast financial, commercial, and publicity scale. Moreover, Cataline had not a position of power that would enable him to commandeer public revenue and official machinery, public debt and treasury deficits, and control the commercial forces of his day to put over any vast project of public doles and wholesale subsidy of the electorate.

The two angles which Cataline did not develop or had not the power to develop, which I here have specially in mind, are these:

First, he did not create the so-called industrial "emergencies" that would afford him the popular excuse for his "recovery" nostrums.

Second, he did not and could not plunge the country into the mire of treasury deficits, and he did not have access to the creation of mountains of public debt to give scope to his dole system. He neither created industrial "emergency" nor erected government bureaus to carry out the pretext of "recovery." As a "new dealer" Cataline was limited to the retail pioneer stage of a primitive era.

The Fabian cult has come down the centuries. In the time of Napoleon, we find the Rothschild family of seven brothers laying the foundation of their vast fortunes by financing Napoleon and then delivering him over to his enemies.

The Rothschild phase of "Fabian tactics" extended chiefly into the financial field. Banks are the credit instrument and foundation of all extended industry, commerce, transportation, public utilities, and even of the revenue and credit resources of governments in floating public debt. He who controls the banks comes very near controlling the business and government of modern society. Thus, when Roosevelt, in March 1933, employed the wartime act of 1917 to close all banks in the United States, most of which being solvent, he created the first new-deal emergency, affecting all industry and commerce and affording the Seventy-third Congress its plausible pretext for railroading into the statute book the various "emergency" acts drafted by the White House—such as the A. A. A., the N. R. A., and other alphabetical organizations. He now is bent on securing complete political control through his centralized banking bill. If he gets this over and continues the power of his N. R. A. the voice of Jacob will no longer be needed and the hairy hand of Esau will seize the stolen birthright.

The Rothschilds of the European capitals directed their "Fabian tactics" to the control of modern governments and business through financing wars and the war debts necessary to the building of navies and armies, arsenals and fortresses, the purchase of munitions and war supplies. No modern wars carried on by the large powers have been fomented without first consulting the Rothschilds and their financial branches and allies in Wall Street and the various financial capitals of the world.

Even in 1934, when the present war propaganda started here and simultaneously around the globe, Baron Rothschild, escorted by the American "contact man", Bernard M. Baruch, came over here as a guest of the White House for 2 weeks, then for 2 months in Wall Street and Washington, and then fishing with the President aboard the flagship *Nourmahal*. Can it be that the President feels that war is the only way out for the new deal? A scapegoat must be devised for the mountain of debt. Moreover, he may think war may be the only way to revive the so-called "heavy industries" and afford a profitable market for steel, copper, tin, lead, petroleum, and raw cotton for the manufacture of explosives.

Among the lieutenants and agents of this Rothschild, Wall Street, Lombard Street, Paris, and Tokyo aggregation of affiliated world finance, either wittingly or unconsciously, are the so-called "international bankers and brokers"—for whom Baruch acts as "contact man" between Europe and the United States, and between Wall Street and Washington. Baruch is the undoubted head of the administration "brain trust"—as he is the chief ambassador of the Fabian cult in the United States. He was chairman of the War Industries Board under Wilson. He has been "contact man" between the war powers of Europe and the United States, between Paris and Wall Street, between Wall Street and Washington, apparently, ever since.

In 1933 Baruch furnished his assistant, General Johnson, to the administration, to "crack down" American industry under the N. R. A., its "Blue Eagle", and 731 monopoly codes.

In 1934, when it was apparent that the N. R. A. was a "flop", Baruch began the war propaganda by publishing a book on the subject of commandeering industry and profits for the successful propagation of war, and incidentally the presumed "recovery" of the heavy industries. About that time he introduced Baron Rothschild to the White House.

In 1932, after Roosevelt had declared himself 100 percent for the Chicago platform, Baruch, during a week or more in early September, was a guest of Roosevelt at "Hide-away Park." After that visit Roosevelt denied the Chicago platform thrice before the cock crew and began unlimbering the new deal.

In Chicago, June 27, 1932, he was 100 percent for tariff revision by Congress, "with a fact-finding tariff commission free from Executive interference."

Today, he is for tariff making exclusively by the Executive, in a star chamber session at which American citizens have no right to a hearing and where tariff duties are raised or lowered by the Executive, free from congressional interference.

He was 100 percent for reduction of Government bureaus, and he would eliminate Government "extravagance" by "not less than 25 percent in cost of Federal Government."

Today he has created more peace-time Federal bureaus than all his predecessors combined, and he has piled up the costs of Government 100 percent.

He was 100 percent for a "Federal Budget annually balanced." In the 3 fiscal years ending June next, his accumulated Treasury balances in the red will exceed the deficit sum total of $10,000,000,000 with a deficit aggregate of $14,000,000,000 in 1936—the highest deficit mark of world history.

He was for the "protection of investors" who had been flimflammed by foreign war powers and international bankers out of the bulk of $15,000,000,000 invested by Americans in foreign bonds.

Congress authorized him in the Security Act of 1933 to create a commission under the auspices of the Federal Trade Commission to secure the fair settlement of these American loans abroad and protect American investors. Not only has nothing been done by the Government to carry out the will of Congress, but the administration has not lifted a finger to help investors against a certain loss of $10,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 and a gift of that amount to war powers abroad. He was 100 percent for "a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards."

What has he done to redeem that pledge? He has struck down the sound currency which we had had for 50 years, destroyed the gold standard, withdrew gold redemption from all American currency, reduced our 100-cent dollar to a supposed 59 cents, until the only currency standard of the United States is that of a fluctuating and unstable medium of exchange depending upon the exchange values in 60 principal countries—a fiat currency bobbing up and down and around on the flotsam and jetsam of foreign exchange.

He was 100 percent for "the sanctity of treaties and the maintenance of good faith and good will in financial obligations."

Within the past 60 days we have seen the administration, through its War Department generals, soliciting appropriations for the establishing of secret air bases along the Canadian border, at the same time that the State Department was unveiling the tablets commemorating the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817 by which the United States and Canada for the preservation of American peace and good will agreed never to militarize our northern border. When the Canadians came down to the State Department the other day to demand an explanation of this duplicity, what did the White House do? It laid the blame upon Congress for publishing the testimony of the generals, and letting the people of the United States and Canada know what the new deal proposed to do to them.

So far as "good will in financial obligations" is concerned, this administration has permitted foreign war powers to default on $12,000,000,000 of debts to the United States Treasury, a large part of which were incurred since the World War, and has never lifted a finger of protest.

Doubtless that was one of the themes on which Baron Rothschild and Barney Baruch spent so many weeks in conference as the guests of the White House and international bankers. It is significant that the Fabian spokesman of Great Britain, George Bernard Shaw, eulogist of the Soviet regime, came over here on April 11, 1933, on a flying visit, he explained, and at someone's expense appeared on the platform of the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, to advise this country to do two things at once:

First. Scrap the Constitution of the United States.

Second. Scrap the World War debts owed the Treasury by Europe and federalize the banking power.

In July 1933 thereafter the administration created an industrial "emergency" by imposing with a blare of brass bands and street parades the first codes of the N. R. A. and "cracking down" on all American trade and industry. Within 4 months the industrial production of the United States had dropped 25 percent—although during the same period in 1932 industrial production had expanded normally 12 percent and Bradstreet's and the American Banking Association declared that the tide of recovery had definitely turned upward.

Likewise, in July 1933, the raid upon the farms was begun by the expenditure of hundreds of millions under the A. A. A.—the plowing under of 15,000,000 acres of growing cotton, the destruction of 6,500,000 hogs, the imposition of processing taxes to the present total of $800,000,000. Taxes assessed and levied by a Government bureau in violation of the constitutional provision that all taxes are the legislative function of Congress.

Today the Treasury daily statement carries a fund of $1,320,000,000 to subsidize farmers with cotton checks, wheat checks, tobacco checks, corn-hog checks, and checks for the producers of every imaginable crop to desert their farms, cut down their production, and help drought, disease, and bugs destroy the agricultural foundation of America, and thereby convert a self-reliant farm yeomanry into public charges and dole recipients, dependent upon a Federal imperial power—as in the time of Sulla, Pompey, Catiline, and the rest of the Roman dictators, and down through the Dark Ages when peasant serfs were dependent upon feudal barons for existence—or as exists today under the Soviet regime of the U. S. S. R.

You are familiar with the overwhelming economic disasters of the new deal. You know how Canada and Great Britain have expanded their production and balanced their budgets during the same period in which our production has crashed, and our Budget balance sunk into depths never before reached in our history.

You know how the legislative powers of Congress have been usurped by the Executive in violation of the Constitution and even of the old guaranties of Magna Carta dating from the thirteenth century. You know how our Bill of Rights has been emasculated by a system of licensed printing such as John Milton inveighed against in the days of the Stuart tyranny.

You have seen these phases of dictatorship, first, developing in the new deals over there, in Rome, Berlin, and Moscow, and by the Fabian method of gradual approach, by harassing methods, by "bold experiments", by use of scapegoats, by encroaching a little here and a little there, by gradually taking over the police powers

of the States, the commerce powers of the States, and the creation of 150 new crimes by edict, the violation of due process of law, the gradual conversion of our boasted government by law into government by men—and by such men without knowledge or care of either law or business, either industry or the rights of liberty and property—a fabianized and tammanyized Federal autocracy.

Gentlemen of the Chicago bar, there is no time on this occasion to go at length into the details of this great fiasco under the American flag. Do you not see the psychology and philosophy of the entire new deal—which is the oldest deal in Christendom? Is it not this?

To "crack-down" by the Fabian tactics of old all the industries and resources upon which the people rely for peaceful independent existence. To destroy their ability to support themselves as independent sovereign citizens. Thereby, by Government threats, by Government interference with their business, their liberty and property, and furthermore by enormous appropriations raised by mountainous debt, reduce an independent and proud free people to the status of subjects subsisting upon Federal subsidies and doles, even as in Rome in the days of the Caesars and the Catalines, or in Soviet Moscow.

You will note that the $5,000,000,000 recently demanded by the White House, to be allocated by the Executive, is for the fiscal year 1937—an "emergency" forecast 2 years ahead. That the five billions amount to an average of $100 per voter for the 40,000,000 voters in the United States. Moreover, that the first half of the fiscal year 1937 begins July 1, 1936, the beginning of the 1936 campaign—when the "allocator's" chief "emergency" begins.

It was 70 years from the dictatorship of George III and Lord North over the American colonists in violation of the principles of Magna Carta down to the dictatorship of the slave power in 1860 and the firing on Fort Sumter.

It was 70 years again from 1865 to 1935, when dictatorship is again in the ascendant, and when the Executive takes over the legislative function in Rome, Berlin, Moscow, Washington, the seats of the big four "new deals." American liberty and union under a Constitution of the people won in 1776 and again 1865. Why not again in 1936? Today there is in America only one true party—the party of, by, and for the people. Let us see to it that it does not perish from the earth, for the President has usurped the functions of our Republic, and is about ready, like Louis XIV, to declare himself the state. If he permits an election in 1936 and by it is reinstated, there will be no future elections, and the Republic of the United States may be only a matter of history.

[From the Chicago Daily News of May 13, 1935]

SCHALL LIKENS ROOSEVELT TO A ROMAN EMPEROR—HE SEES DOOM OF REPUBLIC IF PRESIDENT IS REELECTED

Likening Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Roman Emperor Cataline, Senator THOMAS D. SCHALL (Rep., Minn.) today told the Chicago Bar Association that "if the President permits an election in 1936 and wins, there'll be no future elections and the Republic of the United States may be only a matter of history."

"The President has usurped the functions of our Republic", the blind Senator said, "and is about ready, like Louis XIV, to declare himself the state."

SCHALL, in addressing the city's lawyers at a luncheon, declared that in every third generation through history there is a relapse to some form of autocracy, when government by men is resorted to as a substitute for government by law. He cited as the four dictatorships today those of Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, and Roosevelt.

USE CONQUERING EAGLES

"All of the world dictators, Caesars, emperors, kaisers, tsars, down to the 'new dealers' of today, use conquering eagles to symbolize the fear they wish to create in the hearts of those they seek to subjugate", he said.

The Senator gave the bar association a generous sample of his knowledge of history, saying that the "Fabian school" of dictatorship is more effective and seductive than the fire-and-sword methods which he accredited to Hitler and his storm troops and the soviet rule in Russia. He described the Fabian plan as follows:

"The method of 'gradual approach' by securing control and possession of the public resources and means of subsistence, the avenues of communication, the commerce and lands, the functions of government, and the power to tax, and then capture the imagination of a subservient following by erecting huge public works and amassing a mountain of public debts chargeable to the future—sometimes paid, but usually passed along or defaulted or wiped out by revolution."

CATALINE WASN'T THOROUGH

SCHALL declared that Cataline, master of the Fabian principles, had not learned two angles of the politician game which his more recent successors have developed.

"The two angles", he continued, "which Cataline did not develop are these: First, he did not create the so-called 'industrial emergencies' that would afford him the popular excuse for his 'recovery' nostrums. Second, he did not and could not plunge the country into the mire of treasury deficits, and he did not have access to the creation of mountains of public debt to give scope to his dole system."

THE GOLD STANDARD—STATEMENT BY OGDEN L. MILLS

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Ogden L. Mills in reply to the radio speech of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the gold standard.

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

I am amazed at the charge made by Secretary Morgenthau on the radio last night that the failure of the last administration to abandon the gold standard as early as 1932 was "economic suicide", as well as his statement of the course of events which, beginning with Great Britain's departure from gold in September 1931, terminated in the abandonment of the gold standard by the United States in April 1933.

I am amazed because the facts do not support the Secretary's charge or statement.

The following is a summary of Mr. Morgenthau's analysis of what took place between the above-mentioned dates: Credit and currency difficulties came to a head in Europe in the spring of 1931; Great Britain suspended gold payments in September, other countries followed; "in January 1932, gold began to leave the United States in alarming amounts, which was fair notice to all concerned that our turn was next; the panic was knocking at our door, but nothing effective was done to avert it"; gold continued to leave until loss of gold, declining trade, falling commodity prices and unemployment resulted in the disaster of February 1933.

Anyone listening to or reading Mr. Morgenthau's statement was led to no other conclusion than that, beginning with England's abandonment of the gold standard, the process above described was continuous, with constant and uninterrupted loss of gold exerting unremitting pressure, and that the obstinate refusal of the administration then in power to abandon the gold standard at once was the underlying cause of the eventual panic and of the events that preceded it.

What are the facts? From the end of September 1931 to the end of June 1932 we did lose some $800,000,000 in gold, due principally to the withdrawal of short-term balances of the French Government and of the Bank of France. By July 1932, however so effective were the policies pursued by the administration, such as unfliniching adherence to payment of gold on demand, the securing of the Glass-Steagall measure, and the determined efforts to bring the Budget into balance, that the movement had definitely spent itself.

From July 1932 to January 1933 gold flowed back into this country uninterruptedly, in an aggregate amount of over $550,000,000. In fact, taking the year 1932 as a whole, our monetary gold stock increased rather than decreased. During all of the summer and early fall of 1932 trade, business, prices, and employment all turned upward. In other words, the fight for the dollar and returning confidence had done the trick.

Why did Mr. Morgenthau, in what purports to be a recital of facts, fail to tell the American people of the great inflow of gold during the latter part of 1932, of the actual increase in monetary-gold stocks during that calendar year, and of the sharp upturn in business during the summer of 1932? Because these facts completely destroy his case.

We still gained gold in January 1933, but beginning in February, due to the growing tenseness of the banking situation in the United States, attributable to increasing uncertainty and fear as to the monetary policies of the incoming administration, we began to lose part of the gold we had acquired—one hundred and seventy-three million in February and ninety-seven million in March. In April, the very month in which we abandoned the gold standard, our monetary-gold stock actually increased $29,000,000.

It was not the maintenance of the gold standard that caused the outflow of gold during the first 6 months of 1932; it was the fear on the part of foreigners that we might go off. It was not the maintenance of the gold standard that caused the banking panic of 1933 and the outflow of gold in the second and third months of that year, as is amply proven by all that took place during the summer and early fall of 1932; it was the definite and growing fear that the new administration meant to do what they ultimately did—that is, abandon the gold standard, and their refusal to cooperate in any way with the outgoing administration.

But, if as Mr. Morgenthau says, as early as January 1932, when gold began to leave the United States, "this was fair notice to all concerned that our turn was next"; if the ultimate crisis was due to the stubborn refusal of the then administration to take the necessary action, namely, the abandonment of the gold standard, then what is to be thought of the position of the Democratic Party, which, meeting in June 1932, under the leadership of Senator GLASS, pledged itself to the maintenance of the gold standard?

What is to be thought of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, who, according to Mr. Morgenthau, must have realized that, from the standpoint of safety, we were already 6 months late in taking the necessary action, yet went through the entire campaign without ever disclosing to the country that the abandonment of the gold standard was the means of salvation? And what is to be thought of the now Secretary of the Treasury, who, viewing his country headed for disaster; knowing, as he now tells us, that the obvious remedy was unmistakably clear, never once gave the country the benefit of a word of warning?

Whether it was wise and necessary to abandon the gold standard in April 1933 is a matter as to which men differ. I hold that it was unnecessary and disastrous, and that we have not begun to pay the full consequences of the step taken at that time. Then and there it resulted in a breach of faith on the part of the

United States Government. There is such a thing as moral suicide. It is responsible for the growing fear and uncertainty that paralyzes recovery, for the added currency instability that throttles world commerce, for the careless disregard of the principles of sound public finance, and for the constant threat of a devastating inflation.

But this much is clear. The facts do not support Mr. Morgenthau's charge that the failure of the last administration to abandon the gold standard was responsible for our troubles. And the theory now advanced cannot be reconciled with the complete silence and the pledges repeatedly given during the campaign of 1932 by members of this administration.

It is hardly worth while devoting much attention to the Secretary's flimsy claim as to the great contribution to our foreign trade made by the monetary policy of the administration. It is true—though not universally true—that under certain conditions the depreciation of a nation's currency may stimulate exports for a brief period, and until other countries resort to this and other protective measures. But the fact is that during 1934 we exported fewer goods in terms of the depreciated dollar than we did in terms of sound gold dollars in the year 1931, "when things headed toward a crisis all over the world."

There is one statement of the Secretary's from which the country can derive considerable comfort. That the administration is willing to participate in the stabilization of currencies, which I understand must mean a return to currencies of a fixed gold content, is distinctly encouraging. But even in this connection I am disappointed that the Secretary did not see fit to mention one of the indispensable elements of permanent stabilization—a balanced Budget.

COLONIZATION OF ALASKA—LETTER FROM CYRENUS COLE

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by Cyrenus Cole, a former Representative from Iowa, to the Secretary of Agriculture, with reference to the colonization of Alaska.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 10, 1935.*

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been shocked by the glaring publicity that writers paid for by the Government have been giving to what is styled the "migration to Alaska." At Government expense a thousand men, women, and children are now on their way to that northland, and how many more are to follow them? These subsidized and deluded trekkers are called the "new Pilgrim Fathers" by the official propagandists. I know that this movement is not under your direction, but as the spokesman for agriculture, can you not do something to check this thing?

In 1923 your father, Henry C. Wallace, and I made tours of Alaska, he as a member of the Harding party and I as a member of a congressional investigating committee. We both looked at the country through Iowa-born agricultural eyes. He may have been more favorably impressed than I was, but I recall that he said to me at one time: "Some time now far away, when our lands have become exhausted, we may have to go up there to coax food from the soil, but I hope I will never have to go there to follow a plow with a mosquito net over my head."

But before that necessity has arrived and while we are still plowing under crops, lest we produce too much for our needs and markets, the Government is spending millions of dollars to send people to that Alaska, and the Government's paid writers are luring them on. To encourage them, we are sending 300 C. C. C. boys along to help them clear the land and to build their log cabins, and out of an already depleted Treasury we are giving each of the 200 families a credit of $3,000, which they have to promise to repay in 30 years. Of course, they will not keep this promise for they will find nothing up there to pay with. To lure them on the more, we are outfitting them with gasoline trucks, radios, doctors, nurses, dentists, and other impedimenta of civilization. Soviet Russia sends its victims to Siberia, but semi-civilized America is sending the victims of its professorial dreamers to a de luxe Siberia called "Alaska."

The ghost writers of the Government, who may all have college educations, in word pictures and with ordinary pictures, are depicting the Satanuska Valley as another Garden of Eden. But the men who have such visions of milk and honey may never have seen that Alaskan valley as your father and I saw it in 1923. May I recall some of the things we saw there? A thin soil hardly more than a foot of which is thawed out in summertime, with a thousand feet of frozen ground under it, for Alaska underneath still belongs to the glacial era of the world's history. On this soil all kinds of vegetation make a quick and prodigious growth, while the sun beats on it for 20 or more hours each day. But these quick-growing products are seldom matured and retain too much moisture. An Iowa woman in Fairbanks told me they always got their winter potatoes from Seattle. Moss grows everywhere. The reindeer does the best he can with it, but he cannot make beefsteaks out of nothing. It is not a grass country, and when hay is made the grass has to be cured on ricks, for left on the ground to cure it would rot. But if grass is grown, as they say it can be, the mosquitoes will see to it that the cows do not give "contented" milk.

The propagandists, who are publicizing this migration, show us vine-clad cottages in Alaska. There are plenty of vines up there, but in nearly 500 miles from Seward to Fairbanks I saw few cottages of any kind, for few white men were living in all that distance. Out of one shack came a man and a woman who stared at us with the blankest and most hopeless eyes I have ever seen, eyes that haunt me still. They looked as if they had lived yesterday. What did they have to live for today? They also put trees in their pictures. The trees I saw were birches, aspens, and willows that spread their roots in the shallow soil that is thawed out each summer, and when their tops become a bit heavy they may topple over without the aid of the wind, for they can send no roots into the frozen soil.

It is to such a country that the much-blazoned new Pilgrim Fathers are being consigned by a bunch of dreamers who have found a new folly to exploit with millions of dollars that will have to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers. If we dealt justly with them, we would compel some of those altruistic and philanthropic dreamers to go and live with them and to hibernate with them like the bears. But they will not go where they are sending the men they are deluding. They will remain in Washington and live on $10,000 a year, or at least on $5,000.

I predict that the Government will have these new Pilgrim Fathers on its hands in perpetuity, and that eventually it will have to bring them all back, if they do not die, at public expense. How long and how many more such new follies are to be enacted at public expense? Have we not wasted enough at home without going up in Alaska to scatter other millions? If these farmers have to be rehabilitated, why not do it on the abandoned farms at home?

I am writing to you, Mr. Secretary, to appeal to you in the name of common sense and of the taxpayers, to do what you can to help stop this further wastage of both men and money. Surely you can say something to check this new folly.

Sincerely,

CYRENUS COLE.

CAN AMERICA KEEP OUT OF WAR?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR POPE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE] before the Town Hall Club, in New York City on April 22, 1935, on the subject "Can America Keep Out of War?"

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

Since Germany denounced the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty, perhaps no question has so filled the minds of the American people as that which we are to discuss tonight: Can America Keep Out of War?

That question has become exceedingly practical and its answer is of vital concern to every person in the United States. It has the attention of high officials in the Government. Resolutions to prohibit loans to warring nations and to prevent the issuance of passports to American citizens have been introduced in Congress. The State Department has been surveying the whole field of neutrality legislation.

Can the United States remain neutral in the event of a major war in Europe or Asia?

It may be well to examine, briefly, the principles of neutrality in the light of historic development. In the twelfth century a ban was placed on all trade by neutrals with warring nations, no distinction being made between combatants and noncombatants. Later the doctrine of neutrality was extended to permit neutrals to trade in war as in peace, except in contraband and with ports which had been effectively blockaded. In the European wars of 1613, 1780, and 1800 some neutral nations armed to defend such neutrality. Questions arising out of this doctrine were decided by prize courts of the belligerent countries. Obviously, decisions by these courts were unsatisfactory, and at the 1907 Hague Tribunal an effort was made to establish an international prize court. An agreement was reached to establish such a court, but the treaty was never ratified by the powers of the world. No such international court was ever created.

In 1856 the principal nations signed the Declaration of Paris, which codified maritime law on four points involving the rights of private property of neutrals.

In 1909 another effort was made to restate the principles of neutrality in the Declaration of London. This treaty was signed by the leading nations, but they never ratified it.

At the beginning of the World War Secretary of State Bryan proposed to the contending nations that they be bound by the provisions of the Declaration of London. This was agreeable to Germany and Austria, but declined by Great Britain, France, Russia, and Belgium.

In 1914, however, as a result of various compromises based on customs and treaties, neutrality had come to mean the status of nonparticipation in war with legal, impartial treatment of belligerants. To put it in the form of an understanding, neutral states agreed not to assist belligerents in military operations, and belligerants agreed not to impair the nonmilitary trade of neutrals. Such trade would extend to other neutral nations and to the civil population of the warring nations.

This is the same doctrine which, in the past, neutral nations had armed themselves to defend by war, if necessary. This is the doctrine upon which the United States insisted during the World

War. In spite of the fact that neutral rights and obligations were very well established in international law and generally recognized by all the nations of the world, practically all of them were violated by the belligerent nations during the war.

The twelfth century doctrine of banning nearly all trade and making no distinction between combatants and noncombatants was revived by Great Britain and Germany. Unreasonable sea zones were established and illegal blockades of neutral points were attempted. Neutral ships as well as belligerent merchant ships, upon which neutrals were rightfully traveling, were sunk without warning by submarines. Neutral ships were seized and sometimes destroyed. Contraband was extended to cover food and supplies to civil populations. Ships of neutrals were stopped for the purpose of taking persons off. The American flag was flown on belligerent ships as a ruse, and mines were planted in the high seas.

The only justification by the nations at war for this wholesale violation of neutral rights was that conditions had changed and that it was necessary for self-preservation. In defending the acts of Great Britain, Lord Birkenhead said:

"All the measures adopted may not be generally acceptable (to neutrals), but the broad policy pursued, it may be safely predicted, will be followed in another war by any naval belligerent to the fullest extent compatible with continued diplomatic relations with neutral states."

And Lloyd George said in his Memoirs:

"Nations fighting for their lives cannot always pause to observe punctiliousness. Their every action is an act of war and their attitude toward neutrals is governed not by the conventions of peace, but by the exigencies of a deadly strife."

Of course, the United States made repeated protests both to Great Britain and to Germany. Finally, we were drawn into the war as a result of violations of our neutral rights by Germany. After declaration of war, the claims of our citizens for damages were no longer asserted and at the end of the war they were, in effect, dropped without any admission by Great Britain or Germany that our rights had been violated.

Not a single disputed point raised during the war as to neutral rights has yet been settled. The status of such rights is now exactly the same as it was at the beginning of the war in 1914.

It is true that the League of Nations was established by the peace treaty and the Kellogg Peace Pact outlawing war has been adopted by all the great nations of the world. It is thought by some that these documents change the whole question of neutral rights and obligations. During the World War and since that time, under the League and the Kellogg Pact, the whole pre-Grotian concept of just and unjust wars has been revived. It is asserted that the obligations of members of the League make it necessary that they cooperate in determining the aggressor nation and in taking concerted action to prevent or stop war by assisting the nation invaded. During the last few months this principle has been applied in the Chaco war where Paraguay has been declared by the League to be the aggressor. Since that nation failed to accept a proposal for peace, an embargo of arms has been applied to Paraguay but not to Bolivia. The United States has not cooperated in that effort. There has been such talk, of course, about the part the United States should play in such efforts by the League. So far, the United States has gone no further than to give certain vague assurances of noninterference with League efforts.

Efforts have been made to modify the old concept of neutrality. Resolutions have been introduced in Congress repeatedly, beginning with one by Senator Burton in 1927, and ending with one introduced at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration. These embargo resolutions contained a provision giving to the President authority to place an embargo on arm shipments to "any nation or nations." In no case has such a resolution been adopted by Congress. This country has gone no farther than to provide embargoes against all belligerent nations.

One is safe in saying, therefore, that the United States is still holding the old principles of neutrality—that is, nonparticipation in military operations of belligerent countries, impartiality in attitude toward them, and insistence upon trade in war as in peace, except as to contraband goods and with effectively blockaded ports.

Under this ancient doctrine of neutrality the United States has never been able to stay out of a major European war. In 1793, in the war between France and England, John Adams issued his neutrality proclamation. Every possible effort was made by the Government to stay out of the conflict, but by 1797 Charles Cotesworth Pinckney expressed the prevailing sentiment of the American people in his famous statement, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute", and George Washington was appointed Commander in Chief of the American Army and preparations for war went forward. Happily a truce was made in Europe and the United States did not actually engage in the war.

In 1812, after long years of desperate effort, the United States declared war against Great Britain for violation of neutral rights. The war of 1870, between France and Germany, being of short duration and neither nation being a maritime power, the United States was not drawn into the war. In 1917 the United States was again drawn into European conflict.

That the principles of neutrality, under which the United States was drawn into these European wars, are outmoded is the opinion of many eminent students of international law. Dr. James Brown Scott, for instance, said in 1934:

"There is a generally recognized law of neutrality, but it is an old law, adequate to circumstances which once existed but which no longer obtain. Since law should be in touch with actual conditions, it should change with changing circumstances; the circumstances in the case of neutrality being that, terrible as have been the wars of our century, those of tomorrow will be wars in which the entire populations of the belligerents will be directly engaged or affected, instead of being only remotely touched by war—as was the case when the existing law of neutrality came into being."

In spite of changed conditions, however, the United States still gives allegiance to this ancient doctrine of neutrality, and it seems certain that under it this country cannot stay out of a major war of extended duration, especially where one of the belligerents is a naval power.

The prevailing sentiment in this country now seems to be that this doctrine of neutrality must be modified by restricting to rights and liberties of the American people to avoid conflicts with belligerents. Very well, let us see what are some of the things that we must do and try to do to avoid such conflicts. I have made a list of such matters as occur to me. Doubtless there are many others.

First. It would be necessary to control radio stations, wireless stations, and the cables, in order to prevent their use by agents of one side or the other. It requires no argument to demonstrate that their use by such agents would create serious friction between this country and nations at war.

Second. Also necessary would be the prevention of enlistments by citizens of the United States and of other nations within our borders in foreign armies, as this caused trouble during the last war.

Third. Loans and extensions of credit not only to belligerent nations but to their citizens should be prohibited as such practice inevitably draws our great financial and business institutions into support of one belligerent or another, as it did during the last war.

Fourth. Merchant ships of belligerents should not be permitted to remain in our ports, as they become nests of activity in behalf of the nation to which they owe allegiance.

Fifth. The United States should do everything possible to prevent other nations from flying the United States flag on the high seas, as that was a constant cause of protest during the last war. Perhaps all that could be done would be to prevent such ships from entering our ports.

Sixth. Submarines and armed ships of belligerents should be prevented from entering our ports, as that caused trouble during the last war.

Seventh. The rights of American citizens and property in other nations should be abandoned. Of course, this would cause violent objection by newspapers and citizens who would severely condemn the Government for not protecting its citizens. But to stay out of the war such a position, it seems, would have to be taken.

Eighth. Passports should be denied to American citizens who desire to travel on the high seas, or, at least, let it be understood that they travel at their own risk. It is easy to see that the killing of our citizens, even if they are traveling at their own risk, would raise a clamorous demand in every section of the country that our Government take steps to protect its citizens.

Ninth. Airplanes should not be permitted to land on, or fly over, our territory for the same reason that submarines should not be permitted to enter our ports.

Tenth. An embargo on arms and munitions would have to be adopted. Exports of these commodities during the last war constituted one of the principal causes of our declaration of war. The story of our trade in munitions, together with credit extended to European nations for the purchase of implements of war is a long and complicated one. The danger and difficulty of adopting any policy with reference to such shipments is apparent at the outset. Suppose that a war arose between Germany and the allied nations, and the United States imposed an embargo on the export of war material to all belligerent nations. Since Great Britain controls the seas and Germany manufactures most of her own munitions, such an embargo would be of distinct advantage to Germany and of distinct disadvantage to the Allies.

Is that a policy of real neutrality? Would it meet the approval of the American people?

The same situation arose during the World War, and Secretary Lansing had this to say:

"The principles of international law, the practice of nations, the national safety of the United States and other nations without great military and naval establishments, the prevention of increased armies and navies, the adoption of peaceful methods for the adjustment of international differences, and finally, neutrality itself are opposed to prohibition by a neutral nation of the export of arms and munitions, or other munitions of war to belligerent powers during the progress of the war."

Without doubt, the nations, seriously handicapped by such an embargo, would object to such policy with a resentment which can only be engendered by the passion for self-preservation. While such a policy, it seems to me, must be adopted, it will be attended by difficulty and danger.

Eleventh. The dissemination of propaganda in the United States by foreign agents should be prevented. The same propaganda, however, by citizens and newspapers of the United States probably could not be legally prohibited. Our constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech and of the press would not permit this country to legally do what Holland did during the last war in passing a

law making it a criminal offense to incite hostile opinion against any belligerent nation.

Twelfth. Finally the greatest difficulty of all will arise in connection with foreign trade. There is no way except force for the United States to prevent the sowing of mines in the high seas, the seizure of neutral vessels and unarmed merchant ships, the extension of contraband lists to include every commodity to be shipped to the civil population, the removal and impressment of Americans into service, the drafting of American citizens abroad into service, and various other acts injurious to American citizens.

The placing of an embargo on American exports presents an almost unsurmountable difficulty. Manufacturers in the East, cotton farmers in the South, wheat farmers in the Middle West, with surpluses on hand, would protest to high heaven if foreign trade were stopped. Their surpluses would accumulate and would probably have the effect of a serious business depression. This would force a resumption of trade. It may be said that such exporters would be required to assume the risk of loss. This, again, would raise a clamor for Government protection of the rights of citizens engaged in legitimate trade under international law.

Some days ago I was speaking in a Pennsylvania town and had pointed out the things that would have to be done to keep us out of another great war. A young man arose in the audience and asked this question, "Since when have Americans who fought for their rights during the Revolutionary War, were ready to fight in the War of 1800, fought for them in the War of 1812, and in the World War, become so senile and cowardly that they will not fight for them in the future? Is a policy of surrendering their legal rights, ducking, and hiding consistent with American character?" I submit that by the time we do all the things which have been suggested above to stay out of war, there will be millions of Americans asking this question.

While I am perfectly willing to go as far as anyone in the adoption of measures to insure neutrality, I am firmly convinced that such a policy will be exceedingly difficult to carry out and probably would not prevent our participation in a major war.

I have long been convinced that another policy is better for our country to pursue. In every civilized community in the world another principle has been followed. Individuals remain armed until a collective system of law and order was established which gave them security. Then, they were ready to disarm and to trust to the power of the community, expressed in courts and peace officers, for their protection. No other way has been found in the history of the world to solve this problem. Individuals have never been able to isolate themselves, to hide in storm cellars, to run away from trouble, and have never been willing to surrender their rights as individuals. They will fight first. They always have.

As with individuals, so with nations. In my opinion, nations will never disarm until the power of collective effort gives them security. A world of law and order must precede the disarmament of nations. A means must be found for judicial settlement of disputes between nations, and a way must be found through concerted action of the nations of the world to prevent wars. This is the permanent way out. Only through such international cooperation and concert of action based upon understanding and good will can permanent peace be assured.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—DUPLICATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker, under authority of the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 21, had affixed his signature to the duplicate copy of the enrolled bill (H. R. 6084) to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed $1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President, under authority of the said concurrent resolution.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WAGNER obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WAGNER. I understand the Senator desires to address the Senate on the question of Philippine independence?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; just for a few moments.

Mr. WAGNER. Very well, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, yesterday in the Philippine Islands, by a vote of about 25 to 1, the constitution for the new Filipino Commonwealth was adopted by the people. This action cuts the last tie of the old order and really marks the beginning of local self-government in the Philippine Islands, the ultimate goal of which is complete independence.

Many Senators who have been there, and some who have not been there, question the wisdom of Philippine independence. There is much to be said against Philippine independence from the standpoint of either country, but in the few moments I shall occupy let me point out several factors which always must enter any consideration of the problem.

First, from the very moment we acquired the Philippine Islands down to this date every administration has said repeatedly, over and over again, that we were not staying in the Philippine Islands as a permanent policy, that we were there only until order could be established and a stable government set up under the Filipino people themselves, and when that occurred we would withdraw and return to them their unconditional sovereignty.

Obviously, if that policy was wrong, we cannot in honesty change it now, even if we wanted to do so. We have promised this for 30 years or more. If there is to be any change in the present and future status of the Philippine Islands in their relation to the United States, the suggestion for such change must come from them. It cannot come from us in view of the fact that the independence law is nothing but a crystallization of the promises we have made to the Filipinos for 30 or 35 years.

Whether or not this is going to be economically wise for the Filipinos is a different question. Much of the difficulty ahead has been pointed out to them, in detail, time and time again. As the author of the independence bill I went to the Philippine Islands last fall and there, before the constitutional convention and in a nation-wide broadcast in the Philippines, I tried to inform the people of the islands about the consequences of independence. In a few moments I will read the gist of that speech, to which I hope Senators may listen:

With the coming of independence the American market which I have shown has contributed so much to Filipino progress and prosperity will be closed to your people, except upon the payment of tariff taxes upon the products which you sell to us. Again, the problem of national defense, like all problems of national existence for independent nations, will become one alone for the new Filipino Government.

Fortunately, there is a period of from 10 to 12 years to prepare for and cushion the pending economic dislocation. In order that we may deal with this matter in an atmosphere of complete frankness and candor, I am taking the liberty to point out some of these difficulties in the hope that this may be helpful, and the hurtful economic consequences which would result from a nonconsideration of these matters may be reduced to the fullest extent.

This is a very pertinent part of my statement at that time:

Let me illustrate some of these trade and market difficulties which must be faced. Bear in mind that I have already pointed out that only last year you sold to the United States, free of any import taxes, 60 percent of the entire agricultural production of the Philippine Islands. Now, for the 3 years of 1931, 1932, and 1933 you sold to the people of the United States, commodities consisting of cane sugar, coconut oil, coconut meat, copra, oil cake and meal * * * and other items. During this 3-year period the total sales of these products to the people of the United States amounted to ₱522,000,000, nearly all of which were sold without the payment of any tax to us whatsoever because you are now a part of the United States of America.

Listen to this, Senators:

Had you been then an independent country, during this same 3-year period you would have had to pay, like all other independent countries had to pay, upon this ₱522,000,000 of products which you sold to us, import taxes amounting to ₱440,000,000.

In sum, to state the same thing another way, instead of receiving, as you did, ₱522,000,000 for the products you shipped us in 1931, 1932, and 1933, you would have received, after the payment of those import taxes, only ₱82,000,000, a loss to Filipino producers and laborers of ₱440,000,000 in that 3-year period.

I further pointed out that they sell to us 60 percent of their entire agricultural production every year:

Again, let us translate these large sums of Filipino money into more intimate and understandable values.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am at a loss to know when the Senator is quoting from his radio speech and when he is not quoting from it. Is the Senator now reading from his speech?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I am reading from the speech. This is another paragraph from the same address:

Again, let us translate these large sums of Filipino money into more intimate and understandable values. Your sale of Filipino products to the United States during the last 3 years has been 174,000,000 pesos a year. Now, assuming that there are 14,000,000 people in the islands, these sales are equivalent to 12 pesos per year for every Filipino man, woman, and child in your population. Allowing six persons to each Filipino family, these sales represent 72 pesos per year for every family in the Filipino Archipelago. Again, assuming that the average monthly pay for Filipino labor is 30 pesos per month, it means that from these sales of Filipino products to us you have received sufficient money to provide work for one person from every family in the Philippine Islands steadily for 2½ months out of each year.

Again, the money obtained from the sale of your products to us each year is equal to 3½ cavans of rice for very man, woman, and child in the Philippine Islands—

That is a very large measurement of rice—

or you have received sufficient money from the sale of your products to us to purchase, at 30 pesos each, 5,800,000 carabaos, or more than 2 carabaos for every family in the Philippine Islands.

I shall not quote further, but it must be said, with the wide publicity which these facts were given in the Philippine Islands through the radio hook-up, and the fact that the address was made before the constitutional convention in which were representatives from every nook and corner of the islands, that the Filipino people have been on notice as to what independence means. The address also has been printed in full in the press from one end of the islands to the other.

I felt it on my conscience, knowing there were grave difficulties ahead of those people after independence became an accomplished fact, if they had been led to believe that everything would be just as it was then and is now, to tell them some of the consequences of independence and to present matters in such terms that every man might understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I recall the speech made by the Senator. The Senator was as frank and open as a man could possibly be under the circumstances. I think it was most commendable. I think the Senator performed a great service. He has not read all of the address. I hope he will put it all in the RECORD at this point, or at the close of his speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. It has been put in the RECORD heretofore.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it; but I think it ought to be put in the RECORD in connection with what the Senator from Maryland is now saying.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, well-wishers for the Philippine Islands often say that they think the Filipinos have made a mistake. That may be true, or it may not be true; but the fact remains that we promised them independence. They asked us to make good on that promise. We did make good on that promise in an independence law. They accepted that promise. The Philippine constitution has been written and has been ratified by the people. Obviously, there cannot be any change in our policy toward the Filipinos unless they themselves ask us to change that policy. Even then we might not do it; but, obviously, the invitation to change the projected course of events must come from them. We should be without honor and without logic if we were to promise them something for 35 years, and then give it to them and have them accept it, and then try to take it away from them. Whether it is good or bad does not enter into the question. The fact is that we must keep our word with the people of the Philippines.

There is much so be said in favor of keeping the Philippines as a part of our country. There is likewise much to be said against such a policy. Now that the Philippine constitution has been adopted in a plebiscite by a ratio of about 25 to 1, I desired to call these facts to the attention of the Senate, so that the Senate and our people in this country might know that the Filipinos have been apprised of what independence will mean to them, that they are not moving in the dark, and if they have pursued a wrong policy, our hands are clean. There has been no deception. The facts have been laid on the table, and the United States has kept its word.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I quite agree with the views which the Senator is expressing, but is there any move anywhere, either in the Philippines or here, to retrace our steps?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but it is not as yet a pronounced movement. My thought is that as the transition period grows shorter there will be a vocal and perhaps a numerous support for a movement to change the present status as now conceived, in that there will be a proposal for some sort of dominion project, or for a larger measure of self-government. For my own part, however, I think that movement must be made now by those people if they expect us to consider it seriously. We are not going to wait until the very accomplishment of Filipino independence draws nigh and then considers it. We shall consider the adoption of the constitution and the inauguration of the new government, if I interpret it properly, as final. If the status is not to be final, if it is to be changed at all, it ought to be changed now, and not 6, or 8, or 10 years from now.

Mr. BORAH. I assume it will not be changed at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. I assume so, too, but I desired to put the country on notice that, so far as I can interpret the attitude of the United States, a definite policy has been pursued. If there is to be a change in that policy, the invitation to change it must come from the Filipinos. We do not agree to change it, but we will, of course, consider a proposal from them to change it, but if that proposal is not made now I do not believe America will even seriously consider it in the future. The time for action is now. The agreement is now being written. Both sides must make up their minds to accept the hardships as well as the benefits of complete independence. In my opinion the Philippine Islands are on their way to complete independence for there does not appear to be any unwillingness on the part of the Filipinos to embrace the hardships of independence if they can obtain the supposed benefits.

I thank the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] for yielding in order that I might comment upon this matter immediately after the vote has been taken in the Philippine Islands, and so that I might set the people of that country straight as to the attitude of the United States toward any change in their future status as I see it.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the statement which I made to the Filipino Constitutional Convention in Manila on December 22 of last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED DECEMBER 22, 1934, BY SENATOR MILLARD E. TYDINGS, BEFORE THE PHILIPPINE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. President, gentlemen of the Constitutional Convention, and citizens of the Philippine Islands, I am grateful for your kind invitation to address this convention for it offers an appropriate opportunity to discuss our past common relationship and to consider the problems of the future incident to independence for the Philippine Islands.

For more than three decades our two countries and peoples, though separated by thousands of miles, have enjoyed economic and political union. During that period both countries have traveled far along the highway of progress. We are now approaching a permanent dissolution of our present relationship. Therefore it is fitting and wise that we counsel together and, in an atmosphere of an unalloyed truth and complete frankness, search for the means and measures most likely to achieve our avowed purposes.

HISTORICAL

The United States of America did not secure possession of the Philippine Islands by deliberate design. Our sovereignty here was a consequence of armed hostility, the cause of which was 10,000 miles distant from the city of Manila. At the conclusion of that conflict, through a series of unforeseen events, the Philippine Islands became a part of the territory of the United States.

However, at the very start of our sovereignty, a national policy was declared that our control and possession of the islands would be but temporary; that eventually, after law and order and a stable self-government were established over a period of years, we would relinquish all rights, control, and sovereignty over the Filipino

people. This national policy, uttered over 30 years ago, has been reiterated by every President of the United States since the administration of President McKinley.

In 1916 the Congress of the United States formally proclaimed it through the enactment of the Jones law.

This year upon the open, direct, and specific request of the Filipino people, who sent representatives to Washington to obtain it, the Government of the United States, in spite of the great difficulties attendant upon it, enacted a law which provides for complete and absolute independence for the people of the Philippine Islands within a definite and short period of time.

I repeat that this action upon the part of the American Congress was in line with continuously declared American policy of 34 years standing; but, more particularly, action was taken at this time upon the insistent request of the authorized representatives of the Filipino people who were sent to Washington to obtain the enactment of the independence law.

Following the passage of that law, commonly known as the "Tydings-McDuffie Act", its provisions were considered and discussed by the Philippine Legislature, which body accepted it for and on behalf of the Filipino people on May 1, 1934.

THE TYDINGS-M'DUFFIE ACT

Naturally, in the enactment of any independence law there were many differing opinions for the disposition of the matter. There were those who thought that immediate independence was best; others wanted the independence question postponed for from 20 to 25 years, while still others held that independence should not be considered at all at this time.

After extensive hearings, the time limit of approximately 12 years from the date of the enactment of the law was thought to offer the best opportunity to carry out the national policy of the United States and to accede to the Filipino request for definite action.

The law itself, among other things, provides for certain mandatory provisions in the new Philippine constitution prior to actual independence; for submission of that constitution to the President of the United States for his approval; then for submission of the Constitution to the Filipino people for their approval; for matters affecting international treaties and property rights; for political relations of the islands with the United States pending complete independence; for recognition of Filipino independence and for the withdrawal of American sovereignty over the islands; for the neutralization of the Philippines; for notification to foreign governments of actual and complete independence; for tariff duties before and after independence; for Filipino immigration to continental United States; for the payment of the Philippine bonded indebtedness, which Philippine bonds were sold by the United States of America, and for other matters of equal import.

Like all legislative matters, the independence act may have its imperfections, yet it is doubtful if another could be drawn, which as a whole would better accomplish the objects desired and which would have been at that time acceptable to both the American and Filipino people.

THE EXPORT TAX AND PAYMENT OF PHILIPPINE BONDED INDEBTEDNESS

The export-tax provisions of the independence law seem to have evoked the most discussion in the islands. It is well to note that these export-tax provisions were inserted to accomplish the three following purposes: First, to settle accounts completely between the Philippines and the United States when actual independence is obtained so that the United States might not be kept in the position of morally guaranteeing the payment of another country's obligation, in which country it has no voice in the conduct of affairs; secondly, the payment of this debt will start the independent Filipino nation upon its way free of all indebtedness whatsoever, and hence place the new Filipino nation in the strongest position possible for the settlement of then existing independence problems and for conducting the affairs, both internal and external, of an entirely newly born country; third, for 5 years the export tax does not apply on Filipino products. These taxes begin and increase the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth years. After 10 years, while export taxes on Filipino products are no longer levied, import taxes will necessarily have to be paid by Filipino producers, many times greater than the export taxes, whenever the Filipino people send their products to the United States for sale there. Such taxes are now paid by producers of all other countries upon the entry of their products into the United States. Obviously, therefore, the imposition of the export taxes will commence to prepare the Filipino producer for the situation which will confront him when, as a citizen of an independent country, he desires to continue to sell his products in the United States. To make no provision for such a contingency and to have it all fall upon the shoulders of the Filipino producers at one time would be cruel and inhuman and cause hardships which a gradual infliction of such taxes will, to some extent, mitigate.

I repeat that to provide for all the manifold problems in an independence law was not easy. However, every attempt was made to do so with the aims of both nations in view and so as to accomplish the desired results in the shortest period of time and with the least injury to both people concerned.

THE RECORD OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Here in the presence of this convention, which is engaged in writing a constitution which it is hoped will be the aegis for a progressive, prosperous, and humane people, I cannot refrain, even at the price of immodesty, from feeling a deep sense of pride in the large and unselfish contributions and accomplishments which the United States has made to the Filipino people. You have been given ordered and modern liberty without coercion; an unprecedented prosperity without exploitation; and, with these gifts, you have been furnished national defense of your property and people without any cost to, aid from, or responsibility of your provisional government of your people. Humanity and progress have marked our past relationship. America's real heart, real intention, and worth-while contributions are plainly written today in the law and order which prevails in these islands and in the prosperous contentment plainly visible in the faces of the Filipino people. I doubt if what has been done in the Philippine Islands has been matched before by any country in all the pages of the world's history.

ECONOMIC FACTORS IN THE PAST

We are now about to sever this dual relationship. At a not-far-distant date your country and mine will walk in separate highways down the corridors of the future. As you move through the transition period of the Commonwealth government and into the phase of complete and absolute independence the pathway at times will be difficult. Much of this difficulty is unavoidable. These difficulties are largely due to a new political economy which now becomes necessary upon the part of the Philippine Islands.

Since 1909 products produced in the Philippine Islands have been admitted free—that is, without the payment of any import taxes at all—into the United States of America. With actual independence these free markets will be closed, as they are now closed to all other countries except the Philippine Islands. This will call for a rearrangement of the economic life of the Filipino people. Let me point out how important these free markets are to the workers and producers of the Philippine Islands.

In 1933 the Philippine Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources stated that the total value of your entire agricultural production was ₱284,000,00. It also reported that of this production ₱174,000,000 was shipped and sold to the United States. In other words, 60 percent of the entire agricultural production of the Philippine Islands in the year 1933 was sold in the free markets of the United States and only 40 percent was consumed at home or sold elsewhere. Bear in mind that this agricultural production came from the Philippine Islands without the payment of any import tax whatsoever when it entered the United States. After independence this will not be the case.

For the past 25 years the Filipino people have had complete and easy access to the richest market in the world, and in that market you have enjoyed both a visible and invisible balance of trade. The visible balance of trade arising from the exchange of products between the Philippines and the United States, not including gold, amounts to about ₱60,000,000 a year, over many years, which is in your favor. This shows that you have sold us ₱60,000,000 per year more of your products than you have bought of products from the United States of America. This caused a flow of wealth from the United States to the Philippine Islands, which has made your people prosperous and which has raised the standard of living here to a point which, I believe, is higher than that of any other people in the Orient.

Moreover, it has permitted the Filipino people, with the encouragement and help and guarantees of the United States Government to build highways, construct railroads, build hospitals and improve health, create parks and playgrounds, establish a system of education so that the masses might taste of its benefits, to own lands and homes, and in general to provide your fellows with the luxuries in many cases and the necessities in most cases which are demanded by prosperous people everywhere.

During this period of time American officials and employees were being gradually supplanted in governmental offices by Filipinos, and while the whole progressive pattern was being woven you have not had to bear a single centavo of the cost of full and complete national defense and protection of the United States Army and Navy, which have been at your service. The officers and men and equipment of this military and naval establishment, supported entirely by the people and resources of the United States, cost the American taxpayer about two-thirds of every tax peso which he pays to the Government of the United States. They have been available, nevertheless, without financial cost to you to protect and defend the Philippine Islands whenever your territory was in danger.

ECONOMIC FACTORS OF THE FUTURE

With the coming of independence, the American market which I have shown has contributed so much to Filipino progress and prosperity will be closed to your people, except upon the payment of tariff taxes upon the products you sell to us. Again, the problem of national defense, like all problems of national existence for independent nations, will become one alone for the new Filipino government.

Fortunately, there is a period of from 10 to 12 years to prepare for and cushion the pending economic dislocation. In order that we may deal with this matter in an atmosphere of complete frankness and candor, I am taking the liberty to point out some of these difficulties in the hope that this may be helpful, and the hurtful economic consequences which would result from a nonconsideration of these matters may be reduced to the fullest extent.

Let me illustrate some of these trade and market difficulties which must be faced. Bear in mind that I have already pointed out that only last year you sold to the United States, free of any import taxes, 60 percent of the entire agricultural production of the Philippine Islands. Now, for the 3 years of 1931, 1932, and 1933, you sold to the people of the United States commodities consisting

of cane sugar, coconut oil, coconut meat, copra, oil cake and meal, cordage of Manila hemp, cotton wearing apparel, cotton laces and embroideries, fiber hats, cigars and cheroots, tobacco, cabinet wood, pearl and shell buttons, pineapples, and other items. During this 3-year period the total sales of these products to the people of the United States amounted to ₱522,000,000, nearly all of which were sold without the payment of any tax to us whatsoever, because you are now a part of the United States of America.

Had you been then an independent country, during this same 3-year period, you would have had to pay, like all other independent countries have to pay, upon this ₱522,000,000 of products which you sold to us, import taxes amounting to ₱440,000,000.

In sum, to state the same thing another way, instead of receiving, as you did, ₱522,000,000 for the products you shipped us in 1931, 1932, and 1933, you would have received, after the payment of these import taxes, only ₱82,000,000, a loss to Filipino producers and laborers of ₱440,000,000 in that 3-year period.

Again, let us translate these large sums of Filipino money into more intimate and understandable values. Your sale of Filipino products to the United States during the last 3 years has been ₱174,000,000 a year. Now, assuming that there are 14,000,000 people in the islands, these sales are equivalent to ₱12 per year for every Filipino man, woman, and child in your population. Allowing six persons to each Filipino family these sales represent ₱72 per year for every family in the Philippine Archipelago. Again, assuming that the average monthly pay for Philippine labor is ₱30 per month, it means that from these sales of Filipino products to us you have received sufficient money to provide work for one person from every family in the Philippine Islands steadily for 2½ months out of each year. Again, the money obtained from the sale of your products to us each year is equal to 3½ cavans of rice for every man, woman, and child in the Philippine Islands, or you have received sufficient money from the sale of your products to us to purchase, at ₱30 each, 5,800,000 carabaos, or more than 2 carabaos for every family in the Philippine Islands.

These illustrations show how much of the life and prosperity of the Philippine Islands is dependent upon the sale of your products to the people of the United States. They also show the great hardship which would come to the Filipino people, as a result of absolute and complete independence, when the sale of much of your products in the United States would become impossible if you would then be required to pay the import taxes which I have commented on before. They likewise show the justification of imposing the export taxes upon your products, commencing 5 years from now, so as to prepare the Filipino nation for the circumstances which will confront it when complete independence is obtained.

Further, it can be seen that it will be difficult for Filipino business men and institutions to obtain loans and capital to continue the development of your natural resources until you have demonstrated your ability to deal with the economic conditions I have mentioned and to set up a stable and workable political economy which will give to capital the element of safety which it requires in making investments.

Anticipating the full consequence of complete and absolute independence, it will be necessary to make such cost-of-production adjustment of the things which you produce and sell as will permit the Philippines to compete successfully with other countries producing similar products for sale not only in the United States market but in all the markets of the world.

That such cost-of-production adjustments are necessary can be illustrated by commenting on a single product which you export in great abundance. The present cost, c. i. f., to New York of sugar averages ₱5.40 per 100 pounds, compared with the Cuban cost of ₱3.80 per 100 pounds and the Javan cost of about ₱2 per 100 pounds. The higher cost of producing Philippine sugar is due partly to lower production per acre as compared with Java, partly to higher wages, and partly to other factors. The cost of production perhaps could be reduced so as to permit competition with Cuban sugar only by severely cutting down capital investment, which is high in the Philippine Islands where most of the mills have been built when construction and material costs were high. It is doubtful, however, whether this alone would permit Philippine sugar to compete with that of Cuba and Java after you are an independent nation. Indeed, some informed Filipino economists have stated it will be necessary to reduce wages by at least 50 percent. The same effect could be obtained by devaluing the peso, but it should be stated that such an expedient is attended with other difficulties and may offer but temporary relief.

DIFFICULTIES OF IMMEDIATE INDEPENDENCE

Such economic dislocation as has been shown for the people of the Philippine Islands after independence, if unprovided for during the transition period, will result in great hardship throughout the islands, and for that reason a period of 12 years was selected in preference to immediate independence, although it was the desire of the United States to grant independence at once if the circumstances would have permitted such action to be taken. It is my own belief that persons in both countries who are conversant with economic factors, whatever their emotional, political, and spiritual impulses may be, will not, after a full examination of the facts, contend that immediate independence is the best solution of this problem. Certainly it is doubtful whether such a contention would be made by informed persons if they had the real welfare of the Filipino people at heart or if they did not wish to destroy all the accomplishment of the Philippines while under the United States of America.

To grant complete and absolute independence to the Philippine Islands tomorrow, without giving time for the necessary readjustments, would destroy overnight the export trade of the Filipino people. At the same time there would be such a decrease in the national income of the Filipino people and such a material reduction in the sources of taxation that much of the education, health, transportation, and general prosperity of the islands would disappear and the new government would be forced to carry a load which, to say the least, would be extremely difficult for any nation to bear.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

With the withdrawal of sovereignty of the United States from the Philippine Islands and the accomplishment of complete and absolute independence by the Filipino nation the problem of national defense for the islands likewise must undergo a new consideration. When the flag of the United States of America comes down and there is raised the flag of the new Filipino nation the responsibility for your national defense passes from the hands of the United States to the new Filipino government. To expect the United States to bear responsibility for the acts of a nation over which it had no control whatsoever would be as illogical as it would be to ask the Filipino people, once they are independent, to defend the shores of the United States. Sovereignty and responsibility walk hand in hand. Without sovereignty there cannot be responsibility.

THE NEW FILIPINO NATION

I think the record will show that your speaker has on every occasion in the Congress of the United States been a champion of Filipino rights. Whenever matters affecting our mutual relationship have arisen I have tried, within the limits of my ability, to sincerely present the Filipino view and to safeguard, insofar as I might, Filipino interests. I have no intention at this time to alter that position. Because of my record in the American Congress toward Filipino matters, because of the great affection which I have for the people of the Philippine Islands, and because I wish you well in your new venture of nationhood, I have taken the liberty of pointing out the difficulties ahead. In the not far distant future the Philippine Islands will achieve complete and absolute independence from the United States. What does complete and absolute independence mean for any nation? Some contend that it means the right and privilege to govern itself. Does it not mean more than this in reality? Does it not mean that it must devise a wise political economy, so that from that economy it can produce sufficient governmental revenue to provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, establish a system of education for the masses of the people, improve and safeguard their sanitation and health, build roads and foster other means of land and water transportations to assist in the exchange of their commerce, establish courts and provide sufficient police force to support and enforce the laws of the nation, and, in addition, to govern so wisely its people and commerce that the government will have sufficient revenue at all times to promote the mass progress of the people within its territorial limits and to adequately defend them against attack from without?

This is the goal to which the Filipino people aspire. You have asked for the opportunity to reach this goal and have stated you are ready to assume the responsibilities which go hand in hand with the privileges of an independent nation. You have stated that you are ready to undertake the solution of the attendant difficulties; that you are willing to bear the grave responsibilities of nationhood. Therefore the United States is beginning the termination of its sovereignty in the Philippine Islands. The people of the Philippine Islands are taking up the responsibilities of their future destiny.

The United States of America has kept its word. Its promise is approaching fulfillment. Your request for action has not been denied. It is presumed that you were just as sincere in making this request of the United States as the United States was sincere in making its promise to grant ultimate independence to your people.

I believe our contact with your people and temporary control over your destiny will prove in after years to have been one of the most unselfish and idealistic contact of one people with another. This fact, I hope, will find room for expression upon the future pages of Philippine history, and I believe the historian will say that my country has tried to be helpful and has improved immeasurably the well-being of the people of these islands.

I have welcomed this opportunity to address you and, through you, the Filipino people. I have tried to do so in a spirit of good will, sincerity and frankness. I have ventured to comment briefly upon your future problems, to explain why certain measures have been adopted and to point out the obstacles which yet lie ahead, so that hereafter it may be said that nothing was concealed from the people of the Philippine Islands. America, I am sure, will consider seriously in the future any proposal you may suggest, incident to independence, which will conduce to the welfare of the people of both countries.

Through the medium of open covenants openly arrived at, our union will be dissolved in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, to the end that, after independence, we may continue to carve out our separate destinies, still joined by the golden ties of mutual regard and good wishes one for the other. On behalf of my associates of the Mission and myself, may I publicly thank you all for your hospitality, your helpfulness, and kindness, and wish you Godspeed.

THE PRESIDENT'S DEFENSE OF THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WAGNER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I dare intrude myself upon the able Senator from New York to state that his address will be one of profound information to us; but I depart from its object to remind my brother Senators that the President of the United States is to be congratulated—relying upon the reports of the public press—for having, in his speech to the farmers' delegation, used what Emerson, treating of Shakespeare, describes as "the commanding word."

We read that the President of the United States bravely asserted to an aggregation of gentlemen visiting him in the White House, who are the representatives of farming interests, that there had been those throughout this country who, when alluding to the policies of the present administration and legislation generally, had been guilty of lying.

Sir, we note with gleeful satisfaction that by whatever soft name heretofore, out of consideration to policies noblesse, he had designated such utterances, the time had now come to give them their proper apothegm. They were lies and propagated by liars.

Mr. President, it is the history of legislation—it has ever been so with us, who recognize and remember our own experiences, and I refer to our honorable friends on all sides and both sides of the Senate and all legislators—that a class of individuals, busy projecting before the public and the country what they deem to be the content of a legislative measure and its purposes, usually indulge in the prophecy of sure destruction upon the property of the citizen and all the rights of American mankind.

Mr. President, Shakespeare has placed an observation in the mouth of one of his great players that "half a truth is worse than a whole lie"; and we on both sides of this Chamber, and I am sure the other honorable House, have been made the victim of such misrepresentations, not intentionally, let us believe, by some, but deliberately repeated and multiplied for deliberate uses and purposes by others who with considered object deceive those anxious over the subject. The President may not have been so polite last night in his strong characterization as under ordinary conditions has been his expression. He arose to the height where he adopted the words that the fourth estate, the representatives of Mercury in the press gallery, have heretofore labeled the "short and ugly word." In the use by the President he applied the appropriate one under the circumstances.

I pause to give, in the moment I am seizing from the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], one or two illustrations.

A certain class of men calling themselves financiers, in order to give themselves a respectable attitude and robe themselves with a commercial righteousness, have been publishing in the New York newspapers that this country is on its way to sure inflation, a course that is to destroy the credit of the Nation, rob all securities of their value, and reduce the worth of the Liberty bonds of the country to nothingness. They advertise in the public press that since we are on the eve of doing such infamy and will surely accomplish that fiendish purpose upon the Republic, they tender to the holders of the American Liberty bonds the opportunity to come into their office—"says the spider to the fly" [laughter]—and exchange their Liberty bonds, soon to be "debased", "discredited", and destroyed for valuable "securities", worthy and valuable and which will, of course, float to fortune those destined to unhappy fate and misfortune from inflation. It is asked that the possessors of the Government bonds exchange the Liberty bonds of their Government, securities which are soon to be destroyed by inflation, for the very secure and worthy "securities" which are to be tendered as exchange value by these gentlemen and their representatives.

Mr. President, let us recall that these advertisers of fraudulent seductions are of a kind with those who had been putting upon the people, in a period not long since and not altogether forgotten, a class of other "securities" that robbed the widow of her very last pittance, the child of his inheritance, the man of his possessions, and the Nation of all its credit and honor.

These and their kind are they as portrayed by Aesop, telling how the fox said to the farmer, "Leave to us the chickens to care for—chickens are our specialty." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, these liars for 2 years have been charging that this Republic was on the eve of inflation; that our Nation is now about to follow the steps of Germany, and soon to yield to the financial destruction which surely will follow. This is asserted as penalty if our Government attempts any course whatever that runs against the trickery that accumulated vast profits through robbing the helpless and cheating the defenseless and the ignorant. These slanderers continuously multiplied these charges as to what this Republic is about to do that is to wreck its own people. It is now charged that Mr. Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury, is to put a bomb under the gold deposits of the United States. He is to melt up its metal, burn up its securities, and leave the country in a condition where its house is destroyed and its children left perishing, bereft of hope and of a life of prosperity—all this intimated as ordered financial holocaust, to be brought about by our Goverment officials.

I congratulate the President of the United States that he has now found it agreeable to come out of that closet from which, of course, his office impelled upon him—that great courtesy, smiling indulgences, and sometimes too great deference. He has most timely yielded to the proper impulse to call these liars who slander their Government and misrepresent the legislative bodies of this country, that which they are, "deliberate liars."

We come to two illustrations.

There comes to us the intimation and charge that there is a labor bill, designated by the name of the distinguished proponent of the bill, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and that by this we are on the eve—say these telegrams arriving this morning—of surrendering the Government to what are branded as "labor unions." The President is to abdicate his office, the legislature is to surrender its province, all business is to be sacrificed to its confiscation, finance discredited, all honor of the Nation yielded to terror, and everything in the Republic which gives it distinction before the world surrendered to discredit and disgrace. All this in obedience to the command of those who are to impose anarchy on the one hand, bolshevism all around, and destruction universal to American citizenship.

In the Holy Scriptures somewhere, through the mouth of one of the prophets, the observation is made, "All men are liars." Well applicable indeed it is to those who continue to pass their condemnations, if you please, and their maledictions upon anything that issues out of a legislative chamber.

And now another illustration, sir:

It is said that there is a legislative measure, called "an agricultural bill", by which we are to repose in the Secretary of one of the departments the power to sit in judgment as to when law of action is violated and the offender deprived of privilege to continue his offenses. It is cried out that such provision is tyranny, violation of liberty, where the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sit in judgment to decide who are the offenders against certain regulations and to suggest a form of punishment which can take from those who are now enjoying the privilege the continuous right to violate the law, cheat the farmer in the country, and rob the citizen of the city.

It is heralded that this provision of authority is unprecedented, is an unparalleled power put in the hands of this officer of Government—that this new endowment is a dishonor to the Nation, a discredit to the citizen, and a destruction of liberty. Ah, these "gents" who have been making these observations! I use the word "gents" because it fits the character of those individuals who scream their "indignation." They deserve just such characterization, those who fittingly, if there is anything gentle in them at all, never rise any higher than "gents." The word "gent" oftentimes

means the same as the Latin "gentium", the lowest order of protoplasmic propagated humanity. [Laughter.]

Now, may it please you, sir, and my eminent colleagues on the other side, I say that this provision now carried into the new agricultural bill is taken out of an agricultural law 35 years old, copied, if you please, without the change of a comma or the crossing of a "t", all in order that the new provision should be wholly within the language of the law of similar wording heretofore passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States, held by the Court legal and constitutional. The provision is copied literally from the law which my colleagues will remember as the Oleomargarine Act. By that a highly ranked Republican Congress reposed in the Secretary of the Interior the right to investigate the offender, and, as to the offense, denounce it to the country, and put a form of penalty on the social criminals, depriving them of the right to do business in violation of the law. That, with one or two other agricultural acts of a similar nature, passed on by the eminent brains of the best legislators of both bodies and having the signature of the President of the United States, is in one respect reincorporated. That is the act about which certain of my honorable constituents, of a very high order of intelligence and gentility, send me a wire with that usual ordinance many of my colleagues have received, "Vote against such a bill."

"Why?" There is no reason given.

"For what reason?" None is stated.

"What is wrong about it?" "Do not know."

To be followed up. Why? Because it contains, we are informed, provision for this power in the hands of an official heretofore never so intrusted in a free government.

Who do you think induced this honorable body of citizens to send such a message filled with absurdity and slander? Some one who imposed on them and who knew he was lying, knowing that body of commercial men had not had a chance ever to read the bill, who probably never had seen a line of it, but who could be induced to join in an act of dishonor against the Government because it was at a timely hour to lie against the administration and continue to misrepresent the President, dishonor the legislative body, fill the Nation with despair, strike down every hope of recovery, and in this, dishonor their Nation to the world, all this to the gratification of these malefactors if they could only discredit the administration in the minds of the public of America.

Mr. President, the hour fortunately has come when the President of the United States, in his high station, has found it agreeable, as I remark again, to use the commanding word to characterize these, whoever they are and wherever they are, of whatever party name or designation, who continue to misrepresent their Republic, who continue to misrepresent the United States Congress and pursue the privilege to slander those of the legislators trying to perform their patriotic duty. These the President designates as common liars. To the President our congratulations. The Senate says to him, may his tribe increase and his performance often be multiplied.

I thank my able friend the Senator from New York for yielding a moment to me, as I also thank the Senate.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1958) to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

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

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the national labor relations bill does not break with our traditions. It is the next step in the logical unfolding of man's eternal quest for freedom. For 25 centuries of recorded time before the machine age we sought relief from nature's cruel and relentless tyranny. Only 150 years ago did this country cast off the shackles of political despotism. And today, with economic problems occupying the center of the stage, we strive to liberate the common man from destitution, from insecurity, and from human exploitation.

In this modern aspect of a time-worn problem the isolated worker is a plaything of fate. Caught in the labyrinth of modern industrialism and dwarfed by the size of corporate enterprise, he can attain freedom and dignity only by cooperation with others of his group. This truism has been paid at least the lip service of universal opinion. It is on the page of every treatise and in the platform of every political party.

LEGAL BACKGROUND: THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND THE LABOR INJUNCTION

In fact, this simple idea has become so embedded in our habits of thought that we find it difficult to realize that only a little over a century ago our law denied workers the right to combine for the purpose of raising wages. In the Philadelphia Cordwainer's case, decided in 1806 (Common and Gilmore, Doc. Hist., vol. 3, pp. 59–249), it was said of such a combination:

> This measure is pregnant with public mischief and private injury * * * tends to demoralize the workmen * * * destroy the trade of the city, and leaves the pockets of the whole community to the discretion of the concerned. If these evils were unprovided for by the law now existing, it would be necessary that laws should be made to restrain them.

Fortunately, it was not long before the law became more sensitive to life. The cornerstone of industrial liberty was laid in Massachusetts in 1842 by the great Chief Justice Shaw. In *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* (4 Metcalf 111) he said:

> We think, therefore, that associations may be entered into * * * and yet so far from being criminal or unlawful, the object may be highly meritorious and public spirited.

The classic modern statement was written by Chief Justice Taft in *American Steel Foundry* v. *The Tri-City Central Trades Council* (257 U. S. 184 (1921)). In that opinion trade unions received the following encomium:

> They were organized out of the necessities of the situation. A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily upon his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was, nevertheless, unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment. Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on equality with their employers.

As the increasing mechanization of industry and the flowering of the factory system built up larger and larger aggregates of capital, it became obvious that our cherished equality of opportunity could not be maintained merely by pious declarations or abstract guaranties of freedom. By the second half of the nineteenth century, the active intervention of the Government was necessary to prevent economic concentration from fostering economic despotism. In consequence, the year 1890 witnessed the enactment of the Sherman antitrust laws, designed to protect the laborer, the small business man, and the consumer from the power of combination and the greed of monopoly.

It is not my intent to debate at this time why the antitrust laws withered under sustained assault in the courts. Whether it was due to the formidable battery of lawyers that the powerful could gather, or to the subconscious prejudices that judges carried over from their former associations, or to the fact that the laws themselves were not in harmony with the technique of modern industry are matters of relatively little moment today. The important fact is that the laws failed.

In the very first prosecution which came before the Supreme Court, *United States* v. *E. C. Knight & Co.* (156 U. S. 1 (1894)), it was held that a combination embracing 98 percent of the sugar-refinery capacity of the country was not in restraint of trade because manufacturing was not commerce. This decision, based upon Webster's dictionary rather than upon economic reality, practically inhibited further action by the Government for a decade and created the impression that combines of industrial concerns were virtually impregnable.

Hope for the vindication of the law rose in 1911, when the Court ordered the dissolution of the Standard Oil Co., *Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 1).

But the rule of reason enunciated in that famous case soon became a vehicle for substituting the economic opinions of the Court for the expressed policy of Congress. The copious expansiveness of the rule was portended in *United States* v. *United States Steel Corporation* (251 U. S. 417 (1920)). In writing the opinion of the Court which sanctioned that combine, Mr. Justice McKenna said:

> The power attained was much greater than that possessed by any one competitor. It was not greater than that possessed by all of them.

Thus it was held in effect that a monster combination which controlled from 40 to 50 percent of the steel industry was not in violation of the public interest, since its holdings did not exceed those of all of its competitors. It was overlooked that a scattered field of small rivals might be completely overridden by a single adversary representing even 40 percent of the total national strength.

The Steel case was followed closely by *United Shoe Machinery Corporation* v. *United States* (258 U. S. 451 (1922)), which upheld restrictive tying clauses enabling one corporation to control more than 95 percent of the shoe-machinery business of the country. But the final quietus to the antitrust laws was given in *United States* v. *International Harvester Co.* (74 U. S. 693 (1926)). Here the Court elaborated its fine distinction between good and bad trusts, and said:

> The law, however, does not make the mere size of a corporation, however impressive, or the existence of unexerted power on its part, an offense, when unaccompanied by unlawful conduct in the exercise of its power.

Thus the heavy hand of the courts paralyzed the enforcement of the antitrust laws. During the 40 years after their enactment an average of one person per year was imprisoned for violating their criminal sections, while only about $2,000,000 in fines were collected. Under the provisions for confiscation of goods shipped in interstate commerce by concerns violating the law, only 40 cartons of cigarettes were seized, and these were returned. Walton H. Hamilton, a distinguished economist and lawyer, who has made extensive studies on this subject, testified before the Senate Committee on Finance last month:

> In terms of its formal administration the number of cases is pitiful, the amount of fines assessed is pitiful, the number of people sent to jail for violation of this law is almost negligible as against the great course of the concentration of wealth which has occurred in this country in the last generation and a half.

When the final history of our times comes to be written, its most glaring paradox will be the manner in which the antitrust laws were swerved from the course marked out by Congress and were invoked to harass the activities of those very groups they had been designed to protect. It is interesting to note that another famous Federal statute, also enacted for the protection of the weak, was used even sooner in a manner foreshadowing future events. In the case of *Toledo A. A. & N. M. Railway Co.* v. *Pennsylvania Co.* (54 Fed. 730 (1893)), Judge Taft, later to become Chief Justice of the United States, held that under the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers could be enjoined from ordering employees to refuse to handle freight cars during the course of a strike. But the further extension of that act to the labor field was checked by the advent of the Sherman law.

Beginning in 1893, the lower Federal courts applied the antitrust laws regularly to the activities of labor organizations. This procedure was first sustained by the Supreme Court in the case of *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* (208 U. S. 274 (1908)), where it was said that Congress "made the interdictions include combinations of labor as well as of capital." This Danbury Hatters case, it is true, involved activities which were clearly interstate in their ramifications and powerful in their effects. But in short order notice was served of the meticulous exactitude with which the actions of employees were to be surveyed. Thus in *Gompers* v. *Buck Stove & Range* (221 U. S. 418 (1911)), the Supreme Court said that the antitrust laws prohibited restraints whether occasioned "by blacklist, boycott, coercion, threat, intimidation, and whether these be made effective, in whole or in part, by act, words, or printed matter." Meanwhile the lower courts maintained their vigilance. Although peaceful picketing had come to be recognized as a legitimate and necessary incident to collective bargaining, the case of *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.* v. *Gee* (139 Fed. 582 (1905)) held that "there is and can be no such thing as peaceful picketing, any more than there can be chaste vulgarity or peaceful mobbing or lawful lynching." Certainly the rule of reason did not smile upon the aspirations of working people.

Vexed by the double frustration of its intent, an awakened Congress in 1914 passed the Clayton Act, declaring that labor organizations should be allowed to pursue their lawful and legitimate objectives, and that no injunction should be issued in a dispute between an employer and employees except when necessary to prevent irreparable injury.

But captious verbalisms by the Court soon rendered the Clayton Act as ineffectual as its predecessors. In *Duplex Printing Press* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443 (1921)), upholding an injunction against a secondary boycott by employees, Mr. Justice Pitney argued that Congress, in excluding from the provisions of the antitrust laws all lawful activities of labor organizations, had intended to exclude only those acts which had theretofore been lawful under the antitrust laws. This highly elliptical reasoning was reiterated in *American Steel Foundry* v. *The Tri-City Central Trades Council*, supra, declaring that the Clayton Act "introduced no new principle into the equity jurisprudence of those courts. It is merely declaratory of what was the best practice always."

Ironically enough, it was cases after the passage of the Clayton Act that marked the high-water mark of judicial hostility to labor organizations. In the Tri-City case an employee organization was denied the right to place more than one peaceful picket near the entrance to a building, and the Court added that "the name picket indicated a militant purpose, inconsistent with peaceful persuasion." In *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stone Cutters Association* (275 U. S. 37 (1927)) the issue was whether a small group of craftsmen might refuse to work upon stone shipped into the State from quarries in another State where nonunion labor was employed. A secondary boycott had already been declared legal by high courts in New York and California. *Bossert* v. *Dhuy* (221 N. Y. 342 (1917)) and *Pierce* v. *Stablemen's Union* (156 Calif. 70 (1909)). But the Supreme Court found a violation of the antitrust laws and sustained an injunction. The voice of Mr. Justice Brandeis was heard in protest:

> The Sherman law was held, in *United States* v. *The United States Steel Corporation*, to permit capitalists to combine in a single corporation 50 percent of the steel industry of the United States, dominating the trade through its vast resources. The Sherman law was held, in *United States* v. *The United Shoe Machinery Co.*, to permit competitors to combine in another corporation practically the whole shoe-machinery industry of the country, necessarily giving a position of dominance over shoe manufacturing in America. It would, indeed, be strange if Congress had by the same action willed to deny to members of a small class of workmen the right to cooperate in simply refraining from work, when that course was the only means of self-protection against a combination of militant and powerful employers.

While the courts were thus turning the heavy batteries of the antitrust laws against the activities of employees, they were spiking the statutes that Congress and the States framed expressly to protect these groups. In *Truax* v. *Corrigan* (257 U. S. 312 (1912)), an Arizona statute forbidding the issuance of a labor injunction except to prevent irreparable injury was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Brandeis, accompanied by Justices Holmes and Pitney, dissented in the following language:

> It was urged that the real motive in seeking the injunction was not ordinarily to prevent property from being injured nor to protect the owner in its use, but to endow property with active, militant power which would make it dominant over men. In other words, that under the guise of protecting property rights, the employer was seeking sovereign power.

In *Adair* v. *United States* (208 U. S. 161 (1907)), over the dissents of Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice McKenna, a statute seeking to outlaw the "yellow dog" contract was declared unconstitutional. Seven years later, when the State of Kansas tried to achieve the same result, it was thwarted by *Coppage* v. *Kansas* (236 U. S. 1 (1914)). It was in the

latter case that Mr. Justice Holmes supported Justice Day and the then Associate Justice Hughes in saying:

> In present conditions a workman not unnaturally may believe that only by belonging to a union can he secure a contract that shall be fair to him. * * * If that belief, whether right or wrong, may be held by a reasonable man, it seems to me that it may be enforced by law in order to establish the equality of position between the parties in which liberty of contract begins.

ECONOMIC BACKGROUND: INDUSTRIAL CONCENTRATION AND THE DEPRESSION

These cases which I have cited are not mere records of mock trials in moot courts. They are the external evidence of sweeping political and economic developments completely out of line with our professed desires to make opportunity equally available to all.

The fragile resistance of the antitrust laws did nothing to prevent the compounding of business into larger and larger units. In 1909 there was one small enterprise or manufacturing establishment for every 250 people in the Nation; by 1929 there was only one for every 900 people. In 1904, over 50 percent of the manufacturers in the United States were small enterprisers, each producing less than $20,000 worth of goods per year. By 1929, these small enterprisers had shrunk in number to 32 percent of the total. During the same span of time, producers of goods valued at $100,000 or more per year rose from 16.9 percent of the total to 31.5 percent. And while only one-quarter of the workers in America were employed by million-dollar-a-year concerns in 1904, about three-fifths of the workers were employed by such concerns in 1929.

These technological changes doubled the productive capacity of the average worker between 1919 and 1933. In manufacturing alone, they increased his hourly product by 71 percent. They opened up new vistas of comfort and security to the average man. But despite reassuring discourse about profit sharing and employee participation in industry, the increasing size of business brought concentration of wealth in geometric ratio. By 1929, 200 huge corporations owned one-half of our total corporate wealth. Two years later, 100 general industrial corporations out of a total of 300,000 controlled one-third of the general industrial wealth of the Nation. As a natural corollary, the wage earners' share in the product created by manufacturing has declined steadily for nearly a century. Standing at 51 percent in 1849, it fell to 42 percent in 1919 and to 36 percent in 1933. The isolation of the individual worker has been reflected glaringly in the distribution of the Nation's goods.

The tremendous disparity between the few and the many became most pronounced in that glittering era which we regarded as the zenith of American prosperity. Between 1922 and 1929 the real wages of employees increased by slightly less than 10 percent. But during the same period industrial profits rose by 86 percent, while in the shorter span from 1926 to 1929 dividend payments mounted by 104 percent.

If we had succeeded in providing the minimum requirements of health and decency for every deserving person in the United States, we might have said that the maldistribution of income was a fair price to pay for our industrial efficiency. But we know that we suffered from the prevalence of poverty in a land of plenty. In 1929, 6,000,000 families, or more than 21 percent of our total population, had incomes of less than $1,000 per year. About 12,000,000 families, or more than 42 percent of the total, earned less than $1,500 yearly. Sixteen million families, or 60 percent of the people, had annual incomes below the $2,000 per year necessary for the basic requirements of health and decency. And nearly 20,000,000 families, constituting 71 percent of all America, received less than $2,500 a year. At the same time, in the highest income bracket, one-tenth of 1 percent of the families in the United States were earning as much as the 42 percent at the bottom. It is not surprising that in *America's Capacity to Consume*, the most complete study of family income ever presented to the general reader in this country, the statement is made without equivocation that during the past decade "inequality in the distribution of income has been accentuated."

Not only the preachments of moralists but also the teachings of economists have proved that this injustice wrought its hardships upon those who were temporarily favored as well as those who had been permanently neglected. The low level of income prevented the vast majority of consumers from draining the market of its flood of goods. This was particularly serious in an age of mass production, which had built 21,000,000 automobiles and over 20,000,000 radio sets. At the same time, the extraordinary concentration of income placed excessive savings in the hands of a few. While 60 percent of the families in America contributed only 1.6 percent to the total savings of the country, 2.3 percent of all families contributed 66⅔ percent to all savings, and 60,000 families at the top of the economic ladder saved almost as much as 25,000,000 families on the lower rungs. Corporate surpluses rose from $8,500,000,000 in 1923 to $16,000,000,000 in 1929. These accumulations of the few sought outlet through investments in plant facilities. Contrasted with the 10-percent rise in wages between 1922 and 1929, the production of machinery increased 91 percent and of capital equipment 70 percent. Production mounted beyond any possibilities of market absorption.

For a short while we staved off inevitable disaster by the pipe dream of installment selling and by lending Europe money with which to buy our own products. But when the domestic market finally closed to further investment, and foreign trade collapsed because our own people had no money with which to buy European goods, the crash came.

This thesis, which places the failure of purchasing power at the center of all explanations of depression, has long received recognition. It has been further substantiated this year in a stimulating book entitled *The Formation of Capital*, by Dr. H. G. Moulton. This volume states:

> The base of the economic pyramid is the production of consumption goods. The demand for plant and equipment is derived from the demand for consumption goods * * * A slight shrinkage at the base of the pyramid very nearly eliminates the top * * * The primary need is a larger flow of funds through consumptive channels.

During 4 long years after the depression came we clung to the same policies which had brought the calamity and which were prolonging its ravages. While the level of wages dropped 60 percent between 1929 and 1932, property income fell only 29 percent. The remarkable report of the Research and Planning Division of the National Recovery Administration shows that while wages stood at 44 percent of the 1926 level in 1932, and the national income at only 62 percent of that level, dividend payments remained as high as 142 percent of that level. And day by day the downward spiral gained in momentum.

POLICY OF THE RECOVERY PROGRAM AND SECTION 7(A) OF THE N. I. R. A.

It was only when over 15,000,000 people were unemployed, when banks were closed, when business was uprooted, and when our whole economic system hung perilously on the precipice, that we embarked upon a new program. This new program was projected in terms of recovery and reform. It was designated not merely to set the forces of revival in motion, but, above all, to eradicate permanently the evils that had done so much harm in the past.

The first hypothesis was that the interpenetration of all industries throughout the country, the nonconformity of economic organization to State lines, and the deep-seated and wide-spread character of the national calamity, made Nationwide action essential. For the purpose of rationalizing production, outlawing cutthroat competition, and bringing order into the distribution of goods, not only were the antitrust laws in part suspended but the Government itself embarked upon the diametrically opposed policy of stimulating coast-to-coast cooperation among business men. It was thought that in this manner a permanent equilibrium of the various factors in industry might be maintained.

In addition, there was a second phase of the program which struck at the very core of the depression. Congress determined to fix wages and hours at a level that might, by reemployment and higher pay, spread adequate purchasing power among the masses of consumers and thus prime the

pump of business. Equally in the foreground was the intent to insure a decent measure of security and comfort to those who worked, while protecting the fair-minded employer from the cutthroat tactics of the exploiting few.

But the Government never for a moment proposed to set up a benevolent despotism, or to extend its arm into every nook and cranny of private business. It did not contemplate regulation of every scale of wages or supervision of every schedule of hours. Acting in an emergency, it desired only to create a solid foundation upon which might be built the mutual efforts of a revived industry and a rehabilitated labor. And if industry and labor were to act in unison, it was clear that they would need equal opportunities for intelligent and effective action. Just as industry was organized, so labor was to be allowed to organize. It was for this purpose that section 7 (a) was written into the National Industrial Recovery Act and reinforced last June by Public Resolution No. 44, providing for the election of representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining.

I think it may be safely said that whatever controversy now rages as to the wisdom of many phases of the recovery program, and of the National Industrial Recovery Act in particular, there is practically unanimous agreement in Congress that section 7 (a) was sound in inception, and that the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing should be safeguarded at all times. If Congress recognized that right for decades, Congress must shoulder the responsibility to protect it now that employers are more united than ever before in trade associations blanketing the entire country. The developments of the past two years have not given employees any guaranties to which they were not entitled. But the events of the past two years have intensified the social necessity of protecting these guaranties against repudiation.

THE BREAK-DOWN OF SECTION 7 (A) AND ITS ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

Nor is there any disagreement about the fact that section 7 (a) has collapsed. General Johnson, the first Administrator of the National Industrial Recovery Act, in testifying last month before the Finance Committee of the Senate, said:

> I think section 7 (a) has substantially failed of its original purpose.

Mr. Francis Biddle, the brilliant Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, on the same occasion referred to "the emptiness of a law which we know cannot be enforced." A very recent and exceedingly comprehensive study of the National Recovery Administration by the Brookings Institution says:

> Section 7 of the Recovery Act is uncertain in purpose, vague in contents, and ambiguous in language.

This break-down of section 7 (a) has driven a dagger close to the heart of the recovery program. It was intended that the codes should be formulated with the "united action of labor and management." But with labor denied the opportunity to organize and bargain collectively, practically all of the codes have been conceived and drafted and presented for governmental approval by employers alone. This means that in the original formulation of the labor provisions no less than the trade practices, industry wrote the ticket. Labor came into the picture, not as the genuine party in interest that it should have been, but merely through the indirect representation of the Labor Advisory Board, an organ with no actual authority and with no bargaining power comparable to that of the trade associations.

The results of this defect are well illustrated by the difference between the normal run of codes and the few special codes formed by a process of collective bargaining. The normal codes usually provide a 40-hour week, while the special codes descend frequently to a 36- or 35-hour week. The special codes, such as in the coal, needle, and building trades, provide fairly scientific minimum-wage levels for the various skills, while the normal codes are generally filled with vague and uncertain exemptions and exceptions which make enforcement difficult and remove much of the legal force from the minimum-wage rates.

One specific example is particularly telling. The tobacco industry is one of the most profitable in the country; but since it has allowed collective bargaining no place, the increase in the average weekly wage between 1933 and 1934 was only 75 cents. But in the women's clothing industry, where section 7 (a) has been an actuality, the advance in pay was $3. The average weekly earnings during the last year in the cigarette trade were $11.84; in the women's clothing trade $18.82.

The cumulative effects of these shortcomings are reflected in economic tendencies at the present time. Unemployment is as great as it was a year ago. Average weekly hours of work, which stood at 37¼ when the codes were established in the fall of 1933, stand at 37½ today. The real income of the individual worker employed full time is less than in March 1933. The average worker's income in 1934 was $1,099, or $813 less than the amount required to maintain a family of five in health and decency. The realignment of profits and wages, which we contemplated so confidently in the spring of 1933, has not taken place.

In December 1934, pay rolls registered only 60 percent of the 1926 level, while dividend and interest payments were fixed at 150 percent of that level. Total wages have risen only 28 percent in the past 2 years, while 840 large companies have increased their profits from $471,000,000 in 1933 to $673,000,000 in 1934, a gain of 42 percent. Net profits of 1,435 manufacturing and trading companies increased from $640,000,000 in 1933 to $1,071,000,000 in 1934, or 64 percent, while their annual rate of return rose from 2.7 percent to 4.5 percent.

Furthermore, the history of the past 2 years makes it clear that failure to maintain a sane balance between wages and industrial returns will be attended by the same fatal consequences as in the past. The rise of business activity to 89 percent of normal in the precode booms of April and July 1933 collapsed after July because no adequate purchasing power had been built up to sustain it. The rise to 80 percent of normal in April and May 1934 rested on a surer foundation because of the increase in purchasing power provided through reemployment in the fall of 1933 and through public spending.

If the more recent quickening of business activity is not supported by rises in wages, either we shall have to sustain the market indefinitely by huge and continuous public spending or we shall meet the certainty of another collapse. With the evil and the remedy in such clear relief, Congress cannot hesitate to atone the error of allowing section 7 (a) to languish.

WEAKNESSES IN THE PRESENT LAW REGARDING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

A study of the weaknesses in the existing law brings the conviction that the remedy is neither obscure nor unattainable. The patent ambiguity and excessive generality of section 7 (a) has led to a proliferation of interpretations and counterinterpretations. Consequently both employers and employees have been denied their basic right to a clear and certain law.

Turning at once from substance to procedure, the greatest difficulty with section 7 (a) has been that the present National Labor Relations Board, the cardinal agency for interpreting it, has not been vested with enforcement powers. The Board, after hearing cases, may refer them with recommendations to the National Recovery Administration. As was demonstrated in the recent Colt case, it is that administration rather than the Board which exercises final discretion in determining whether the Blue Eagle shall be removed or whether Government contracts shall be canceled.

Of course, the National Recovery Administration has adequate enforcement powers. But everyone knows that the whole tendency of that organization has been toward conciliation and compromise with industry in order that codes of fair competition may be administered smoothly and continuously. This approach may be laudable in dealing with standards of fair competition that have been written and proposed by industry itself. But it is totally unsuited to the enforcement of section 7 (a), which is a mandate of Con-

gress, which becomes a crucial issue in those very cases where it is most flagrantly challenged, and which, like all analogous laws of Congress, must be vindicated by a judicial process. The confusion of the voluntarily submitted fair-practice provisions with section 7 (a) has put the Recovery Administration in the untenable position of conciliator and prosecutor at once. Not only has section 7 (a) been lost in the shuffle but the Recovery Administration itself has suffered from the misplaced burden. And this difficulty has been aggravated because, under present conditions, section 7 (a) is applicable only where there is a code of fair competion, which constantly puts recalcitrants in the position where they can threaten to surrender their codes in case section 7 (a) is enforced against them.

As an alternative, the present National Labor Relations Board may refer its recommendations to the Department of Justice for enforcement. But since the Board has no power of subpena or investigation except in connection with elections, the records which it builds up are based in most cases upon the testimony of complainants alone, supplemented at best by the testimony of such witnesses as the defendant voluntarily presents. This makes it necessary for the Department of Justice in any event to make further investigations before bringing suit; and if the Department brings suit at all, it must commence entirely *de novo* in the courts, with the defendant having 30 days to answer, or moving to dismiss, or applying for a bill of particulars. Thus is defeated the very purpose of an administrative agency, which is to provide specialized treatment of the factual aspects of a specialized controversy.

Weak as it is, the present National Labor Relations Board has been subjected, in addition, to the corroding influence of various industrial boards, dealing according to their own lights with the same subject matter. At present from 13 to 15 boards have been established to handle 7 (a) cases, and over none of these has the national board jurisdiction, either as to fact or as to law. Since there are now over 100 codes which provide for the establishment of industrial boards, there exists the constant threat that dispersion of authority will transcend all reasonable bounds.

Quite aside from all question of scattered responsibility, these industrial boards are essentially unsuited to the handling of 7 (a) cases. Partisan in composition, living in an atmosphere of compromise and conciliation, they are well designed to adjust wage and hour controversies in accordance with the varying standards of different localities. The success of labor before an industrial board depends upon the strength of labor in that particular area. But section 7 (a) was written by Congress to protect the weak who could not protect themselves, and it was intended for universal application, not universal modification. The major effect of leaving its enforcement to a variety of industrial boards is to give the least protection to those who need it most.

Last June, in order to remedy the recognized weaknesses in section 7 (a), Congress passed Public Resolution No. 44. The main purpose of that resolution was to facilitate the holding of elections by the National Labor Relations Board; but a fatal loophole has rendered its effect nugatory. In providing that election orders of the Board might be reviewed in the courts prior to the holding of the election itself, the law afforded employers a shield to ward off action indefinitely. The most revealing commentary upon the joint resolution is contained in a letter disclosed by the Senate committee investigating munitions. Written last June by a vice president of one of America's largest corporations, it says:

> My guess is that Congress will today pass the joint resolution proposed as an alternative to the Wagner bill, and that will end, for the time being, at least, many of our troubles in that respect. Personally, I view the passage of the joint resolution with equanimity. It means that temporary measures, which cannot last more than a year, will be substituted for the permanent legislation proposed in the original Wagner bill. I do not believe that there will again be as good a chance for the passage of the Wagner Act as exists now, and the trade is a mighty good compromise.
>
> I have read carefully the joint resolution, and my personal opinion is that it is not going to bother us very much. For one thing, it would be necessary, if the newly created boards are to order and supervise elections in our plants, that they first set aside as invalid the elections just completed.
>
> I do not think this can be done. If, in 1935, our elections should occur in the second half of June rather than in the first half, the board would automatically be legislated out of existence before that date.
>
> If they try to horn in on us in any situation in the meantime, I think we have our fences pretty securely set up. Therefore, and for other reasons, I am in favor of compromising by not opposing passage of the joint resolution. This, of course, is my own personal opinion. I have not yet had a chance to clear it with our people here.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BILL—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

The present bill cures the defects in existing law. It clarifies and amplifies the provisions of section 7 (a), and it centralizes in a single permanent National Labor Relations Board the duty to protect the collective-bargaining rights of employees. The Board will, of course, have regional agencies throughout the country to handle violations initially at their source, and will be empowered to designate any existing industrial board for such purposes. In all cases, however, the findings and recommendations of these agencies will be transferred to the National Labor Relations Board for final action. After these appropriate hearings the Board will be empowered to issue orders forbidding violations of the law and making restitution to those who have been injured thereby. All such orders will be fully reviewable at the instance of any aggrieved party in the Federal courts.

The procedure set forth in this bill is so closely modeled upon other statutes, such as the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Interstate Commerce Act, that one is astounded to hear the charges circulated to the effect that this measure would sweep aside the courts and endow a new and queer kind of agency with dictatorial or arbitrary powers.

The power of the Board to hold elections is considerably clarified. An election is merely a preliminary determination of fact. There is no more reason why it should be subject to anterior court review than why a hearing should be deferred pending judicial action; but if any election is made the basis for an order of the Board related to an unfair labor practice, the whole procedure embracing the election will be fully reviewable in the appropriate Federal court.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

Let us turn now to the substantive provisions of the bill dealing with unfair labor practices. I wish to emphasize at the outset how limited these provisions are in their scope, how simple they are in their language, and how thoroughly they are grounded in long-established congressional policy.

The first unfair-labor-practice provision, in substance, forbids an employer to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

This language follows practically verbatim the familiar principles already embedded in our law by section 2 of the Railway Labor Act of 1926, section 2 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, section 77 (p) and (q) of 1932 amendments to the Bankruptcy Act, section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and section 7 (e) of the act creating the office of the Federal Coordinator of Transportation.

Experience over a considerable period of time, however, has made it clear that these general declarations of freedom have little effect unless they are accomplished by a specific catalog of forbidden practices. Therefore, the succeeding four unfair-labor-practice provisions, without narrowing in any way the widest possible application of the first, enunciate with particularity the concrete acts which have been the most fertile source of trouble in the past.

THE PROBLEM OF THE COMPANY UNION

The second unfair-labor-practice provision deals with the so-called "company-union problem." It makes it unlawful for an employer to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization, or contribute financial or other support to it.

The intent here is to bring about in industry generally the same conditions which Congress decreed for the railways and businesses under trusteeship by the 1933 amendments to the Bankruptcy Act, the act creating the office of the Federal Coordinator of Transportation, and the 1934 amendments to the Railway Labor Act.

Anyone familiar with these laws will recognize at once that there is nothing in the pending bill which promotes a union monopoly, which places the stamp of governmental favor upon any particular type of union, or which outlaws the so-called "company union", if by that term is meant simply an entirely free and independent organization of workers who through their own volition confine their cooperative activities to the limits of one company. Nor is there anything in the bill which interferes with the benefits of pension or recreation plans when such benefits are extended equally to all employees, without discrimination tending to encourage or discourage union membership. The bill intends merely that those agencies designed to represent the workers for purposes of collective bargaining shall be free from the domination or even the interference of the other party.

The primary evil of the organization which is dominated or interfered with by the employer is that, sometimes because of express prohibitions, more often because of its intrinsic composition, it is not well suited to extend its cooperative activities beyond the bounds of a single employer unit. A thorough study of this subject has just been made by the Twentieth Century Fund, backed by an impressive array of scholars, employers, and professional men. It shows that even different company unions of the same employer rarely work in unity, and almost never is there even a loose and informal contact between company unions of different employers.

Limitations such as these run counter to the very core of the new-deal philosophy. Business men are being allowed to pool their information and experience in vast trade associations in order to make a concerted drive against the evil features of modern industrialism. If employees are denied similar privileges, they not only are unable to uphold their end of the labor bargain but, in addition, they cannot cope with any issues that transcend the boundaries of a single business. And under modern industrial conditions problems of wages and hours are regional or even national in scope. Order must exist everywhere if it is to exist at all.

In the second place, the employer who dominates or interferes with his workers sometimes, either by express provisions or more likely by subtle economic pressure, limits his employees' choice of representatives to those who work for him. A worker may be a complete master of his tools, but as a representative he is not an expert in industrial relations, and is likely to be entirely unable to take advantage of legitimate opportunities based upon knowledge of the labor market and general business conditions. More important, only representatives who are not subservient to the employer with whom they deal can act freely in the interest of the workers. Simple common sense tells us that a man does not possess this freedom when he bargains with those who control his source of livelihood.

The third defect of the company-dominated union is that it is supported, in whole or in part, by the employer. I cannot understand how those so well schooled in the doctrines of Americanism can sanction a practice whereby the person on one side of the bargaining table pays the attorney of those with whom he deals. Collective bargaining becomes a mockery when the spokesman of the employee is the marionette of the employer.

These few practices by no means cover the whole range of the abuses that constitute interference. The undue influence which the employer exerts over the supposedly free agent of his workers may take other forms. It may consist in employer interference with the formation of the constitution or bylaws of a labor organization. The essence of interference is that the workers' organization, instead of being absolutely free and independent as an organic entity, is subjected in some way to the employer's will.

The recent study to which I have referred affords ample evidence that the company union is the mere creature of the employer. Out of 125 company unions investigated, the plans for 53 of them were installed by executive order on the part of the employer. Only 22 of them were ratified by a representative vote of the employees. In only 10 cases out of 72 were the employees alone free to change their plan.

The severest indictment of these unions imposed from above is that they have blossomed forth since the passage of the very act which was designed to give workers full freedom of organization. According to the National Industrial Conference Board, the number of workers recruited into company unions rose from 432,000 in 1932 to 1,164,000 in 1933, representing a gain of 169 percent. More than 69 percent of the company unions now in existence have been inaugurated in the brief period since the passage of the Recovery Act.

Contrary to the argument that the company union has the virtue of insuring industrial peace, we know that this open entry of employers into the field of active organization of workers promotes strife and discord. Men versed in the tenets of freedom become restive when not allowed to be free. The sharp outbreaks of economic warfare in various parts of the country to a large extent attest the bitterness of feeling when company unionism raises its head. Most impartial students of industrial problems agree that the best records of mutual accomplishments have been made where the sham union has been driven from the scene, and where workers are free men in fact as well as in name.

PROBLEM OF THE CLOSED SHOP

While outlawing the organization that is interfered with by the employer, this bill does not establish the closed shop or even encourage it. The much-discussed closed-shop proviso merely states that nothing in any Federal law shall be held to illegalize the confirmation of voluntary closed-shop agreements between employers and workers. This insertion is necessary to prevent repetition of those mistaken interpretations which have held that Congress intended to outlaw the closed shop when it enacted section 7 (a) of the Recovery Act.

I hold no brief for or against the closed shop, but there are some who believe that it is a device which at times may be necessary to advance and preserve the living standards of employees. It is legal in many States, and there is no reason why Congress should make it illegal in those places where public policy now sustains it.

The virulent propaganda to the effect that this bill encourages the closed shop is outrageous in view of the fact that in two respects it actually narrows the now-existing law in regard to the closed-shop agreement. In the first place, while today an employer may sign a closed-shop contract even with a minority group, the bill provides that he shall be allowed to negotiate such an agreement only with an organization which represents the majority of employees in the appropriate collective bargaining unit covered by such agreement when made. Secondly, the bill is extremely careful to forestall the making of closed-shop agreements with unions that are interfered with or dominated by the company, or with any organization that has been tainted at any time in the past by practices which are now declared to be unfair. The closed-shop agreement is to be allowable only when an organization has been free from its inception.

The third unfair-labor-practice provision makes it illegal for an employer, by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization.

This provision is merely a logical and imperative extension of that section of the Norris-LaGuardia Act which makes the "yellow dog" contract unenforceable in the Federal courts. If freedom of organization is to be preserved, the employees must have more than the knowledge that the courts will not be used to confirm injustice. They need protection most in those very cases where the employer is strong enough to impress his will without the aid of the law. And it is perfectly

obvious that unfair pressure may be exercised by discrimination during employment as well as by actual discharge.

The fourth unfair-labor-practice provision, forbidding discharge or discrimination because an employee has filed charges or given testimony under this measure, is self-explanatory.

THE DUTY TO BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

The final unfair-labor-practice provision makes it illegal for an employer to refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of his employees.

Most emphatically this provision does not imply governmental supervision of wage or hour agreements. It does not compel anyone to make a compact of any kind if no terms are arrived at that are satisfactory to him. The very essence of collective bargaining is that either party shall be free to withdraw if its conditions are not met. But the right of workers to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing must be matched by the correlative duty of employers to recognize and deal in good faith with these representatives. The Government itself is held up to ridicule when the elections which it supervises are rendered illusory by failure to acknowledge their results. And needless to say, such a contradictory course generates perpetual discontent and strife.

Just what the duty to bargain collectively implies was clearly set forth by the present National Labor Relations Board in the Houde Engineering Corporation case, decided on August 30, 1934. There the Board said:

> Without this duty the right to bargain would be sterile * * *. The incontestibly sound principle is that the employer is obligated by the statutes to negotiate in good faith with his employee's representatives; to match their proposals, if unacceptable, with counter proposals; and to make every reasonable effort to reach an agreement.

The sound result which the Labor Board reached by interpretation of a vague law should be confirmed and protected by a clear definition of congressional policy.

PRINCIPLE OF MAJORITY RULE

Further to facilitate the procedure of collective bargaining, the bill embraces the principle of majority rule. It states that—

> Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes shall be the exclusive representatives of all employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment.

Collective bargaining is not an artificial procedure devoted to an unknown end. Its object is the making of agreements which will stabilize employment conditions and promote fair working standards. It is well nigh universally recognized that it is practically impossible to apply two or more sets of agreements to one unit of workers at the same time, or to apply the terms of one agreement to only a portion of the workers in a single unit. For this reason, collective bargaining means majority rule. This rule is conducive not only to agreements, but also to friendly relations. Workers find it easier to approach their employers in a spirit of good will if they are not torn by internal dissent. And employers, wherever majority rule has been given a fair chance, have discovered it more profitable to deal with a single group than to be harassed by a constant series of negotiations with rival factions.

Majority rule makes it clear that the guaranty of the right of employees to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing must not be misapplied so as to permit employers to interfere with the practical effectuation of that right by bargaining with individuals or minority groups in their own behalf after representatives have been picked by the majority to represent all.

At the same time, majority rule recognizes minority rights. It does not ever imply that any employee can be forced to join a union, except through the traditional method of a closed-shop agreement with the employer. And since, in the absence of such an agreement, the bill specifically prevents discrimination against anyone either for belonging or for not belonging to a union, the majority will be quite powerless to make an agreement more favorable to themselves than to the minority who remain without. In addition, the bill preserves the right of any individual or minority group to present grievances to its employer.

Anyone who analyzes the problems and who studies the history of industrial relations will be amazed at the current opposition to majority rule. Certainly it cannot be claimed that the rule is lacking solid precedent. It has been applied regularly by governmental agencies and recognized repeatedly by laws of Congress. It was followed by the National War Labor Board created by President Wilson in the spring of 1918. It has been applied consistently by the Railway Labor Board created by the Transportation Act of 1920. The 1934 amendments to the Railway Labor Act provided for it. Public Resolution No. 44, approved last June, in that it provided for elections, must have contemplated majority rule.

If we turn from governmental experience to private practice, what do we find? The platform adopted by the Congress of American Industry and the National Association of Manufacturers on December 5 and 6, 1934, and they are the ones who now oppose majority rule for workers, provides:

> Under appropriate safeguards, the approved competitive practices and prohibitions submitted by the properly defined majority of a group, trade, or industry shall be binding upon the minority.

The experience of the National Labor Relations Board has been that the very employers who decry majority rule today insisted upon majority rule alone when they were in control of the situation through their dominance over a company union. The animus behind the crocodile tears now being shed for the welfare of minorities was laid bare by the liberal dean of the Wisconsin Law School, Lloyd K. Garrison, a former Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. Testifying before the Committee on Education and Labor upon this bill, he said:

> It seemed to me last summer, as I sat on the Board and listened to these cases, quite evident that the opposition to this rule came down simply to this, that the employer who opposed the rule merely wanted to avoid doing any collective bargaining at all so long as he could keep his responsibility diffused. So long as he could say, "I will bargain first with this group, then I will bargain with that group, and then I will run back to the first and see what they think about the proposals", and so on ad infinitum, he would end up by reaching no collective agreement at all. And that is why the majority rule is opposed.

Mr. Garrison has placed the matter in a nutshell. He has made it clear that democracy in industry must be based upon the same principles as democracy in government. Majority rule, with all its imperfections, is the best protection of workers' rights, just as it is the surest guaranty of political liberty that mankind has yet discovered.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

It is appropriate that some reference should be made to the constitutional problems raised by this bill. There are two broad questions involved: First, does the regulation of the employer-employee relationship as herein provided violate due process of law; and, secondly, can Federal jurisdiction over this relationship be sustained under the commerce clause?

The authority of Congress to guarantee freedom of organization, to prohibit the company-dominated union, and to prevent employers from requiring membership or nonmembership in any union, has been completely upheld in *Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co.* v. *Brotherhood* (281 U. S. 548 (1930)). This was a suit by a labor union to restrain the railroad from interfering, in violation of the Railway Labor Act of 1926, with the right of its employees to self-organization and the designation of representatives. The decree of the lower court had provided that the railroad company should: first, completely disestablish its company union; second, reinstate the Brotherhood as representative until the employees by secret ballot should make a choice; third, restore to service and to stated privileges certain employees who had been discharged for activities in behalf of the Brotherhood. The Supreme Court, with Chief Justice Hughes writing for a unanimous Court sustaining the decree, said:

The legality of collective action on the part of employees in order to safeguard their proper interests is not to be disputed. It has long been recognized that employees are entitled to organize for the purpose of securing the redress of grievances and to promote agreements with employers concerning rates of pay and conditions of work. * * * Congress was not required to ignore this right of the employees, but could safeguard it and seek to make their appropriate collective action an instrument of peace rather than of strife. Such collective action would be a mockery if representation were made futile by interference with freedom of choice.

Thus the Supreme Court sustained a decree prohibiting, in substance, all except the last of the unfair labor practices listed in this bill, and it is particularly significant that this decree was based upon a law containing only the first of these practices. Brushing aside the much-criticized earlier cases which had declared the prohibition of the "yellow dog" contract unconstitutional, Chief Justice Hughes said:

The petitioners invoke the principle declared in *Adair* v. *United States* (208 U. S. 1, 61) and *Coppage* v. *Kansas* (236 U. S. 1), but these decisions are inapplicable. The Railway Labor Act of 1926 does not interfere with the normal exercise of the right of the carrier to select its employees or to discharge them. The statute is not aimed at this right of the employers but at the interference with the right of employees to have representatives of their own choosing. As the carrier subject to the act has no constitutional right to interfere with the freedom of the employees in making their selections they cannot complain of the statute on constitutional grounds.

When we realize that this prevailing and unanimous opinion rendered by the Chief Justice followed precisely the line of reasoning that he had followed when dissenting in the Coppage case, and that the two cases are really identical in principle, we can have no doubt that Coppage against Kansas and Adair against United States have been overruled.

It is true that the Texas case involved the interests of railway workers. But its decision upon the question of due process is equally applicable wherever congressional jurisdiction over interstate commerce can be established. Let us now examine the grounds for Federal jurisdiction.

A vast number of strikes have arisen in protestation against the denial of the rights guaranteed by section 7 (a) of the Recovery Act and reaffirmed by the present bill. Certainly, many similar outbreaks will be prevented if these rights are secured, for whenever given a fair trial the protection of collective bargaining has promoted industrial peace. And that strikes burden commerce cannot be denied, in view of the recognition of this fact by such landmarks of our law as *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564), *Duplex Printing Press Co.* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443), *American Steel Foundries* v. *Tri-City Central Trades Council* (257 U. S. 184), *Coronado Coal Co.* v. *United Mine Workers* (268 U. S. 295), and *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Stone Cutters Association* (274 U. S. 37). Moreover, the courts which have enunciated so broad an interpretation of commerce when the result has been to frustrate the attempts of wage earners to better their economic conditions by collective action, will be constrained to take an equally broad view in order to diminish strikes by preventing the unfair labor practices which incite them.

Those cases under the antitrust laws which have been cited for the proposition that the Federal Government cannot deal with the employer-employee relationship are not applicable. For where the courts have refused to enjoin strikes under the antitrust laws, it has not been for lack of constitutional power but because the burden upon commerce was not deemed such as the antitrust laws intended to prohibit. Statutory construction of these laws fixed the boundaries of equity jurisdiction. But the Federal Government has the power under the Constitution to prevent any burden whatsoever upon interstate commerce. And there can be no doubt that Congress intends this power to be exercised in full to prevent unfair practices that cause or threaten to cause even the slightest burden.

It is clear that these practices may be enjoined even before the strike occurs. As Chief Justice Taft said in the first *Coronado case* (259 U. S. 344 (1922)):

If Congress deems certain recurring practices, although not really part of interstate commerce, likely to obstruct, restrain, or burden it, it has the power to subject them to national supervision or restraint.

I want to emphasize ever more strongly the constitutional power and the intent of Congress to prevent these unfair labor practices even where they do not lead or threaten to lead to strikes. As economic conditions have changed, courts on the whole have shown an increasing willingness to recognize that unsound business practices are a direct burden upon the regularity and volume of commerce. One example is the line of cases dealing with unfair competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act. The principle is well stated in another connection in *Chicago Board of Trade* v. *Olsen* (262 U. S. 1 (1922)), upholding Federal regulation of future sales on grain exchanges, an activity in itself purely local. The Court said:

The question of price dominates trade between the States. Sales of an article which affect the country-wide price of the article directly affect the country-wide commerce in it. For this reason Congress has the power to provide the appropriate means adopted in this act by which this abuse may be restrained and avoided.

In effect upon commerce, wages are indistinguishable from prices. In fact, each is significant only in terms of the other. When wages sink to low levels, the decline in purchasing power is felt upon the marts of trade. And since collective bargaining is the most powerful single force in maintaining and advancing wage rates, its repudiation is likely to intensify the maldistribution of buying power, thus reducing standards of living, unbalancing the economic structure, and inducing depression with its devastating effect upon the flow of commerce.

In the more recent case of *Appalachian Coals, Inc.*, v. *United States* (288 U. S. 344 (1933)), Chief Justice Hughes said:

The interests of producers and consumers are interlinked. When industry is grievously hurt, when producing concerns fail, when unemployment mounts, and communities dependent upon profitable production are prostrated, the wells of commerce go dry.

This statement will long be a beacon light to guide those who are seeking to make our law consonant to the needs of our social and economic life. While the pending bill of course does not intend to go beyond the constitutional power of Congress, as that power may be marked out by the courts, it seeks the full limit of that power to prevent these unfair labor practices. It seeks to prevent them whether they affect interstate commerce by causing strikes, or by destroying the equality of bargaining power upon which the flow of commerce depends, or by occurring in interstate commerce.

The recent decision in the Weirton case is based upon Judge Nields' finding that the activities of the Weirton company did not interfere with the freedom of employees to organize, as guaranteed by section 7 (a) of the Recovery Act. It seems clear that this decision is far out of line with that of the United States Supreme Court in the Texas case (supra), which held that activities similar to those at Weirton were illegal under the Railway Labor Act of 1926, an act no more specific in its terms than section 7 (a). Not a single lawyer with whom I have talked has been able to explain Judge Nields' failure not only to distinguish, but even to refer to the Texas case. And even if it were to be conceded that Judge Nields correctly interpreted section 7 (a), his decision merely emphasized the need for strengthening that section and creating a permanent administrative tribunal, versed in the complexities of labor relations, to deal with such matters.

Since Judge Nields found that section 7(a) did not outlaw the activities complained of at Weirton, his discussion of the constitutionality of that section was pure dictum. I cannot believe that this decision of a single district judge as to the extent of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce will weigh very heavily with this Senate, particularly since his limited conception of interstate commerce, while in line with many early decisions of the United States Supreme Court, is clearly at odds with later decisions which

I have discussed and which are more responsive to the changing character of our national economic life.

It is even clearer that the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Railway Pension case has absolutely no applicability to this bill. That case held, rightly or wrongly, that the retirement of superannuated workers had no recognizable relationship to the efficiency of interstate transportation. The opinion of Mr. Justice Roberts expressly distinguished the situation covered by the Texas case, supra, where a statute was designed to promote interstate commerce by preserving industrial peace.

PROMOTION OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

This bill is designed to promote industrial peace. The bitterness and the heavy cost of economic conflicts between employers and workers in this country constitute a long and tragic story. Between 1915 and 1931 there were 4,856 strikes, involving the surrender of 2,795,000 jobs and the loss of 72,957,000 working days. At least $1,000,000,000 per year have been wasted because of these controversies.

This toll of private warfare cannot be measured by statistics alone, for it places the taint of hatred and the stain of bloodshed across the pathway to amicable and profitable business dealings. Nor can we be satisfied to allow these troubles to proceed unchecked to their bitter conclusion. A do-nothing procedure leaves the temporary victor as exhausted as the temporarily vanquished, and sows the seeds for recurrent strife when the competitors have rallied from their efforts.

One method of approach to the problem of industrial peace would be for the Government to invoke compulsory arbitration, or to dictate the terms of settlement whenever a controversy arises. Where this procedure has been tried in European nations it has met with only questionable success. In any event, it is so alien to our American traditions of individual enterprise that it would provoke extreme resentment and constant discord.

It is clear that in this country peace must be based upon reason rather than upon force. We have cherished always the ideal of employers and workers meeting together with friendly and open minds in order that they may exchange views and arrive at solutions based not upon compulsion but upon mutual concessions and mutual benefit. This may be termed the method of conference, of give and take, of free cooperation.

The best example of the conference or voluntary method of ironing out disagreements is the railway industry. Because of the vital connection between steady transportation and the very lives of our people, the Government early took steps to set up machinery for the peaceful adjustment of railway-labor disputes. The central idea of all these efforts has been to promote the making of collective agreements between employers and workers without exercising any compulsion upon either side.

In seeking these ends, however, the Government did not rely upon a policy of complete laissez faire. It soon saw the necessity of establishing by law the underlying conditions from which agreements might arise. It protected employees in their right to organize and bargain collectively. It applied to the railway industry the principle of majority rule, and it abolished the union that was interfered with or financed by the company.

The application of these rules of fair play yielded the finest results. Not once since 1894 has serious strife upon the railroads hardened our arteries of trade. It was to be expected that such a record of success would be emulated elsewhere, and when our entry into the World War made it imperative to cement the bonds of cordiality between employers and workers the War Labor Board was established. This Board immediately applied the principles that governed the railway industry. It was remarkable that not a single strike or lock-out in defiance of an award of the War Labor Board occurred until after the armistice; and the United States was the only belligerent unvexed by major labor disturbances.

It is a matter of record that one of the most prolific causes of strikes has been the failure to apply to industry generally the rules of industrial democracy underlying the conference method. At least 25 percent of the labor disputes in recent years has resulted from denials of the procedure of collective bargaining. In regard to the steel strike of 1919, which was one of the severest and most disastrous affrays in recent history, the impartial commission of inquiry of the Interchurch World Movement said that both sides agreed that the occasion of the strike was the failure to recognize the friendly conference idea. Of the 3,655 new cases received by the regional agencies of the present National Labor Relations Board during the second half of 1934 and the first month of 1935, the issue of collective bargaining was paramount in 2,330 cases, or about 74 percent.

The pending bill is designed merely to apply to industry generally the benefits of our rich American experience. While it has been branded radical by some and ultraconservative by others, every one of its principles has been sanctioned by a long train of laws of Congress. While it has been called inopportune and hasty, it is responsive to the serious industrial disturbances of last summer, when blood ran freely in the streets and martial law was in the offing. While some think it one-sided and directed against industry, it is trained upon the solution of problems that have plagued industry as much as any other group. In its search for industrial peace combined with economic justice, it appeals to the conscience and intelligence of all those who know the history of our country and are imbued with its high ideals. In applying the healing balm of an upright, impartial, and peaceful forum to industry and labor it will benefit employers, workers, and the country at large.

During the delivery of Mr. WAGNER's speech—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not understand the statement of the Senator from New York that "all such orders will be fully reviewable by any aggrieved party in the Federal courts."

Mr. WAGNER. Parties to the controversy, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; but what is meant by the term "by any aggrieved party"? I am asking for information.

Mr. WAGNER. Suppose the Board orders an election, which is held. Then a controversy arises as to who was really elected by a majority of the workers, the company making one contention, and a representative of the workers making another contention. That controversy will be heard by the Board, evidence will be taken, and then, if either party is dissatisfied with the order of the Board, based upon the supposed violation of a legal right, such party may have a review in the courts.

Mr. ROBINSON. The point I am asking about is, What is the meaning of the words "by any aggrieved party"? The language is not clear to me.

Mr. WAGNER. The bill itself is clearer than my statement. I assume that the meaning is by parties to the controversy which is heard before the Board.

After the conclusion of Mr. WAGNER's speech—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WAGNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not hear all, but what I did hear of the able Senator's discussion of the proposed legislation deeply impressed me by its force, persuasiveness, and learning.

Is it fair to conclude that the proposed legislation will have important values for national and industrial development and peace, whether the National Industrial Recovery Act shall be continued or not?

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, I answer in the affirmative, absolutely.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is it proper to say that the measure is designed to apply to all industries which affect commerce?

Mr. WAGNER. That is the intent.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is it to be understood that the proposed legislation's admirable purposes are to be attained by au-

thorized Federal investigations with a view to voluntary settlement of industrial disputes; by outlawing company unions; by the assurance of majority rule among workers organized to bargain collectively with employers; and by the maintenance of a permanent and impartial national relations board?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; and by the prohibition of certain unfair labor practices which are enumerated in the bill and which are intended to make the worker a free man, to decide for himself whether he wants an organization, and if he wants one, what the type of that organization shall be.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With such features the proposed legislation evidently embodies some of the settled conclusions of our foremost industrial experts. The measure is clearly intended to support recommendations both of acknowledged industrial leaders in America and of America's organized labor movement. Nor are such convictions new. Almost 20 years ago they were urged as the prevailing expert judgment of those best informed on industrial problems, appearing at that time before the United States Industrial Relations Commission, which surveyed the entire field of industrial relations for a couple of years by authority of Congress and with commissioners of ability appointed by President Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just for a clarification?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have admired the Senator's presentation. I am very favorable to his bill. What I desire to know, in keeping with the question propounded by the Senator from Colorado, is whether the continuation of the N. R. A. is in anywise linked with the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. WAGNER. It is not. Of course, the N. I. R. A. has section 7 (a) in it; but this bill proposes, in the first place, to define the rights of labor more clearly; and, secondly, to implement them by certain enforcement sanctions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Just one further inquiry. Am I correct in saying that even though the N. R. A. should pass out of existence with section 7 (a) as it now stands in the N. R. A. Act, we should have all the beneficial results that might flow from section 7 (a) if we should enact the pending bill?

Mr. WAGNER. That is certainly a correct statement so far as section 7 (a) is concerned.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 carried an appropriation of $100,000,000, which was earmarked for the purpose of rural electrification; and those of us who are interested in the efforts of the administration to provide cheap electric energy for the farmers confront the necessity of informing the farmers how to obtain this cheap power.

If the $100,000,000 is merely to be siphoned off into channels which can only serve to step up the revenues of private power utilities, in my judgment the program of rural electrification probably will not be of very much value to the farmers.

I myself have had some experience in the matter of aiding farmers to obtain cheap power for their farms, because in my State the farmers have organized themselves into power companies (for distribution only) owned, controlled, and operated by the farmers; and there, in those activities, they have for themselves solved this problem of getting cheap power to the farm.

The National Popular Government League, with its office in Washington, D. C., has prepared another one of its very illuminating bulletins, it being merely one of a number of bulletins dealing with power and other public questions. This is Bulletin No. 171, and is entitled "Who Will Get the $100,000,000 for Farm Electrification?" It is a discussion of policies which farmers ought to pursue to establish some reasonable foot rules for estimating honest costs of service. I should like to have this bulletin incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and for that purpose I send it to the desk.

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

The bulletin is as follows:

NATIONAL POPULAR GOVERNMENT LEAGUE,
Takoma Park Station, Washington, D. C.

Bulletin No. 171, April 25, 1935

(By Judson King, Director)

WHO WILL GET THE $100,000,000 FOR FARM ELECTRIFICATION?—POLICIES FOR FARMERS TO DETERMINE AND SOME FOOT RULES FOR ESTIMATING HONEST COSTS OF SERVICE

In recent Federal work-relief legislation $100,000,000 has been earmarked to make a start toward farm electrification in the United States. That is due to the fact that during the past 6 years President Roosevelt has closely studied the subject and has a vital interest in it.

This means that all over the Nation in localities where farmers promptly come forward and cooperate, low-tension rural distribution lines will be built, buildings will be wired to carry current to light the house, the barn, and the yards; to do the washing and ironing; to pump water for the house—including, perhaps, the newly installed bathroom—to water the stock, run motors to chop feed, grind grain, and turn the grindstone; to furnish refrigeration, cleaner and better than ice, and to operate many other appliances which ease the work burden and bring a far greater degree of comfort, enjoyment, and profit to farm life. Ask the farmer who has tried it, or, still better, his wife and children.

It costs more to deliver electricity to widely scattered farm homes than to urban residences. A vast majority of farmers have never been able to stand the expense and their present deflated condition aggravates the situation. Hence the hundred million dollars.

Assuming that the President will soon designate an agency to spend this money, the first question which arises is, who is going to get it? Manifestly, it will be either municipally owned power plants, or public power districts, or farm cooperatives organized on a nonprofit basis, or private power companies on a profit-making basis.

Manifestly, again, public bodies have the first right to this Federal money, just as a municipality, a State, or power district has the first claim before the Federal Power Commission on a water-power site. If they do not exercise this right, then the site goes to a private company making application for it.

This advance of $100,000,000 gives the existing municipally owned power plants the greatest opportunity which has ever come to them to extend electric service into the country and benefit both themselves and the farmers. It offers an inspiring opportunity to cooperatives either established or newly formed for that purpose.

If the people and the public plants do not vigorously embrace this opportunity, then they will have no grounds for complaint if the private companies get the money and spend it. It is known that they are on hand in Washington now asking for it.

Now is the time for farmers to get accurate information on honest costs of electric installation and do some grim thinking on the best policy. There is no sense in spending millions of Government money to build distribution lines unless the cost of current is to be the cheapest possible. Otherwise the farmers cannot continue the use of the service. On the other hand, the success of the President's effort depends absolutely upon the support it receives from farm communities not yet electrified, which, incidentally, constitute 88 percent of the farms of the Nation.

Remember sharply that this rural electrification scheme is primarily an aid to self-help. It calls for the exercise of "rugged individualism" and the "pioneer spirit." The administration proposes to do what the private companies have not done in adequate fashion for the past 20 years because there was not enough money in it and what the bankers will not do today save on prohibitive security conditions and interest rates—namely, loan money to build the lines and furnish equipment.

Of course, the farmers may expect to be told by certain high political and utility spokesmen in both parties that any part of this $100,000,000 advanced to municipalities or cooperatives is "communism" and destructive of the farmer's "liberty", but if given to private companies it will be praised as proper encouragement to business in helping recovery. This ancient twaddle need disturb no intelligent person. The point is, the farmers need electricity and this is the only way thousands of them can get it at all. There are two main points to be considered at the outset in planning:

1. What are honest costs for line and equipment construction and appliances, and honest rates for the current to be used through the years?

2. What is the best policy to be pursued, recognizing the fact that costs will vary under differing conditions and that some farm communities will not have the spirit, the initiative, and the leadership to do this job for themselves?

FOOT RULES FOR FARMERS

As to costs and the steps to be taken in applying for a loan, it will contribute to clarity if the subject is dealt with in the form of definite questions and answers, as follows:

1. Where will the electricity be obtained?

It will be supplied either from an existing "high" line owned by a utility company or a municipality, or from a newly constructed generating station, using water power, coal, or a diesel engine.

2. How many electricity be procured for the farm?

The usual procedure in the past has been to apply to the local utility for service. With the Government embarking upon a rural electrification program, the most effective procedure would now seem to be to direct inquiries to the Government agency in charge of this work.

3. What Government agency will direct rural electrification?

President Roosevelt will probably very soon designate the agency which will administer the $100,000,000 program.

4. What immediate procedure should the farmer follow?

Discuss the matter with your county agricultural agent, county deputy master of the grange, county farm bureau adviser, or corresponding official in your county. With him sketch a map showing the proposed line, the prospective customers, and approximate distances between customers. This map, together with any other pertinent information, such as the number of various appliances which it is expected will be connected to the line, should be forwarded to the agency in Washington which will handle the work. The Government will probably send representatives who will be able to advise the farmers as to how to proceed further.

5. What charge should be made for electric service?

In the ordinary farm community with at least three customers per mile of line a minimum charge to cover line costs might lie between $3 and $3.50 per month. This minimum amount to cover interest and sinking-fund charges will pay for the use of sufficient energy on the average farm for lighting and water pumping.

6. What is a fair rate to be paid for the added current used?

Additional energy should be purchased at a progressively decreasing cost. A fair rate for either a private company or a cooperative at the start would give a total monthly charge of $5 for 100 kilowatt-hours, $7 for 200 kilowatt-hours, $8.50 for 300 kilowatt-hours, and all over this amount at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour.[1] (For the number of kilowatt-hours used by various appliances see the answer to question 9.)

It should be stated, however, that it is not likely that at the present time one rate will apply to the country at large, although the time may come when uniform rates will be universal. The type and characteristics of the electric line, the number of customers per mile, and, more important, the amount used per customer are all important factors in arriving at a fair rate. With the construction of the electric line certain, annual charges must be paid by the owner of the line, such as interest on the money invested, depreciation, and operation and maintenance. Manifestly, the more customers per mile, the lower the cost for each customer. These charges accrue whether or not any electricity is used from the line.

Estimates indicate that on a rural line in average territory, with three customers per mile, there must be a total annual usage by these three customers of about 3,600 kilowatt-hours if a low rate is to be had. The cost of such a line ready to serve the three customers will be about $1,000 per mile. With more customers per mile, the cost and required use would increase slightly.

7. What will it cost to wire the house and barn?

The cost will vary from about $40 upward, depending upon such things as the type of wiring and fixtures chosen, the size of the house and barn, the number of outlets required, local labor rates, and the amount of work done by the farmer himself. Sufficient outlets should be installed so that appliances may readily be connected where most convenient. Your local electrical contractor will be glad to give you an estimate.

8. How can the cost of wiring be financed?

If you cannot make an outright payment, a loan may be obtained through a Government agency providing for repayment over a period of years.

9. What appliances are available and at what cost?

There are over 250 different appliances now in use. The more useful of them, together with their cost and approximate consumption, are as follows:

Household appliances	Approximate annual consumption (kilowatt-hours)	Approximate first cost of appliance
Automatic water pump for shallow well	150	$75 upward.
Washing machine	25	$45 upward.
Vacuum cleaner	25	$15 upward.
Refrigerator	600	$75 upward.
Range	1,800	$65 upward.
Radio	80	$10 upward.
Iron	60	$4 upward.
Fan	20	$3 upward.
Water heater	3,000	$65 upward.

[1] A kilowatt-hour—1,000 watt-hours—is the unit used in measuring and selling electricity as the bushel is used in measuring wheat or potatoes, the gallon for gasoline, the dozen for eggs, or the pound for butter. A 25-watt incandescent bulb giving light equivalent to 20 or 25 candles uses one-fortieth of a kilowatt-hour if kept turned on for 1 hour. A kilowatt-hour of electrical energy will keep such a lamp going for 40 hours. (Report of the Giant Power Survey Board (Harrisburg, 1925) p. 17.)

BARN AND FARM APPLIANCES

Motor, 1 horsepower, single phase, uses about 0.9 kilowatt-hour per hour of operation, approximate cost $40 upward.

Motor, 5 horsepower, single phase, uses about 3.75 kilowatt-hours per hour of operation, approximate cost $150 upward.

Cream separators use about 0.33 kilowatt-hour per hour of operation, approximate cost $30 upward.

Milking machines use about 0.25 kilowatt-hour per hour of operation, approximate cost $85 upward.

Five horsepower motor with pump uses about 3.75 kilowatt-hours per hour of operation, approximate cost $380 upward. This pump will deliver 350 gallons of water per minute with 40-foot head.

Incubator, 300-egg size, uses about 0.25 kilowatt-hour per hour of operation, costs from $70 upward.

The use of a water pump makes possible the installation of an inside bathroom the fixtures for which bath tub, toilet, and wash basin will cost from $50 upward.

10. Under what plans may appliances be purchased?

There is an existing Government agency, the T. V. A. Electric Home and Farm Authority, through which appliances may be purchased and paid for in monthly payments extending over longer periods than those now in effect with private companies. The length of time allowed for payment is defined by the useful life of the appliance. The plan now in effect is designed specifically for financing urban domestic appliances. With the formation of a broad rural program, appropriate terms will probably be arranged to accommodate this type of business.

POLICY: TWO METHODS OF FINANCING

As to policy, there are two key things to consider—ownership and amortization, it being assumed that the money advanced by the Government will be repaid to the Government in something like 20 years. Something like 60 percent of the present over-all cost of distributing electric current is the cost of capital invested in equipment.

If then a private company borrows some of this $100,000,000 to build farm lines, it may be assumed that the company will collect enough in rates from the farmers for it to repay the interest and principal on the Government loan. It will own the lines, and if the usual practice is continued it will set up this amount as an "investment" on which "a fair return"—say, 6 percent—must be paid by the farmer as long as the company lives and the farmer buys current.

On the other hand, if a municipality or farm cooperative borrows the money, it will also collect in rates enough to pay principal and interest, but the interest charge will gradually grow less as the amortization charges are paid and finally vanish. There will be no debt, and the "fair return" will be kept by the farmers in the form of cheaper rates.

These are the basic differences between two methods of financing a utility. It needs to be held in mind without further discussion of the old controversy over private versus public ownership. A brief notice of some practical examples will be in point.

Gage County, Nebr.

Gage County, Nebr., furnishes an example in line with what farmers may expect to be offered by private power companies cooperating with the electrification program.

The southeastern Nebraska power district was organized under a recent State law authorizing the setting up of public power districts. It was allotted by the Public Works Administration an outright grant of $140,000, and bonds in the amount of $435,000 to build some 595 miles of distribution lines to serve an estimated 1,358 rural and village customers.

It is proposed that the district buy its wholesale power from the Gage County Electric Co., a subsidiary of the Atlantic Gas & Electric Corporation, a holding company with offices in Boston, Mass., organized under the laws of Delaware.

Wholesale rate: The district is to pay the company 3 cents per kilowatt-hour for the first 50,000 kilowatt-hours, 2 cents per kilowatt-hour for all in excess.

Retail rates: The proposed rates for farmers are $4.25 minimum monthly charge, including 25 kilowatt-hours (equals 17 cents per kilowatt-hour), 6 cents per kilowatt-hour for the next 25, 3 cents per kilowatt-hour for all above 50.

To get a line on how these rates work out in the average monthly bill as compared with what city users pay, the Edison Electric Institute reports that the average domestic customer in 1933 used 604 kilowatt-hours for which he paid $33.16, or an average of 5.49 cents per kilowatt-hour. This usage furnishes but little more than is necessary for lighting a house. The above figures work out thus:

Average American city user, 50 kilowatt-hours at 5.49 cents equals $2.76 per month, or $33.16 per year.

Gage County farmer, 50 kilowatt-hours at 11.5 cents equals $5.75 per month, or $69 per year.

The Edison Electric Institute reports central and eastern farmers using an average in 1933 of 770 kilowatt-hours per year for which they paid $49.65. Compare Gage County:

Average American farmer uses 64 kilowatt-hours at 6.45 cents equals $4.13 per month, or $49.65 a year.

Gage County farmer, 64 kilowatt-hours at 9.64 cents equals $6.17 per month, or $70.04 a year.

It is evident if the $100,000,000 is spent on the Gage County basis it will benefit the companies, but will not increase the use of electricity or electrify rural America.

If a Gage County farmer used a relatively small amount for house and barn service, say 200 kilowatt-hours monthly, it would cost him ¢10.25 or $123 annually at an average rate of 5.13 cents per kilowatt-hour.

It is understood that the promoter of the above power district was Mr. C. F. Shaffer, of Beatrice, Nebr., manager of the Gage County Electric Co., who writes in his prospectus urging the plan:

"It is assumed that the farm income will be sufficient to enable the consumers in certain sections to pay electric rates higher than prevailing rates to make the project self-liquidating."

Certainly the wholesale rates charged will help sustain the operating company and the holding company above it.

Pierce County, Wash.

In 1912 the city of Tacoma completed a large hydro-electric plant on the Nisqually River some 35 miles from the city. The transmission lines from this plant passed over a big farming community which had not previously been served with electric energy because the Stone & Webster power interests had refused to extend their service into that community except at a base rate of 14 cents per kilowatt-hour, in addition to which they demanded long-term contracts and that the farmers virtually pay for the lines. The farmers could not meet these onerous conditions.

The city of Tacoma was without legal power to distribute energy to these farmers. Under an existing State law various communities of farmers organized several little mutual, nonstock, cooperative companies, of a corporate nature, secured franchises from Pierce County and laid out and built their own distribution systems. Because the city had no power to distribute outside, these little companies were compelled to build to the city limits so that they could buy current and take delivery at a point inside the city.

The cost record of one of these companies indicates that its distribution lines were built at a cost of around $600 per mile. Many of the farmers worked out their membership costs by helping to build these lines. Eight or ten of these little farmer-mutual companies are now supplying service to around 3,000 farm homes. The membership fee in these companies ran from $75 to $125. The interest of each member is evidenced by his membership certificate. The city of Tacoma wholesales them current at the industrial power rate which is its lowest power rate and begins at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour and goes down to approximately a mill and a half. The more power the farmer line buys, the cheaper the current, and there is every inducement for the farmers to increase their use of energy, thereby obtaining a constantly cheaper rate for themselves. One company, the Elmhurst Mutual Co., distributes current to its members at the rate of 5 cents per kilowatt-hour for the first 20 kilowatt-hours and 1 cent per kilowatt-hour for all over that. A Captain Waldwick, who owned one of the large chicken ranches on the lines of that company, used 13,000 kilowatt-hours in 1 month which cost him $130.80. At the proposed rates for Gage County, Nebr., his bill would have been $394.25. Since his membership in this little company cost him less than $100 it is evident that the cost of membership was a small factor, as compared with the saving in power rates.

I am indebted to Senator HOMER T. BONE, from the State of Washington, for the above information. Prior to coming to Congress he was attorney for some of these farmer power companies and organized the largest one of them. He is author of the Bone power bill, passed by the Washington State Legislature in 1933 after a 15-year fight, and this measure gives the big municipally owned plants of that State the right to freely sell electric energy outside of their corporate interests. The Senate is familiar with the financial status of these farmer-owned power companies and says that their 20 years' operation demonstrates that they are sound and successful. These companies have built up over the years a surplus out of revenues to take care of obsolescence and depreciation. Their corporate powers permit them to supply electric accessories to their members at cost. Being private companies, they pay taxes like the power trust.

Alcorn County, Miss.

Farmers interested in county organization units should write to the T. V. A., department of electricity, Chattanooga, Tenn., and get the recent report on the operation of Alcorn County, Miss., power authority for the first 6 months of operation, June–November 1934. Here town and country have united. There is one rate for all. A fine description of the method of organization is given as well as figures on results thus far. It started off with an average reduction of 42 percent in rates. For example, where the Mississippi Power Co. charged $3.50 for 50 kilowatt-hours the authority charged $2. In 6 months consumption had increased materially and the enterprise had paid all operating and capital costs, including taxes and depreciation, and had a surplus profit of $14,000 to be applied to amortization and new construction. At this rate the entire present debt of $142,000 will be paid off by January 1, 1938.

Los Angeles County, Calif.

Mr. F. E. Scattergood, chief electrical engineer of the Bureau of Power and Light of Los Angeles, reports that for several years the city has been serving the rural and small urban users in the San Fernando Valley at city rates. The area covered comprises 120,000 acres, largely composed of farms from 2 to 100 acres in size along with rural towns and small industries. There are now around 10,000 farmers, including subsistence farmers, and practically every home is electrified.

The average monthly bill is less than one-half the price formerly charged by the private company. The whole was worked out by the city engineers and officials years ago, and is a practical illustration of planned economy to which students and administrators in this field should give attention. In many respects it is a model for the Nation. The present domestic combination schedule for city and for these farmers and subsistence dwellers is:

	Cents
First 35 kilowatt-hours	4.8
Next 140 kilowatt-hours	2.5
All in excess of 175 kilowatt-hours	1.5
Water heater, separate meter	1.0

Note sharply that Los Angeles has been and is amortizing its capital investment out of these low rates, and has not added a surcharge for "self-liquidation", as proposed in Nebraska.

Seattle's city light and the farmers

The farmers of Washington to the north of Seattle have recently voted several power districts. Will they pay 3 cents and 2 cents for wholesale current? Hardly. The great Skagit development owned by the city of Seattle will deliver power to them at around 1 cent. Furthermore, they will have the honest and sympathetic advice of Seattle's able engineer, J. D. Ross, who, incidentally, is also a horticulturalist, in planning, and it is of superlative importance for farmers to get the right engineer.

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY

There are engineers and engineers, as the New York Power Authority, Hon. Frank P. Walsh, chairman, found when it needed to discover the actual cost of distributing electricity. It had to make its own investigation, and its report is of value to farmers as well as town people everywhere. In this work the Authority had the guidance of one of its members, Mr. Morris L. Cooke, consulting engineer, of Philadelphia, now a member of the National Power Policy Committee. Distribution costs were found to be not nearly so high as claimed by private power-company engineers.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Remember that the data and costs given in the questionnaire under the head "Foot rules for farmers" apply to private companies, and before making contracts above these figures you should stop, look, and listen—and consult.

Remember that, as Col. William T. Chantland, assistant chief counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, recently stated to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, the investigation of the Trade Commission of power companies showed that for the past 20 years the private companies, as a rule, have ignored farm extension, except where the farmers were made to pay construction costs and high rates. It was not until the President's program got under way that the companies discovered such warm interest in farmers. In the opinion of this writer, this interest is political more than economic.

The average farm home, the one with which the administration is concerned, must have, not light and radio alone but power for washing, ironing, pumping, and machines run by motor, if the program is to succeed.

The average farmer cannot afford to pay more than from 2 cents to 3 cents per kilowatt-hour for the amount of current needed; and if any agency, public or private, raises that price to from 5 to 10 cents, it defeats the purpose of the $100,000,000.

American agriculture is staggering under mortgages and interest thereon. It will be mere folly to plaster another series of mortgages on it in the shape of watered stocks for operating and holding companies on which the farmers must pay interest and profits for the next half century. But this is exactly what private enterprise is endeavoring to do, and will succeed in doing if we don't watch out.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1958) to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, we have now reached the stage where the committee amendments will be taken up for disposition. I therefore think a quorum call should be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Burke	Fletcher	King
Ashurst	Byrd	Frazier	La Follette
Austin	Byrnes	George	Lewis
Bachman	Capper	Gerry	Logan
Bailey	Caraway	Gibson	Lonergan
Bankhead	Carey	Glass	Long
Barbour	Clark	Gore	McAdoo
Barkley	Connally	Guffey	McCarran
Bilbo	Coolidge	Hale	McGill
Black	Copeland	Harrison	McKellar
Bone	Costigan	Hastings	McNary
Borah	Couzens	Hatch	Maloney
Brown	Dickinson	Hayden	Metcalf
Bulkley	Donahey	Johnson	Minton
Bulow	Duffy	Keyes	Moore

Murphy	Pope	Shipstead	Tydings
Murray	Radcliffe	Steiwer	Vandenberg
Neely	Robinson	Thomas, Okla.	Van Nuys
Norris	Russell	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Nye	Schall	Townsend	Walsh
O'Mahoney	Schwellenbach	Trammell	Wheeler
Overton	Sheppard	Truman	White
Pittman			

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I rise merely to reannounce the absence of the Senators whose names I have given earlier in the day, and the reasons for their not being present at the moment of this roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE ADMINISTRATION FARM PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the speech delivered by the President yesterday at the White House to the delegation of farmers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is this the celebrated "liar" speech?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the speech referred to earlier in the day by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LONG. I am not objecting; I am merely asking a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the only speech the President made yesterday.

Mr. LONG. Is it the "liar" speech?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the one referred to by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], when he said there were still some liars alive in the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to have a speech delivered by the President inserted in the RECORD. Is there objection?

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

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, DELIVERED FROM THE SOUTH PORTICO OF THE WHITE HOUSE, TO FARMERS WHO HAVE CONVENED IN WASHINGTON FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUPPORTING THE ADMINISTRATION'S AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM, TUESDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 14, 1935

I am glad to welcome you to the National Capital. We can think of this occasion as a kind of surprise birthday party, for it was just 2 years and 2 days ago that the Agricultural Adjustment Act became a law. And I well remember the fine group of representatives of farmers from every part of the Union who stood around me on that occasion when I signed the act.

In record time you and thousands of other farmers took hold and set up the machinery to control your own affairs and put the new law to work.

I remember, too, the many high and mighty people who said you could not do it—that it was no use for you to try—intimating clearly that their only remedy to improve your situation was to let the sheriffs' sales go on. That was the old and very familiar way—the high and mighty balanced farm production with demand. Those people did not understand, and many of them do not understand today, that if the farm population of the United States suffers and loses its purchasing power, the people in the cities, of necessity, suffer with them. One of the greatest lessons that the city dwellers have come to understand in this past 2 years is this: Empty pocketbooks on the farm don't turn factory wheels in the city.

Go back for a minute to the spring of 1933, when there was a huge carry-over of almost 13,000,000 bales, and a price, because of that carry-over, of 6 cents a pound. You and I know what 6-cent cotton means to the purchasing power of the Cotton Belt.

There was a huge carry-over of tobacco, and the price of tobacco during the preceding 6 months was the lowest on record for many years. Wheat, with a carry-over of nearly 400,000,000 bushels, and a price of 35 cents on the farm; corn, with a price of 15 cents a bushel on many farms; hogs, selling at 3 cents a pound.

You and I know what that meant in the way of purchasing power for 40,000,000 people.

When we came to Washington we were faced with three possible programs. The first involved price fixing by Government decree. This was discarded because the problem of overproduction was not solved thereby.

The second was a plan to let farmers grow as much as they wanted to and to have the Federal Government then step in, take from them that portion of their crop which represented the exportable surplus and, in their name, on their behalf, dump this surplus on the other nations of the world. That plan was discarded because the other nations of the world had already begun to stop dumping. With increasing frequency they were raising their tariffs, establishing quotas, and clamping on embargoes against just that kind of proposition.

Therefore, we came to the third plan—a plan for the adjustment of totals in our major crops so that from year to year production and consumption would be kept in reasonable balance with each other to the end that reasonable prices would be paid to farmers for their crops and to the end that unwieldy surpluses would not depress our markets and upset the balance.

We are now at the beginning of the third year of carrying out this policy. You know the results thus far attained. You know the price of cotton, of wheat, of tobacco, of corn, of hogs, and of other farm products today. Further comment on the successful partial attainment of our objective up to this time is unnecessary on my part. You know.

I want to emphasize that word "adjustment." As you know, a great many of the high and mighty—with special axes to grind—have been deliberately trying to mislead people who know nothing of farming by misrepresenting—no—why use a pussyfoot word—by lying about the kind of a farm program under which this Nation is operating today.

A few leading citizens have gone astray from ignorance. I must admit it. For example, the prominent city banker who was driving through up-State New York with me 4 or 5 years ago in the late fall. Everything was brown. The leaves were off the trees. We passed a beautiful green field. He asked me what it was. I told him it was winter wheat. He turned to me and said, "That is very interesting. I have always wondered about winter wheat. What I don't understand is how they are able to cut it when it gets covered up with snow."

The other was the editor of a great metropolitan paper. He visited me down in Georgia when the cotton was nearly grown but before the bolls had formed. Looking out over the cotton fields he said to me:

"What a great number of raspberries they grow down here."

Raspberries was right. At 4½ cents a pound for cotton his mistake was, perhaps, a natural one.

I was speaking of adjustment. It is your duty and mine to continue to educate the people of this country to the fact that adjustment means not only adjustment downward but adjustment upward. If you and I agree on a correct figure for a normal carry-over it means that if we have a bumper crop one year we will, by mutual consent, reduce the next year's crop in order to even up that carry-over. At the same time, if we get a short crop in a given year, you and I agree to increase the next year's crop to make up the shortage. That is exactly what we are doing today in the case of wheat.

It is high time for you and for me to carry, by education, knowledge of the fact that not a single program of the A. A. A. contemplated the destruction of an acre of food crops in the United States, in spite of what you may read or be told by people who have special axes to grind.

It is high time for you and for me to make clear that we are not plowing under cotton this year, that we did not plow it under in 1934, and that we only plowed some of it under in 1933 because the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed after a huge crop of cotton was already in the ground.

It is high time for us to repeat on every occasion that we have not wastefully destroyed food in any form. It is true that the Relief Administrator has purchased hundreds of thousands of tons of foodstuffs to feed the needy and hungry who are on the relief rolls in every part of the United States.

The crocodile tears shed by the professional mourners of an old and obsolete order over the slaughter of little pigs and other measures to reduce surplus agricultural inventories deceive very few thinking people and, least of all, the farmers themselves.

The acknowledged destiny of a pig is sausage, or ham, or bacon, or pork. In these forms millions of pigs were consumed by vast numbers of needy people who otherwise would have had to do without.

Let me make one other point clear for the benefit of the millions in cities who have to buy meats. Last year the Nation suffered a drought of unparalleled intensity. If there had been no Government program—if the old order had obtained in 1933 and 1934—that drought on the cattle ranges of America and in the Corn Belt would have resulted in the marketing of thin cattle, immature hogs, and in the death of these animals on the range and on the farm. Then we would have had a vastly greater shortage than we face today.

Our program saved the lives of millions of head of livestock. They are still on the range. Other millions are today canned and ready for this country to eat.

I think that you and I are agreed in seeking a continuance of a national policy which on the whole is proving successful. The memory of old conditions under which the product of a whole year's work often would not bring you the cost of transporting it to market is too fresh in your minds to let you be led astray by the solemn admonitions and specious lies of those who in the past profited most when your distress was greatest.

You remember, and I remember, that not so long ago the poor had less food to eat and less clothes to wear, and that was at a time when you had practically to give away your products. Then the surpluses were greater and yet the poor were poorer than they are today when you farmers are getting a reasonable although still an insufficient price.

I have not the time to talk with you about many other policies of your Government which affect the farm population of the country. I have not the time to go into the practical work of the Farm Credit Administration, which in all of its ramifications has saved a million farms from foreclosure and has accomplished the first great reduction in exorbitant interest rates that this country has ever known.

Because your cause is so just no one has had the temerity to question the motives of your "march on Washington." It is a good omen for Government, for business, for bankers, and for the

city dwellers that the Nation's farmers are becoming articulate and that they know whereof they speak.

I hope you have enjoyed your stay in Washington. Seeing your Government at first hand, you may have a better idea why its efforts at times seem lumbering and slow and complicated. On the other hand, you may have seen that we are moving faster and accomplishing more practical results than you have been led to believe by the high and mighty gentlemen I have spoken of. I want to thank you for your patience with us. I want to pledge our whole-hearted cooperation as you go forward.

FARMERS' VISIT TO WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I desire to present a resolution, and to have it read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 139) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate any and all correspondence in his Department touching the gathering of some three or four thousand farmers in the city of Washington during the last 2 or 3 days; whether any instructions had been given by him, or any person in his Department, or any of the various county agents or farm organizations receiving Federal aid, with respect to getting these farmers to come to Washington; how the particular group was selected and by whom, and the purpose of having the said farmers come to Washington at this particular time; and

Resolved further, That the Secretary of Agriculture give to the Senate all information in his possession with respect to any cost borne by the Federal Government, directly or indirectly, in meeting the expenses of the farmers gathered as aforesaid.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether there is some particular committee to which he wishes to have the resolution referred? If so, will he indicate it?

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask that it go over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has just inserted in the RECORD a speech made yesterday to the farmers by the President of the United States. I shall take only a few moments of the Senate's time to make some comments in respect to that subject.

We are told by the newspapers that there are some 4,000 farmers here. I take it, in view of the fact that legislation is pending to amend the A. A. A., that they might very well be called "lobbyists." Certainly that term is applied to other people who come to express their interest in such subjects.

I assume also that the expenses of most of these farmers are being paid directly or indirectly by the Federal Government. I am not quite so much interested in that as I am in the address made by the President to this group. Four times in that speech the President spoke sarcastically of those who criticised the A. A. A. program as "high and mighty." He described them as persons with "special axes to grind." He spoke of them as "lying about the kind of a farm program under which this Nation is operating today." He warned his audience not to "be led astray by the solemn admonitions and specious lies of those who in the past profited most when your distress was greatest." He spoke of "crocodile tears shed by the professional mourners of an old and obsolete order."

The surprising thing to me is that the mild-mannered and genteel, distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] should have seized the first opportunity he had to approve all that has been said. I am quite certain that, knowing all the facts, the distinguished Senator from Illinois would never use such language himself about any group of people in this country regardless of what criticism they might level against him.

In the President's radio speech on April 29 we find these four words standing out boldly in print, directed to the American people, "Feel free to criticize", and within 3 weeks, although the President invited that criticism, he showed in his address to the farmers yesterday that he "cannot take it."

We who have criticized the new deal were earlier called Tories, traitors, whiners, chiselers, and so forth, but now we are called liars, and everybody understands just what that means; and I submit, Mr. President, it comes with little dignity from a man who holds the high position of the President of the United States. But I want to say this to him and to the distinguished Senator who praised what he said here this morning, that if that term is to be applied to all the persons who have criticized the new deal, we have developed the greatest crop of liars within the last 6 months ever found in any country.

The President's speech reminds me of the small-town bully who boldly and courageously calls his opponents foul names when he has his own crowd about him to protect him.

Mr. President, as I read that speech this morning there came to me a letter from a business man who had made a trip to North Carolina, and he gave me his observations. He says among other things:

The A. A. A. is the laughing stock of the industrial world. Mr. Wallace's program is so destructive and senseless as to make it appear like it was subsidized by the Soviet.

When that gentleman reads this morning what the President said yesterday he must conclude that he is in that class of people whom the President called liars.

However, let me see who else has been lying about this. I quote from the editorial columns of the Philadelphia Inquirer; and let the President find for himself how many lies are in this brief editorial. Let us see whether or not he is willing that that term shall apply to this editorial writer and to other editorial writers all over the country. I take it, of course, that he was applying the term to me and to distinguished Senators on this floor on both sides of the Senate Chamber who have been criticizing the A. A. A., because he made no exceptions. He said plainly and without any misunderstanding on the part of anyone that he had to call the people who had criticized the A. A. A. by that term in order to make himself clear.

Let me read this editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on May 14, 1935, under the heading of—

WONDERS OF THE A. A. A.

Some farmers from Texas and points west are concentrating on Washington, shouting for Secretary of Agriculture Wallace and his A. A. A. While denying that they inspired the movement, the Wallace intellectuals are plainly pleased with it, since in a measure it offsets the antagonism aroused by cotton manufacturers.

Cotton growers have been receiving fat checks from the Government for restricting acreage, but what has happened is this: Their normal exports have been reduced nearly one-half. The sharecropper is badly hurt. The price of cotton, boosted by the Government, is disastrous to manufacturers, and numerous mills are either closed or are losing business and money. That is what A. A. A. has done to cotton.

Western wheat farmers welcome Government checks in return for partial idleness, but the public is furnishing the money. Wheat is being imported, despite the high tariff.

A. A. A. had an idea that there were too many hogs in the land, and it started out on a gigantic slaughtering expedition. Result, importations in quantities of fresh pork. In March of last year we brought in 2,811 pounds; in March of 1935 more than 1,000,000 pounds. And what price is the householder paying for pork chops? Consult the family budget.

The Government spent upwards of $1,000,000—the figures come from the Treasury Department—in reducing cattle herds. Result, in the whole year of 1934 we imported 57,677 head, whereas in January and February of this year alone we have imported 43,566.

Formerly we raised plenty of corn with an export market, but we purchased abroad—still the Treasury figures—3,713,035 bushels in the first 2 months of 1935. Oats? In bushels, 3,762,014. Tallow? In pounds, 31,615,534.

And what about butter? Because we have killed off so many cows, we have had to go elsewhere to piece out our supply. In January and February last there came to our shores and over our borders 3,609,588 pounds, valued at $645,231. And the importation of foodstuffs is constantly rising.

Oh, yes; a truly wonderful machine is A. A. A., and marvelous are the theoretical gentlemen who operate it.

Notwithstanding those facts taken from the Treasury report, the President calls those persons, who criticize the A. A. A., liars.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. From what publication has the Senator just read the article?

Mr. HASTINGS. The Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a great agricultural paper published in Philadelphia!

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator knows of the newspaper, I assume. I do. However, no one disputes the facts, so far as I know.

Mr. President, while the President was making that speech, or about that same time, his chief pet, Mr. Richberg, was making another speech, and I think Senators will be interested to know what Mr. Richberg was saying to the 1,500 employees of the N. R. A.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I object to the reading of Richberg's speech, because it reflects upon the motives of myself and the other 93 Senators.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I will not wait for a ruling on the point of order. However, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to what Mr. Richberg said about what the Senate did unanimously on yesterday without a single dissenting vote when it passed the N. R. A. bill with certain modifications, extending it 9 months. Mr. Richberg said of it:

It was complete folly.

Not only that but he described the fundamental concepts of the N. R. A. as being so sound that only confused, muddled minds could attack it.

Mr. President, of course, it is impossible for us here in the Senate to meet the conditions imposed upon us by an administration which is run by a man like that. I might say in passing that in my judgment the N. R. A. is on its way out, and Donald Richberg is more responsible for its being on its way out than any other single individual in America. There was real merit in parts of the N. R. A. if its functions had been properly carried out and if it were legal—I have always doubted whether it was legal—but all of us who heard the story before the committee believed and reached the definite conclusion that 90 percent of the mistakes made in the N. R. A. were made by the administration forces. Yet, notwithstanding that record, this man dares to say to the group of 1,500 N. R. A. employees, at the time the President was attacking those who were complaining about the A. A. A., that what the Senate of the United States did was pure folly and that the Senators had muddled minds.

Mr. President, I just wished to make those observations, because I am not accustomed to permit people to call me names such as that without resenting it and giving voice to my resentment when I get a chance.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I would not again burden the Senate at this moment with any observations from me on this subject were it not for the fact that the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] has found it agreeable to make me the object of an allusion, referring to a speech I made this morning on this floor touching the speech of the President referred to by the Senator from Delaware.

The Senator from Delaware proceeds to leave the intimation in this body—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Delaware, as I have an idea he would like to hear what I am saying——

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, I am not missing a word.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator from Delaware, recognized as an eminent leader of his party, and the complete voice of stricture whenever such is required to serve party uses, and in many respects the most talented of the satirists, and who, rising to the effulgence of his capacity, supreme as it is, if desired by his colleagues, and, of course, ever rewarded by the smiles of their approval, could not lose the opportunity when this privilege was afforded him this morning of participating in a bit of practice which no doubt he expects to continue in a more excellent form and more continuously in the coming months before his honored constituents.

We pause to ask ourselves, To what did the able Senator allude? He first said that the President of the United States, departing from his standards, has in some wise violated some ethical procedure by alluding to those who have been heretofore characterizing the President himself as that which they were—liars—and because he having used the expression, he had descended beneath the dignity which the robes of his office would have required him to respect. I take it the able Senator meant to indicate that a remark of this kind, where there was no proof, was incorrect procedure. Yet I gather from the Senator's continuing observations he meant to assert that the criticism of the whole policy of the President in all things, whether by editors or by orators eminent as himself, or less, in quantity or quality, nevertheless was justified. Therefore, being justified, anybody who should make an allusion to them adversely would be calling them liars.

But, Mr. President, at this point I am greatly arrested by the thought that the able Senator tenders a resolution here which calls upon the Secretary of Agriculture please to inform this body why these farmers have assembled here in Washington; what is the meaning of their presence; to what extent, if he knows, their expenses have been paid; and who it is that has lured them by some seductive suggestion of reward in some form to assemble upon the grass in front of the White House in acceptance of the President's invitation, where he might address his farmer countrymen through these delegates.

The able Senator, following the submission of his resolution, leaves the intimation that from some sources will naturally come some information as to those who have besought these gentlemen by some method, sir, either of present financial emolument or the prospect of some future reward, to come here to the city; and we gather that such reward, if it is to be paid at all, is to be paid out of a fund which the able Senator, in his resolution, indicates exists.

Now I submit to the able Senator, if he were to appear in a courtroom or in this honorable body in denial of a slander upon himself, addressing on the Senate floor here his constituency at home, and there were those who intimated that he had come because he had been paid to arrive and that somewhere there was some reward waiting him for that which he was saying and for what he is doing, how quickly would he exclaim, "Oh, the array of liars!"

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read the resolution which has been offered by the Senator from Delaware but am I correct in assuming that it only deals with this assembly of farmers on the south side of the White House yesterday?

Mr. LEWIS. I must answer my able friend that, as I caught the reading of the resolution, it seemed to deal with those who assembled, whether they assembled on the south side or the north side I am unable to say, but I note that the disturbance in the bosom of my able friend from Delaware is that they assembled for and on the right side. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I was anxious to know whether the resolution covered a similar inquiry with respect to the meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce a few days ago, which met on the opposite side of the White House from that occupied by the farmers yesterday, and which adopted some resolutions which I have not heard our distinguished friend from Delaware criticize up to this date.

Mr. LEWIS. I was about to allude to that, sir, and I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky.

I remind my honorable friend from Delaware that his clear intimation—contained in the resolution that these men have been paid to come to the city and that somewhere there is a reward for their presence, is made at a place where none of these men can answer, where none of them are allowed to speak, and where, in the very nature of things, the President of the United States can have no knowledge of the attack of the Senator because the President would hardly descend to recognize it in view of the conditions under which it has been delivered to the Senate. The men to whom it alludes have no place in this body to reply, and the Secretary of Agriculture can only answer, if at all, providing the resolution itself is approved by the Senate as properly being addressed to him. I ask my able friend does he not recognize that the resolution tendered by him, coming from one so high in authority in his party as well as from one so high in this honorable assemblage as himself becomes an intimation to the public that he

must have some knowledge that these men have had their expenses paid; that they have been lured to come here, in appearance to give applause and approval to the President's action, and that their attitude here is one that has been purchased by some form. If the able Senator has no knowledge on such questions, an intimation of that kind, when properly read, comes within the designation used by the President in his speech, which was a little less than the expression used by Horace Greeley in retort to similar intimations of slander—

You lie, you villian, you lie!

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator said that the farmers were on the "right side" of the White House.

Mr. LEWIS. I hope so; I assume so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And the Senator from Kentucky said that the chamber of commerce met on the opposite side. Does either Senator imply, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, that the chamber of commerce met on the "left." [Laughter.] I am prompted to ask the Senator that question, because when I first came to the Senate Senators were talking of right and wrong, and now they are talking of "right" and "left."

Mr. LEWIS. I may answer the able Senator and say, so far as I am concerned, I observed that the honorable body called "chamber of commerce", assembled, and I observed the resolution they adopted referred to by the Senator from Kentucky. I do not know who paid the expenses of the members when they arrived here; I do not know what particular potent force in this Republic induced them to come or seduced them to the slanders contained in their resolutions. I answer my able friend from Minnesota, and say I do not know whether they are "right" or whether they are "left", but whatever they left was not "right" and what they left has not been regarded anywhere as "right." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I again invite the able Senator from Delaware to regard the effect his resolution and its intimations will have upon the American mind; that is, that somewhere there must have been some conduct that suggested a fund for the purchasing of these men to come here and some inducement from some source that caused their visit to the President, and that the President was aware of what he must have known to be a conspiracy to bring these gentlemen here for the purposes of their visit. Since the able Senator has no information to justify such an intimation, I ask him does he not realize that that is the very impression his resolution will create upon the public mind? Since that is clearly the intimation, I ask the Senator now, has he any information anywhere to justify him in making the intimation contained in his resolution? If so, will he please now reveal the information and its source?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, in answer to that question, I desire to say that I have no knowledge except the general attitude of this administration upon that and like subjects. I am satisfied that this administration has in the past used money appropriated for public purposes to produce an effect upon the country that the administration was doing greater things than it was actually doing. I am surprised that anybody should at this moment, at this late day, raise any question about it. It has been the practice so long that I think I am correct in assuming that it is a fact—and I am seeking to find out by this resolution definitely whether I can get an admission from the Secretary of Agriculture to that effect.

With respect to being an insult to the Department, it cannot be; that is the farthest thing from my mind; but these farmers have been receiving under Secretary Wallace this year and last year and year before last large sums of money for doing nothing. Certainly if that be true, it would be no hardship on them and no reflection upon them if I should charge—which I do not do definitely, because I do not know definitely—that they are being paid money to come to Washington to see this great President who has been doing these great things for them. I say if I actually charged that, certainly they would not be insulted; it would be no reflection upon people who have been getting money from this great President for doing nothing. I do not see that I have reflected upon them at all, and I am sorry that my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has put any such interpretation as that upon the resolution under the circumstances.

Mr. LEWIS. I recognize the abnegation of my eminent friend and the withdrawal by him of all the intimations he intended to cast upon the President and upon the country, and I would that his apology had been thought of before he had allowed this resolution to be presented under his authority. When the able Senator says he has no knowledge save a very general knowledge upon this subject, I must answer that if he has no more special knowledge as to that then he has general knowledge as to the righteousness of the President; it indicates that he has no knowledge of any kind nor of any nature touching the President or what he is doing.

But my able friend says that all he knows is that "for a long time" the "passing out of money" in different directions has been the custom. Since the administration has only been in power a little more than 2 years, then "the long time" that my eminent friend knows about must have been under his own administrations and, of course, he would have complete knowledge as to them; but it does not mean anything of the kind has prevailed as to the present administration. So, I consent to accept his confession as to the administrations of his party purchasing those who came to praise their efforts and applaud their schemes; but as to us, I accept his announcement now that he has no proof whatsoever, but tenders a resolution which I insist is an unhappy intimation of affront to these farmers who honestly came to seek relief for their people and present their petition of grievances and to receive the welcome of the President of the United States. The President invited them to the White House grounds as his guests, as he invited those to whom my eminent friend from Kentucky made reference, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, likewise, to visit him and accept the courtesy of the White House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The skepticism, the suspicion, and the agnosticism of the Senator from Delaware are not difficult to understand. During the period when his party was in control of the country the farmers did not make enough money to enable them to save sufficient to come to Washington, but now that they are receiving prices that enable them to get away from their farms, and beyond the county line, they are able to come to Washington whenever they see fit, for whatever purpose may bring them here. The Senator from Delaware ought not to be held accountable for the fact that he is not sufficiently up to date to realize that fact.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, repelling the Delaware Senator's allusion to these farmers and the accusation that they really came here under the sway of money that had been advanced from source to bring them here, leaving the intimation that such money must have come from the Public Treasury as a compensation, and that the hand that had drawn it forth from the Treasury was the hand necessarily of an injudicious robber—for such person would have to use the public funds without authority—let me remind the Senator that, while it may be, as the able Senator intimates, that there has gone forth money from the Government to aid these farmers in distress, such as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has alluded to, it was in the process of ordered and orderly government.

The able Senator from Delaware, as chairman of the senatorial committee of his eminent party, my distinguished rival, as I hold the similar position within my own party, has frequently held forth to the country, and during the campaign of 1934, both by speech and through the press, asserted that the relief money which was being paid then to the

farmers, to these producers, was in the form of a bribe for votes and was used in purchasing votes.

This slander which this eminent able leader of his party at that time left upon the American mind as against the people was responded to by the people at the election, and when the ballots were counted it was found that they had repudiated the affront and had returned to the United States Senate and House of Representatives the largest majority of one party representatives ever known to political parties, certainly since the Civil War. I ask my friend from that lesson has he not learned that similar intimations, such as made in this resolution, are likely to bring upon him and his party similar crisis? I ask him to consider if these honorable men, the guests of the President, would not scorn the intimation made against the President and themselves, and that they would not highly regard him who has left upon them the affront and the slander which now will attach to them in view of this resolution being offered by a Senator of the United States.

I take it the able Senator is correct. He did not mean to leave that impression—and since he said it was not his intent, I suggest but one other duty upon his part, and that is to withdraw the resolution and confess the affront regrettably by withdrawing his resolution, and thus make amends to these people, to the President, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have secured a copy of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. I have been interested in his disavowal of his resolution in his colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Let us see what the Senator from Delaware wants to do. He does not have any "whereases" in his resolution, and I am surprised at that. The resolution reads:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate any and all correspondence in his Department touching the gathering of some three or four thousand farmers in the city of Washington during the last 2 or 3 days; whether any instructions had been given by him, or any person in his Department, or any of the various county agents or farm organizations receiving Federal aid, with respect to getting these farmers to come to Washington; how the particular group was selected and by whom; and the purpose of having the said farmers come to Washington at this particular time; and

Resolved further, That the Secretary of Agriculture give to the Senate all information in his possession with respect to any cost borne by the Federal Government directly or indirectly in meeting the expenses of the farmers gathered as aforesaid.

Mr. President, how any Senator can give any consideration to that resolution except to conclude that it is a direct reflection on all the farmers who came to Washington, I cannot conceive. The intimation is that because several thousand farmers have come to Washington at this particular time there is some sinister or some corrupt or some secret motive or cause underlying their visit.

I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware that there are about 700 farmers here from my own State. I have been in contact with a great many of them since they have been here. If it will at all enlighten the Senator, if he will give any credence to secondary evidence, I desire to say to him that the farmers from Texas who are here have told me that their expenses were paid by the farmers contributing in each county and each locality 50 cents or a dollar each, and after the money was contributed the local organizations elected certain delegates to represent the county to come with this delegation to Washington—to come for what?

They are not coming demanding favors, as so often the constituents of the Senator from Delaware come, but they have come to Washington in order that the country may know that they appreciate the fact that the present administration, of all the administrations we have had in recent times, has somewhat vindicated its campaign promises to agriculture and has had a real farm program.

That is the head and front of their offending, if there be such. The head and the front of the offending of these farmers in coming to Washington has been that they have come to the Capital City, where the Government sits, to express their gratitude and appreciation, not for something that is expected in the future, but for the fact that the Government has dealt fairly with them in the past.

For that cause they come, and the Senator from Delaware by his resolution proceeds to smear them over with suspicion; he must daub them all about with the implication that they have been subsidized to come here; that there is some political motive back of their coming. They have come from practically every State in the Union. I dare say there are farmers here from Delaware. I dare say they came at their own expense. I dare say the farmers from Delaware did not come at the expense of the Chamber of Commerce of Delaware.

Senators, the ridiculous features of the resolution of the Senator from Delaware are revealed when we stop to think a moment. When did the Senator from Delaware ever introduce a resolution of inquiry to find out who paid the expenses, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], of the chambers of commerce who came here? The Senator from Delaware does not want to know about that because he already knows why they came. He knows they came, perhaps paying their expenses with their own money, for a selfish and greedy purpose. He knew they came either to obtain more favors from the Government or to try to prevent someone else being accorded some consideration at the hands of the Government; so he does not inquire about the chambers of commerce. He knows why they came.

Does the Senator from Delaware inquire why the lobbyists come and who pay the expenses of the lobbyists who beset us in the corridors from time to time and appear before our committees? No. He knows who pays their expenses. He knows that the Secretary of Agriculture does not pay them; so he does not ask the Secretary of Agriculture if he paid the expenses of any of the lobbyists.

I am wondering if the Senator from Delaware ever inquired who paid the expenses of the munition makers who hang around the Navy Department and the War Department? I wonder if he ever inquired who pays their expenses? No. He knows who pays their expenses. He knows that the munition makers and their masters pay their own expenses. Why? Because they think it is a good investment to pay a little expense now in order to obtain great profit later on.

I wonder if the Senator from Delaware, who comes from a shipping State, has ever inquired by resolution or otherwise who pays the expenses of the representatives of the shipping interests who hang around the Merchant Marine Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and who crowd the corridors and lobbies of the Shipping Board and the Department of Commerce? Who pays their expenses when they come to Washington? The Senator from Delaware does not inquire. He already knows.

But it is different when some farmers come here, most of whom have never before been to Washington, most of whom were delighted at the opportunity to come to their capital city for the first time, and were glad to come as delegates, not representing some cold corporate interest, but representing their own fellow citizens, their own farmer neighbors, who out of their meager earnings were willing to contribute 50 cents or $1 or $1.50 in order to send delegates here; not to go back with their grips full of loot, not to go back with their trunks crammed with favors, not to go back with the blood of our sons on their hands in the form of profits to munition makers, and with ship subsidies of all kinds. When they come simply to say to the Government, "We come here representing the farmers of America to say to you that we are grateful for what you have already done", then the Senator's feelings of sublimated purity, his rarefied emotions of fear that somebody is going to "put something over" on the Government, become so agitated, so aroused that he boldly proclaims that some malevolent movement is going to be undertaken against the interests of the Government. We must find out who brought these dangerous people to Washington. [Laughter.] Whence comes the great subsidy that bought a reduced-rate railroad ticket for a round trip, limited to 4 days? Who is it that is

making it possible for this embattled group of farmers to come to the National Capital? What business have they here? Let them go back to the farms where they ought to stay! What right have they to come to Washington?

It is true that the Senator from Delaware had no idea that any farmer had enough money to journey to Washington [laughter], and he did not under Mr. Hoover and under the benevolent administration of the Senator from Delaware; so they had to take up assessments. Most of these farmers had to come here through the bounty and through the favor of their own neighbors and citizens. I am not speaking for the other States. The rumor and the story circulating among all the farmers I have contacted are that that is the way they all came; but I know how the farmers from Texas came to Washington. The Senators from Texas are not afraid to have their farmer constituents come up and see them, and see how they are performing their duties. I marvel that the Senator from Delaware is afraid to have the farmers from Delaware come to Washington. Why should they not come here?

Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware wants all the correspondence in the Department of Agriculture about this trip. Of course, we all know what the motive of the Senator is. The Senator is the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, and he has what I consider the very foolish idea that by attacking the farmers through Secretary Wallace he can gain some political advantage. I do not concede it to be a sound policy, however, even in behalf of the Republicans, to attack the entire agricultural population of our Nation for the sake of gaining a few votes among chambers of commerce.

The Senator probably already has the chambers of commerce, or a large part of them, rounded up, and he has already proved his subserviency to them. It was not necessary for him again to come forth and denounce the farmers to ingratiate himself with the chambers of commerce, or at least with the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, this resolution cannot be viewed in any other light than as a practical insult to the delegation of farmers who have come to Washington. It implies a crime. It implies that somebody has violated the law. It implies that the Secretary of Agriculture has embezzled the funds of the United States, because, so far as I know, we have passed no law authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, or anybody else, to pay the railroad fare and expenses of delegations of farmers to come to Washington. So, the resolution implies that the Secretary of Agriculture has embezzled the funds of the United States, and it also implies that the farmers who have come here are parties to that criminal act, and that they and the Secretary of Agriculture have conspired together to rob the Treasury of the United States.

How else can the resolution be construed? No other construction is possible. The Senator from Delaware does not charge, it is true, but the implication is there that some persons, without warrant of law, in violation of the statute, against all canons of integrity and of honest and fair dealing, have conspired to rob the Treasury of the United States. So, evidently, according to the attitude of the Senator from Delaware, all of the three or four thousand farmers who have come to Washington from all parts of the Union are under suspicion; and if he had his way he would probably send them to the Federal grand jury for investigation to see whether or not they have in fact defrauded the Government of public funds.

Mr. President, this is one of the most unheard-of and unusual and remarkable documents to be introduced in the Senate that has ever come within my knowledge. I cannot understand the motives of the Senator from Delaware. Can it be that he has lost his political bearings? Can it be that he has lost his sense of direction, that he has lost his sense of orientation? I am afraid that in his desperate state of mind, in his wandering in the political woods now for more than 2 years, he has lost his sense of proportion. I caution him as a friend—not a political friend, but as a personal friend—to get a grip on himself and not allow himself to be swept away by these fatuous, alluring, fantastic things that might lead him into the bog.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to ask the Senator from Texas if he will not ask unanimous consent to have the resolution voted upon immediately.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. LONG. I object.

Mr. CONNALLY. In fairness to the Senator from Delaware, I think he ought to hear what has been said. The Senator from South Carolina has suggested that the Senator from Texas ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration and for a vote on the resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I object.

Mr. CONNALLY. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. For an immediate vote upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For an immediate vote upon the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG. I object.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to ask the Senator from Delaware whether he is willing to have an immediate vote on the resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. I assumed that there would be no objection to the resolution.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator who submits the resolution asks for a vote upon it. The Senator from Texas asks for a vote upon it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I assume that there will be no objection by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], or anybody else. I have merely asked the Secretary of Agriculture, which is nothing unusual, to furnish to the Senate information with respect to a certain public matter; that is all.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WAGNER. If an immediate vote should be ordered by the Senate, would that in any way affect the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. May I ask if there was any objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the RECORD show as to who objected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] interposed an objection to the request of the Senator.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I do not want this political faux pas to get in the way of the Wagner labor bill. Let us go on with the Wagner labor bill and then bring up this resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is perfectly willing to have a vote taken now on the resolution. Has the Senator from Louisiana taken charge of the Wagner bill?

Mr. LONG. If there is no debate to be had, nothing except a plain vote, I have no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was my request.

Mr. BYRNES and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be voted upon without debate.

Mr. LONG. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the resolution be voted upon without debate. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McNARY. The resolution has been read, and it properly should follow the usual parliamentary procedure—lie on the table and come up at some future day in the morning hour.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the author of the resolution asks for a vote at this time, may I ask the Senator from Oregon if he will not permit the resolution to be voted upon?

Mr. McNARY. That does not alter the case at all.

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not ask that.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Oregon objects to a vote upon the resolution at this time?

Mr. McNARY. I have stated my proposition. The resolution has been read. It goes over for the day under the rule. It remains on the table. At an appropriate time, when we have a morning hour and the calendar is considered, it may come up.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Oregon certainly understands the resolution. It has been debated. It is easily understood, and the Senate is ready to vote upon it. Will not the Senator from Oregon withdraw the objection, and let us vote?

Mr. McNARY. I insist on my objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon objects. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much regret that the Senator from Oregon interposed an objection to immediate consideration of the resolution. I thought the Senator from Delaware was so close to the councils of the minority leadership that if he really wanted any information, and was so anxious to get it, we could have an immediate vote, and his sleuths could be out by sundown with their searchlights and their other detective paraphernalia, before these farmers leave town, and they could search them and see if they have anything left on them. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Visitors in the galleries must not show signs of approval or disapproval. They are here as guests of the Senate, and may remain only so long as they observe the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HASTINGS. I assumed that there would be no objection. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon concluded that there was about to be an objection. When the request was made, I assumed that it was to adopt the resolution. If it was to kill the resolution, I should not want that done. I should like to talk about the resolution for a while.

Mr. CONNALLY. All we asked was a vote.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the Senators on the other side of the Chamber are satisfied to adopt the resolution, very well; but if those on the other side of the Chamber are not going to let the Senate have the information requested in the resolution we will let it go over until some other day, and discuss it a little while longer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my recollection was that when the Senator from Delaware presented the resolution earlier in the day he asked for its immediate consideration, and upon the suggestion of some Member on the floor of the Senate it was proposed to have it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HASTINGS. No; I did not make any such request. I merely asked that the resolution be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Delaware assumes an impregnable position when he says that he is perfectly willing to agree if we do everything he wants done.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why does the Senator from Texas object if there is nothing contained in the resolution which reflects upon the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is something in the resolution which reflects on him.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is the Senator from Texas afraid of the facts? Is that what is the matter with him?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then, let us adopt the resolution, and let us get the facts.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what we want to do.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do you want to adopt it, or to kill it?

Mr. CONNALLY. We want to vote on it. We want to vote on the resolution. If the Senate votes it up, very well; if it votes it down, very well. I am only one Member of the Senate.

Mr. HASTINGS. How is the Senator from Texas going to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HASTINGS. Is the Senator going to vote for the resolution, or is he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is ready to vote now.

Mr. HASTINGS. For the resolution, or against it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to vote. Does the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator want to vote against the resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator's question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then answer my question, and I will know what the Senator's position is.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is a very shrewd man. He wants everyone to promise in advance that he will vote for his resolution, and if one says "Yes", then he will let it come up, but if one says that he is not going to vote for it, then the Senator objects to it coming up, although it is his own resolution. It is his own baby, but he disowns it if anybody does not kiss it. [Laughter.]

If we could get an immediate vote on the resolution, and the Senate should adopt, as the Senate has a right to do, the Senator from Delaware would, of course, be appointed chairman of the investigating committee, and then before tonight's sun went down he could have all his sleuths, his investigating experts, and his heavy artillery, and the munitions that Delaware produces, if need be, and he could seize these farmers before they leave. Some of them will not leave until 6 or 7 o'clock tonight. He could search them.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. He could search them. He could go through them and find out whether they had on them any letters from the Department of Agriculture. He could look through them and see whether or not the Washington hotels had left them with a thin dime. [Laughter.]

And he could trace the money, perhaps, through the Treasury and discover whether it did, in fact, come out of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator has read the resolution, has read it to the Senate, and he knows it makes no such provision for an investigation by anybody. It is merely a resolution asking the Secretary of Agriculture to send to the Senate what information he has upon a certain subject. Why try to mislead people by misstating what the resolution provides?

Mr. CONNALLY. I know what it provides.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then why say something else? Why say that it provides for something it does not contemplate? The President used a very nasty word with respect to such a practice.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us see whether the Senator from Delaware means what he says. He says that all he wants by this resolution is to get a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not the Department furnished any money. Did he not say that?

Here is the morning paper, the Washington Herald, which the Senator from Delaware always reads, or ought to. [Laughter.] It says this:

A. A. A. Administrator Chester C. Davis categorically denied reports that departmental county agents had inspired the meeting, and Chester H. Day, leader of the demonstrators from Hale County, Tex., said the march "just grew like wildfire" and within 3 weeks brought the crowd into Washington, despite there was no organization, no money, and no planning.

If all the Senator from Delaware wants is a statement from the Department of Agriculture, he already has it. He had it before he offered his resolution.

Let us see. The Senator from Delaware is a great economist; he does not believe in spending Government money. All he wants is to have the Secretary of Agriculture tell him that the Secretary did not furnish any money to these farmers. Here he is taking up a great portion of the time of the Senate today with a resolution, when he could have telephoned the Secretary of Agriculture in 3 minutes. He has secretaries who get other people on the telephone. It would have delayed the Senator from Delaware just long enough to pick up the receiver and say, "Hello. This is the Senator from Delaware, chairman of the Republican Executive Campaign Committee. Is this Secretary Wallace?"

"This is Secretary Wallace."

"Mr. Secretary, did you furnish, directly or indirectly, any money to bring these farmers to Washington?"

The Secretary would have said, "No", and the soul of the Senator from Delaware would have been, he says, in peace; but, in fact, I think it would have been in a great state of disturbance, because he would not have had this opportunity to make a field day of this great crime.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Texas has already covered what was in my mind; a private conversation of that sort between the Republican chairman and the Secretary of Agriculture would have gotten no headlines in the newspapers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not if they kept it secret. It would not have gotten any headline, it would not have gotten into the RECORD, and he could not have franked it out to the people of Delaware. It is impossible to frank out a verbal conversation. It must be placed in the RECORD. No newspaperman is going to send in for a Senator and take him out to the President's room and talk to him about a private conversation about which he knows nothing. But if a Senator offers a resolution, that commands the attention of the correspondents. There is news in the air.

"Administration circles are rocked by the Hastings resolution."

"Hastings resolution creates great political furor."

"Wall Street tickers begin to record disturbance on the stock market."

[Laughter.]

"Great national scandal. Farmer caught with a dollar and a half in his pocket."

[Laughter.]

"Great suspicion that it came from the Department of Agriculture."

"It is well known in informed circles that the same farmer in 1932 did not have a red cent. [Laughter.] He now has $1.50, and it is believed that the money can be traced, at least indirectly, to the Treasury of the United States."

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the rains which have occurred in the West in the last few days, does the Senator suppose that the object of this resolution is to create another dust storm?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that if there is any Senator in this body who can create an intellectual dust storm, the Senator from Delaware is the man. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, since we cannot vote on the resolution, since the Senator's own organization on the other side of the aisle are trying to suppress this wonderful resolution, since his own leader, having better judgment than has the Senator from Delaware in political matters, knowing a great deal better how this foolish resolution is going to strike the country, says, "Senator, do not inflict this on us. Do not let us vote on this resolution of the Senator from Delaware." Will not the Senator between now and tomorrow at noon, when the Senate shall meet, call the Secretary of Agriculture? He certainly would not doubt the integrity of the Secretary if the Secretary told him he did not give any money to these farmers. Will he not call Mr. Chester Davis and ascertain the facts, and save the Senate and the country from this great hubbub? Why does he not get his party to have a conference tomorrow before the meeting of the Senate?

Mr. HASTINGS. The Senator from Texas has made more hubbub about this matter than has anybody else in his effort to try to prevent me from getting the desired information. Let the Senator from Texas get it for me and deliver it to me in the morning.

Mr. CONNALLY. Here it is in the newspaper now. The Senator does not want it.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is from Mr. Davis.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. If the Senator from Texas secures a written statement, or a verbal statement, from the Secretary of Agriculture before tomorrow noon, will the Senator drop his resolution?

Mr. HASTINGS. If he will answer the questions asked in the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. If! If! A moment ago the Senator from Delaware said that if I would get a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture he would let up. Now he is putting a lot of "ifs" in it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want answers to the question which I have asked. I do not want the Secretary's interpretation. I want him to give me the facts.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will call him over the telephone he will not only get answers to all his questions——

Mr. HASTINGS. Let the Senator get them for me, and save me the trouble.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not the Senator's secretary. I am glad to accommodate the Senator wherever possible. The Senator from Texas has been here only a short time. He tries to observe the ancient and honorable rules of this body and the rules of courtesy toward Senators, but, frankly, I do not regard it as quite within the compulsion of those canons of conduct for one Senator to ask another Senator to perform a task that is considered to be one for secretaries, or telephone operators, or attachés about the office. I do not think it is quite fair for one Senator to ask another to perform such a service for him.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator's secretary call Mr. Wallace, or let his doorkeeper or someone else call the Secretary, and then talk to the Senator.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is shedding crocodile tears about this resolution when he could leave the floor now and in a few minutes get me the information, which would be a lot less trouble than making this speech and trying to amuse the galleries with it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that I will be willing to excuse him right now, and while I am finishing my remarks he can go out and get the Secretary on the telephone and settle the matter before I conclude.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. The Senator from Delaware has referred to the Senator from Texas as stirring up a hubbub, as he says. The Senator from Texas may have

had something to do with the hub, but most of it was the bub furnished by the Senator from Delaware. [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not heard all this discussion——

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator ought to be thankful.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But I desire to ask the Senator from Texas if the Senator from Delaware has included in his resolution the investigation of the recent statement of the United States Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that that has been adverted to heretofore, and I think the RECORD fails to show that there has been any concern or any effort on the part of the Senator from Delaware to secure information on that point.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. For the information of the Senator from Alabama, I should like to inform him that my information is that there are 700 people from Texas in the Senate gallery.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not that many.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the Senator from Texas is trying to put on a show for them. That is the information which has come to me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to know what kind of a show the Senator from Delaware is putting on.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is ungracious for the Senator from Delaware to attack the Senator from Texas because once in a lifetime some of the constituents of the Senator from Texas have visited Washington. When they do come to Washington they want to see the sights. They look at the Library of Congress; they look at the Washington Monument; they want to come up to the Senate and see the curiosities here. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely desire to suggest that if there were 700 people in the Senate galleries from Delaware, there would not be anybody left in that State.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is ungracious of the Senator from Delaware to attack the Senator from Texas for making a few remarks on an occasion of this kind, when he says there are 700 Texans in the gallery. Of course, there are not that many. There may be some Texans in the galleries, and I hope there are. I want the people from Texas to see, now and then, with what the Senator from Texas has to contend in the Senate. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The Senator from Delaware is more blessed than is the Senator from Texas. When in Washington he lives only a short distance from his tiny State—tinier geographically than any other State but one, I believe—while mine covers more square miles of territory than any other State in the Union. But he lives nearby, and I dare say that not a day passes but that the Senator from Delaware may rear back with an expansive smile and beam on some constituent in the gallery. There is not a day when we are in session, no doubt, but that happens.

The Senator knows they are here; he knows when they are here; he knows why they are here; he knows what they are trying to take back with them when they come here. Yet because some of my farmers, who probably never have been to Washington before in their lives, come to Washington and visit the galleries, because they have the hardihood to sit in the galleries and view the proceedings here, the Senator from Delaware says the Senator from Texas is "putting on a show", when, if it had not been for the fact that the Senator from Delaware, ungracious host that he is, attacked the guests of the Government here in the gallery by a resolution reflecting upon their integrity, poking fun at them, and smearing them all over with suspicion, there would have been no occasion for the Senator from Texas to take the floor at all.

Mr. NEELY rose.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas admit that these farmers came here as guests of the Government?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the Senator from Texas admit that these farmers came here as guests of the Government?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas means that anybody who is in the gallery is a guest of the Senate. I said "the Government." This is a part of the Government under Democratic rule. [Laughter in the galleries.] I said that they are here as our guests. Of course the Senator from Texas did not mean that they came here all the way from Texas as the guests of the Government, and the Senator from Delaware knew that the Senator from Texas did not mean that.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Delaware reminds me of a sharp pettifogging—I will not say politician, but statesman, in making that kind of an insinuation.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I protest that the able Senator from Texas is not dealing generously with the senior Senator from Delaware—the State that is a little larger than a postage stamp. The Senator from Delaware was an important part of the Hoover administration. During that administration the World War veterans came here, just as the farmers recently came here from Texas and various other States. Mr. Hoover called out the Army, and with bayonets and bombs the veterans were driven out of Washington. The Senator from Texas ought to be thankful that the Senator from Delaware does not demand that war be waged against the farmers.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for that contribution to the debate. Of course, I do not really, sincerely believe that the Senator from Delaware wants to call out the Army to evict the farmers. When the ex-soldiers came here everybody knew they did not have any money. They came without any funds whatever. I do not think the Senator from Delaware would want to eject these farmers from the city until he knew that they did not have anything left.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to denounce this resolution as an unwarranted and unjustified and baseless reflection upon every farmer who has come to Washington, upon the Secretary of Agriculture, upon Chester C. Davis, the Agricultural Administrator, and everyone connected with the Department of Agriculture.

REGULATION OF PUBLIC-UTILITY HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate briefly to the report from the Interstate Commerce Committee on the proposed Public Utilities Act of 1935, the bill known as the "holding-company bill." The committee has filed a very exhaustive report on this bill, setting forth the numerous changes in the bill as originally introduced, which were made by the committee, and also has set forth in its report a description of every paragraph in the bill, and what effect the proposed legislation will have upon the utilities industry as a whole. I especially call it to the attention of Senators, and ask them to read it, because there has been so much misinformation sent out with respect to the bill.

I expect to call up the bill for early consideration as soon as I possibly can have it considered by the Senate.

SHARE OUR WEALTH

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, about 4 weeks ago—will the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] give me his attention just a moment and then he can leave the Chamber if he wishes—about 4 weeks ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made speeches over the radio in which they referred to the program and the plan which I have supported since I have been in Congress—the problem and the proposition to limit the wealth of the large fortune holders and to guarantee something to the smaller people.

The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky both stated, as I read their remarks, that it would be impossible for me to draw legislation to cover the proposi-

tions I have submitted. Unfortunately both those Senators have not kept up with the proceedings of this body. Legislation had been drawn in the last session of Congress to cover practically everything proposed by this plan, but it has not been seen by the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Arkansas, or else they would not have asked the questions they did ask.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Kentucky saw the bill or resolution referred to by the Senator as having been introduced in the last Congress, which has not been introduced in this Congress, but, very far from setting out any plan, it was merely a resolution or a bill requesting the Finance Committee to do what he evidently could not do—draw a bill along the lines of his discussion. Moreover, neither then nor since did the Senator himself furnish the Finance Committee any draft of a measure from which the Finance Committee could begin to work, or, if it desired itself to initiate legislation on the subject, from which it might obtain any idea as to the Senator's proposition.

Mr. LONG. The Senator did not look far enough because there were bills drawn, as well as a resolution. There were bills drawn covering most of the things I have advocated. However, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] have rather sneeringly referred to the phrase "share our wealth." The Senator from North Carolina, amidst the smiles of the Senators from Kentucky and Arkansas, referred to the "share-our-wealth dog."

I desire to give them to understand where the "share-our-wealth" phrase was first used. I want them to understand that that "share-our-wealth" phrase did not come from the senior Senator from Louisiana, but was the phrase and promise of the present President of the United States in his acceptance speech delivered at the Chicago convention; and now, in order that I may start out right so that the Senators will understand what this whole thing is intended to effect, I will read from the President's acceptance speech at Chicago, page 383 of the Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention of 1932—and I am quoting Mr. Roosevelt:

Throughout the Nation—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for order. I am very anxious to hear what the Senator from Louisiana has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is so seldom that we hear the Senator from Louisiana that I do not wish to miss anything.

Mr. LONG. I do not mind conversation, but I do not want my colleagues to go to the point in their conversation where I cannot hear myself talk. I talked so much on yesterday that I cannot talk very loud today.

Throughout the Nation, men and women, forgotten in the political philosophy of the Government of the last years look to us here for guidance and for more equitable opportunity to share—

S-h-a-r-e—

in the distribution of national wealth. [Applause and cheering.]

My friend from Kentucky was the keynoter of that convention. He forgot all about it and went on the radio to denounce "share-our-wealth" the other night. He has become disloyal to the party. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. LONG. No; not now.

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

Mr. LONG. I will yield in just a minute.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be too late for me to answer what the Senator is saying now.

Mr. LONG. All right; go ahead, since I have been interrupted.

Mr. BARKLEY. I not only did not depart from the speech which I had the honor to make as temporary chairman of the convention, but I did not depart from the language of the President in accepting the nomination. I challenge the Senator from Louisiana or anybody else to place any such interpretation on that language as is indicated by his proposition about which he speaks so often and so vociferously.

Mr. LONG. I am coming to that!

"Share our wealth", "share our national wealth", "share in the distribution of wealth", were the phrases of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he accepted the nomination in Chicago. I want my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], my friend from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and my friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]—and I have sent for the Senator from Arkansas, because I am replying to the charge he made against me in his radio speech at some gathering or some club or chamber of commerce or some other something where they send for Senators to speak to them and give some sum somewhere between $50 and $150 to listen to us. I want these friends of mine to realize when I first adopted that phrase for our organization. It is a pretty big organization in this country, Mr. President. It is in every State in the Union. It has thousands of members in every State. It has probably millions in some States, not counting, of course, that they may not all be voters. There may be many below the voting age. But the "share our wealth" phrase was the promise—yes; I said the "promise"—the "share our wealth" phrase was the promise of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Chicago convention when he accepted the nomination.

It is true that men like the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Carolina have been denouncing everybody in the Senate and everywhere else who still advocates what the people were led to believe they were going to get by the promise made at the Chicago convention. Nonetheless there are a few of us who are still clinging to the tenets of that platform and the pledges made in that convention, beginning with the promise made by Franklin D. Roosevelt at that convention.

What is a platform for? What is a party promise for? What the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] ought to be out here doing, what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] ought to be out here doing, is apologizing to the people for not having carried out that promise made at that convention, instead of trying to ridicule somebody because he is insisting upon that promise being carried out as made at that convention. Instead of doing that they are speaking over the radio, talking, I understand, in terms of denunciation of the proposal to redistribute wealth in this country, saying that it is dishonorable, praising the President with one breath and condemning with the next breath someone who insists upon the thing being done and the promise being kept, and at the same time condemning again someone who does not agree with them and the President for failing to keep the pledge made to the people at the Chicago convention.

There is the "share our wealth" declaration. So much for that.

A short time ago a New York daily newspaper decided it was going to prove that all these statements I had been making about the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few were not true; so they sent a man to Washington to investigate and see whether or not there was any need to redistribute wealth in the United States. The New York Daily News, I understand, has the largest circulation of any paper in the United States. I do not know whether that is true or not. I am told by some of my newspaper friends that the paper which I hold in my hand has the largest circulation of any paper in New York, this Daily News. It is owned by men who come from the millionaire and multimillionaire ranks. It is owned by the multimillionaire families.

The Daily News said that having heard a speech which I delivered in reply to Gen. Hugh Johnson, in which I said that 4 percent of the people owned 85 percent of the wealth and that 96 percent of the people of America live below the poverty line—this newspaper said that having heard that statement by me it was going to send its investigators to Washington, D. C., to prove that the statements I had made

were false and untrue, and, like the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said, like the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] said, and like the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] intimates, this newspaper was going to prove that this talk of HUEY P. LONG about the concentration of wealth and the necessity for the redistribution of wealth was untrue and impossible. So they sent their man down here. They say they sent one of the best economists and investigators there was in the United States. What did he do?

Here is the New York News and I am going to read from it. They made the investigation as they announced, to prove that what I said was untrue, to prove that such men as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] knew what he was talking about, and to prove that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] knew what he was talking about. They had some help and here is the help they got from the biggest paper in America.

I read from the New York Daily News of April 11, 1935. Here is the headline of this editorial.

This is an important editorial, especially for newspaper editors.

That is the headline.

When HUEY LONG in his "share the wealth" reply to General Johnson said that 1 percent of Americans own 59 percent of America's wealth, while 4 percent own between 85 percent and 95 percent of the wealth, we knew he was a liar.

They are using the President's word. [Laughter.]

In other words, said this newspaper, when I said that 1 percent owned 59 percent of the wealth, and 4 percent owned 85 percent, "we knew he was a liar."

I read on:

We intimated as much, and added that somebody ought to look into this question and get the true figures on American wealth distribution in order to refute this demagogue, LONG.

The News then assigned one of its most competent investigators, Lowell Limpus, to the job of digging up the figures. About Limpus' character and qualifications for such a job it should be recorded that he is not a sentimentalist, is not suffused, for instance, with the conviction that when a white-collar person loses his job he should be taken by the hand by a paternalistic government and taught eurythmic dancing. Limpus is a realist. He was a West Pointer, in fact, and West Pointers are not noted for their sentimentality toward the poor, the rich, or anybody else.

And so Lowell Limpus went to Washington and worked for weeks in the Library of Congress and elsewhere to root up the true figures with which to confound LONG.

The results of that research are now being published in the News. And to the consternation of many people (including ourselves when we first heard of them), the results of that research show that LONG had essentially the correct dope.

Now, get that. After all the cartoons you have been seeing, all the ridicule you have been seeing, all the calumny you have been seeing, and all the flannel-mouthed speeches over the radio by these distinguished men all over the country that all that HUEY P. LONG was saying was untrue, false, and ridiculous, and an appeal to passion and prejudice—after all that, here comes the biggest newspaper in the United States and says, "After weeks and months of investigation, we find that every living word that he says is correct."

Of course this is not going to convince the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. It would not do him any good. We do not expect it to do him any good. We have other ways of getting these reforms. If we waited for votes to come from men of conservative leaning, who never have been able to see the truth until it was too late, we should never hope for these reforms to come.

But I read further.

The results of that research show that LONG had essentially the correct dope. He was wrong in some details.

They say:

He was wrong in some details, and we still think HUEY LONG a dangerous little demagogue—

They say, "He has the facts all right. What he says is essentially true, but we are still afraid of him, because he is telling the truth about the thing"; but, none the less, they say it is so.

Now, wait until I go a little further:

But his assertions about where the money power is lodged in this country are substantially borne out by figures compiled and buried away from McKinley's time till now.

In other words, this paper wants it understood that it does not want to claim to be kinfolks with me, and I do not need to claim to be kinfolks with them. I do not need any newspaper myself. I can stay in office or out of office without one. Now, here is what they say:

The gist of the Limpus findings is this:

And they quote Limpus' findings:

More than 96 percent of the workers in the United States receive less than the $2,000 a year which is regarded as "sufficient only for basic necessities."

According to the United States Federal Trade Commission, in 1926, 1 percent of the people dying did own 59 percent of the wealth reported; and since that time the rich—

Get this:

And since that time—

Since 1926, when 1 percent of the people owned 59 percent of the wealth—since that time, says this paper—

Since that time the rich have been getting richer in proportion, and the poor poorer.

In other words, I have understated the truth. I have not stated it as bad as it is, according to this newspaper. My statement that 1 percent owned 59 percent of the wealth is not accurate. On the contrary, 1 percent own a great deal more than 59 percent; and still the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have not yet seen the light. They have been in the Congress of the United States for 20 years—about that long, I guess—and if they were kept here 20 more years, until 15 men owned 99 percent, they never would be able to see what this thing is all about. They just simply were not brought up right to this kind of politics, and they never will be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Thank God! [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I thank God for that myself. It has been my good political fortune to have blind men like these in politics. I have gone as far as I have, with my limited ability, due to the fact that my enemies had less foresight than I had. I have very little foresight, and they have less; but they are worse off than I am, for they have not even got hindsight. [Laughter.] They cannot see something after it has passed over them, and they have been knocked down by it half a dozen times.

I read on from this editorial:

When Limpus discovered that such was the picture of wealth distribution in the United States, he wired the News that his data would prove very startling, and that probably his findings could not be published.

Get that! When he found out that he was going to have to say to the Daily News, "Instead of my reporting back to you that the figures of HUEY LONG are incorrect, I am going to have to give you figures showing that he is not only telling the truth, but that the times in this country are a good deal worse than even he said they were", he wired to the paper and said: "Probably you do not want my figures, because they are going to be very startling"; and this paper says so. But, says this paper:

It was decided, after some deliberation, to publish them nevertheless. That decision was made on the ground that the ostrich act of sticking our heads in the sand, blinding ourselves to facts, will only do us harm in the long run. To suppress these facts might damper down some unrest for a while. But it is these facts which are causing the unrest.

And even then they are 18 years in finding it out. Eighteen years ago the Industrial Relations Committee reported to the Congress of the United States that it was the distribution of the wealth to such a large extent into the hands of the few that was causing the trouble in America.

The eventual kick-back would be much more serious if the facts continued to be kept under cover.

And they are ominous facts. It has happened time and again that when a nation's wealth has become concentrated in too few hands, and ways of redistributing part of it peaceably have not been worked out—

Get this, now, will you? Listen to me, you so-called "conservatives." Listen to me, you so-called "defenders of truth." Listen to me, you who have stood on this floor and said that your father was a Baptist minister. Since you want to be concerned with truth, perhaps the Baptist minister was not the only man who ought to have told the truth. The son of the Baptist minister might want to tell the truth sometimes himself. Who knows but that he would? Now, listen to me while I give you the figures:

And they are ominous facts. It has happened time and again that when a nation's wealth has become concentrated in too few hands, and ways of redistributing part of it peaceably have not been worked out, ways of redistributing it by violence have been adopted in time, as in France and Russia.

Says this biggest newspaper of the United States:

America has got to redistribute the wealth of this country into the hands of the people, one way or the other.

Says this newspaper:

If you do not redistribute the wealth that is in the hands of the few people, and put this money into the hands of people who need it, it will either be done by peaceable means or it will be done by bloodshed, as it was in France and Russia.

And this is the biggest newspaper owned by multimillionaire families in the United States of America.

And as long as mass purchasing power stays down and continues to shrink there will be overproduction of the bathtubs, cars, radios, etc., which we like to think are elements in the American standard of living.

Mr. President, I am not going to read more of these newspaper editorials and articles, but there are some several of them here. Here is one, for instance, published on the 8th day of April, which says:

Four percent own 87 percent of the United States, news survey shows.

I shall now go to something else. Somebody says that they are trying to defend the farm folks. I am not one who objects to farmers coming to Washington, D. C. I am only sorry that more of them could not come, and that so few of them have ever been here. It is a sad thing that, even with the few who did come here this time, according to my understanding, in the various communities the neighbors had to chip in so that they could pay the way of one man to Washington.

In a little community near where I live the farmers wanted one of their number to come. It cost $48.75 for a round-trip ticket, and the whole community chipped in two or three dollars apiece so that one farmer out of the whole community might come on this train here to Washington and see Congress and see the President of the United States.

Somebody says they brought 400 of them from Louisiana. According to a Washington newspaper, when President Roosevelt, on the White House lawn, was denouncing people who criticized his program, someone spoke up and mentioned my name. That might have been true, but out of the 400 farmers they brought from Louisiana I would not have any trouble getting my part of the votes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. To whom does the Senator refer when he says "out of the 400 farmers they brought from Louisiana"?

Mr. LONG. The railroad. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The visitors in the galleries must conform to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator mean to imply that the railroads should not have brought them?

Mr. LONG. No; not if they paid them.

Mr. ROBINSON. There was a plain implication——

Mr. LONG. There was not.

Mr. ROBINSON. In the Senator's statement that somebody had influenced them to come here.

Mr. LONG. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to say that, according to my information, these farmers came because they wanted the opportunity of presenting their views in the Capital concerning a subject matter of legislation that is of interest to the farmers of the country.

Mr. LONG. That is what I just said. The Senator did not hear me, or he would not have had to get up and take up my time. I did not even yield to him, but he got up and talked anyway.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; if the Senator does not wish to yield, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. LONG. I do not object; but who has given anybody authority to get up and take charge?

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

Mr. LONG. Yes; when I am asked to.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator a while ago violated the very rule to which he refers by speaking while not even rising.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Louisiana does that all the time, but he thinks he has a patent or monopoly on that process.

Mr. LONG. I am sorry the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky, after having heard a few things read to them, are getting their ire aroused.

Mr. BARKLEY. My ire is not aroused. I was never in better humor in my life.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stated that a while ago I observed the Senator speaking out so that he could be heard all over the Senate without even rising, and I wondered if the same rule applied to him which he seeks to invoke toward others.

Mr. LONG. I do not think the Senator heard any such thing. If he did, I beg his pardon. I do not like to have anyone rise and just take charge of my speech. I always like to be asked.

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

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think any Senator has made a speech on this floor in the last 30 days but that the Senator from Louisiana has literally butted into the speech.

Mr. LONG. If I have done so, I have asked the President to ask the Senator to yield. If the Senator will look up the RECORD he will see that in each instance I asked the President to ask the Senator to yield.

Now, let us get along. We have more business to talk about than this matter. I said I was only too sorry that more of these farmers could not come, and I said that all these farmers were not able to pay their own way, but that their communities wanted someone to come, down in my section of the country, and they chipped in—in lots of cases—two or three dollars apiece—so that someone of their neighbors might come here and present their views, and go back home and tell them what they found out.

I rather approved that. The only objection I have is that instead of only 400 farmers being able to come here from Louisiana, I wish they could have brought several thousand. But they were not able to come, or no doubt they would have come. I do not see any objection to it.

I was talking about the concentration of wealth. I come back to where I was before being interrupted. Farmers have come here on a farm program. They have been told, and I have been told, we have all been told, that there is need to decrease the amount of farm products in this country. The Senator from Michigan made a speech the other day, but did not entirely catch the point. He and the Senator from Tennessee did not see the proposition I was trying to get to their minds at all. Now, I want to tell both of those Senators, and all the Senators, what it was.

There is not any overproduction in the United States—I hope Senators will hear what I am saying—there is not any overproduction in the United States of cotton or of corn or of wheat. There is not any overproduction of rice or beans or cattle. There is an underproduction of those products.

However, the farmers of Louisiana, of Iowa, and of Texas, and all other States, are gradually being stamped out of existence, they are being fed by means of the dole, they are having to receive a subsidy called a process tax in order to live. They are being told to plow under their cotton, they are being told to kill their hogs, they are being told to shoot the cows, they are being told to pour the milk into the river. Why? Is it because there is an overproduction? No. It is because the people have not the money with which to buy the things they need and must consume if they are to live in a reasonable or respectable way. Farmers are not overproducing. Yet those poor farmers are being told that, "Next year you will not be able to get 11 or 12 cents for your cotton unless you decrease the amount of cotton you raise; you will not be able to sell your hogs unless you teach them to follow birth control; you will not be able to sell your cows unless you keep from raising many of them."

What is the condition? I will read it to the Senate. I have in my hand the Liberty Magazine. Members of the White House family are contributors to this magazine. The President's own daughter is one of the writers for this magazine. It is a magazine friendly to them. I will read to the Senate what it says:

The simplest way to come at them is to consult the table of per-capita food requirements of the American people under American standards of living as set forth in Circular 296, issued by the Department of Agriculture.

That circular is issued by the Government. Not only that, it is issued by the Department of Agriculture.

The Liberal Diet prescribed in that circular is based on food standards recommended by our most eminent authorities on nutrition.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. From what is the Senator reading? I know he is reading from a magazine, but what is the article and who wrote it?

Mr. LONG. It was written by Charles W. Burkett in Liberty Magazine of April 13, 1935.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is he discussing?

Mr. LONG. He is discussing the food supply of America. Now he is quoting a circular of the Agricultural Department, No. 296.

The Liberal Diet prescribed in that circular is based on food standards recommended by our most eminent authorities on nutrition. Such a diet would promote national health and well-being to the highest degree. At present we don't even come within sight of it.

Here is the Liberal Diet, showing the amounts and kinds of food which should be annually consumed per capita:

Remember this comes from the Department of Agriculture.

Food	*Pounds*
Flour and other cereals	100
Milk, fresh and evaporated	656
Irish and sweet potatoes	155
Dried beans, peas, and nuts	7
Tomatoes and citrus fruits	110
Leafy, green, and other vegetables	135
Dried fruits, raisins, prunes, etc	20
Other vegetables and fresh fruits	325
Butter	35
Other fats, bacon, and salt pork	17
Sugar, molasses, and other sweets	60
Lean meats, poultry, and fish	165
Eggs (360 individual) in pounds	34
Total, annual poundage	1,819

That means less than one egg per day.

One thousand eight hundred and nineteen pounds of food for every one person every year.

The right of every American citizen to such a diet as that should be undoubted. It is basic. And the only reason the American people have not demanded and bought from the farmers all the farmers could produce is simply that the prices have been too high relative to city incomes. * * *

The year 1929 was one of relatively large agricultural production.

I hope Senators get these figures. In 1929, the very year when we were supposed to have so much agricultural production, this very year when we had too much, and I thought we had too much at that time myself—

The year 1929 was one of relatively large agricultural production, or of "overproduction" according to the food destructionists. And yet a comparison of the 1929 production figures with those called for by the Liberal Diet makes it evident at a glance how far short we fell of our real necessities.

In other words if we take everything we raised in 1929 and compare that as against what the Department of Agriculture said we ought to have eaten we will find what?

Such a comparison reveals a production shortage—

That is in 1929, the year when we were supposed to produce so much that we never could consume it, and yet according to the table of the Department of Agriculture of 1929, if the people could have bought what they wanted to eat, how much overproduction would we have had? None! On the contrary:

Such a comparison reveals a production shortage in fruit of 39 percent; in vegetables, 10 percent; dried fruits, 69 percent.

Think of it, Senators. Let the Senator from Florida think of it; let the Senator from California think of it; let Senators who come from Mississippi and from the Rio Grande Valley of the State of Texas—Senators who saw their dried fruit products dumped into the Mississippi and into the Rio Grande and into the Gulf of Mexico and into the Pacific Ocean—let them think of that year 1929 when that was done, that there then was an actual food shortage of dried fruits of 69 percent. There was only 31 percent of the Nation's requirement of dried fruits produced that year. There was a shortage of 69 percent of dried fruits, according to the United States table of standards, and yet nonetheless, a large part of that 31 percent of dried fruits produced was not sold on the market.

Milk. How much overproduction in milk? Why, there was a shortage of milk, according to what the people ought to have had. It says in this article:

Milk, exclusive of that used for butter, 33 percent.

There was too little of milk; not too much!

Butter. Was it overproduced? Why, it went to waste. The farmers held up one another's wagons to keep them from bringing it into town, because they were flooding the market, but milk was underproduced, and butter was underproduced 51 percent. And then sugar products were underproduced 30 percent. Beef, pork, mutton, poultry, and fish, 9 percent underproduced; and eggs 27 percent underproduced.

It got down to the point where you could not give eggs away. You could not sell them, you could not give them away; you could not sell milk, butter, rice, potatoes; you could not give cotton away. Notwithstanding that fact, according to the United States Government, there was a shortage in production of every one of those things.

What did Roosevelt say? He said there is no overproduction. He said we have got to give a purchasing power to the masses. Then is when Franklin Delano Roosevelt announced that he was in favor of the share-our-wealth platform. Then is when he got up in the Chicago convention, when a man was supposed to be a man, and stood on his hind legs and said that "the crying need of the country is for more and equitable opportunity to share in the distribution of wealth", and our report says "applause and cheers" when he made that statement on the floor of the convention.

What did we do through the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], to whose speech I am now replying, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to whom I am still replying? What did we do? Did we come into the United States Senate and provide that we would give the people more money so they could buy the things which the United States Government said they had to have in order to live? Did we come here and provide that they could buy more and provide that instead of the farmer continuing underproduction he might produce what was expected to be consumed by the people?

No. We did not. I say "we" did not. I have to include myself in it, though I tried to do the contrary. We did not provide to "share the wealth." We did not provide to produce up to what standard statistics said the human family had to have to live on. On the contrary, what did we do? We allowed the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer, according to this big newspaper which was going to disprove the statements I made, but which it admits now to be true. We allowed the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer. We gave the masses less with which to buy.

What was the remedy finally followed? The remedy was that since the people could not buy we had to burn up what we could not sell, and plow under what nobody would have any money to buy. We adopted that expedient, and that has been all we have ever done.

Why, Gentlemen of the Senate, someone has said I am at war with the President. With which President am I at war? Am I at war with the President who took the nomination of the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1932? No. That man is my brother. Is he demised? Has there been a funeral and another one born since then? Whether he has gone through the stages necessary to come into new life, physically or spiritually speaking, is not the question. I mean as a matter of political advocacy, as a matter of political thought, is that man to whom we gave the nomination and who uttered those words at the Chicago convention in 1932 still alive? If he is alive, he is a boon companion of mine because I am standing where he stood in 1932. Yea, more, I am standing where I stood before he took that stand.

And now, when we have gotten into the calamitous condition where we are legislating in the Congress of the United States to keep from producing because the people cannot buy, when we have turned the horse around the other way and said to the people, "We are not able to give you the purchasing power and therefore we have to reduce the producing power", we have done what? We have opened up the country to the stagnation and calamities with which we were threatened when man was first placed on earth. We have brought on the dust storm. Yea, we brought on the dust storm. We brought on the shortages. We brought on the poverty. We aggravated the misery. We promoted the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer, and today what is before the American Congress?

We have reduced the purchasing power of the masses in the last 3 years, and the figures here show it. We have 22,000,000 on the relief dole and 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 more people trying to get on it. The United States Relief Department says that $8 is enough for one family to eat on, and, therefore, with that starvation diet we have prescribed under the dole they have forgotten the diet the health authorities of the Department of Agriculture, in 1929, and up to now, said was necessary for the human family, and have decided to reduce the people to where it is a bread-line proposition of getting a cup of soup for supper and some little hand-out for breakfast in the morning.

I come back now to my friends from Arkansas and Kentucky. I come back to this radio address.

Mr. President, there is more joy in Heaven over one lost soul that is saved than over a thousand that are already saved.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. LONG. Just a moment!

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. In a moment!

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to express the belief that when the Senator finally is saved there will be such great rejoicing that it will create more than a dust storm in those regions. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I am talking about political salvation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so much interested in that as I am in the Senator's soul.

Mr. LONG. I fear I should admit there will be a dust storm when the announcement is made in heaven that I have been saved, and I would like the Senator's help. The Senator from Kentucky reminds me of old Deacon Jones. When Deacon Jones got sick the people were prevented from talking over the telephone by their putting up a blackboard for announcements about his condition:

One o'clock: Deacon Jones very sick.
Two o'clock: Deacon Jones grows worse.
Three o'clock: Deacon Jones gone to heaven.

Four o'clock came around and some fellow went there and put up the following announcement:

Four o'clock: Great excitement in heaven. Deacon Jones has not yet arrived.

[Laughter.]

There may be that much excitement in my case. I am afraid there will be that much excitement up there, too, if the Senator from Kentucky is allowed to enter the pearly gates. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator might bear in mind the prayer delivered at the revival services in which the man prayed fervently that Deacon Jones might be sent to hell. When the services were over he was asked why he offered such a prayer. He said:

Well, Deacon Jones had broken up the Methodist Church, he had broken up the Baptist Church, he had broken up the Campbellite Church, he had broken up the Presbyterian Church, he had broken up everything he had ever got into, and I am just in hopes that if the Lord sends him to hell he might break that up, too.

[Laughter.]

That might be the situation in which the Senator from Louisiana would find himself if he ever got there.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate that joke. [Laughter.] The trouble is it takes my kind to bring the Senator from Kentucky into the majority. If it had not been for a few of my kind he would still be sitting on the mourners' bench. [Laughter.] We might have broken up the country when we did it, too. [Laughter.]

There is more joy in heaven for one soul that is saved than for a thousand that are already saved. If I could convince the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Arkansas of the error of their understanding, if I could convince them that 2 and 2 make 4, if I could convince them that an elephant cannot be put through a keyhole, if I could convince them that water will not run up hill, if I could convince them of these simple axiomatic rules of mathematics, I would have more joy in my heart than I have had in the advocacy of these principles for years.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The trouble is that the Senator is trying to teach us that 2 and 2 do not make 4, that an elephant can go through the eye of a needle, and that water can run up hill; and I cannot be convinced of that.

Mr. LONG. That just shows how blind the Senator from Kentucky is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may be blind, but I can see the Senator from Louisiana, and see through him.

Mr. LONG. Here are these multimillionaire families that found out the truth, and they admitted the truth; but with all that the Senator from Kentucky cannot see it. He is like the rich man who allowed Lazarus to stay outside the gate, with the dogs licking his sores, begging for the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. When Lazarus had died and the rich man had died, and the rich man looked afar off and saw Abraham with Lazarus in his bosom, the rich man cried and said, "Father Abraham, send Lazarus that he may pour water and cool my tongue!" Abraham said, "It cannot be done." The rich man said, "Then send Lazarus back to earth that he may tell my four brothers there of the torments with which I am afflicted, that they may avoid this place." Abraham said, "There is not a bit of use. They have Moses and the prophets back there, and if they will not believe Moses and the prophets they will not believe one who has risen from the dead and has come back to earth."

The Senator from Kentucky stands here today, with far less food than is needed in some instances being produced in the United States—a three-fourths food shortage in dried

fruit, a 39-percent shortage in butter, a 40-percent shortage in eggs—and with all the shortages in dried fruits and these other things, the Senator from Kentucky has his eyes blinded. "None so blind as those having eyes that see not; none so deaf as those having ears that hear not." He is so blind that he has it in his head that when you have too little food, and still the people cannot buy it, the only remedy is to go and burn up some more of the food that you have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. Just one word. It makes me think of a man who seized the 140-acre farm of a man for a debt he owed to the store. The old man went off, and a few years later he came back, and meanwhile the other man has discovered oil on the land. The old man went in and said, "Mr. So-and-so, you seized that 140 acres of land for a $100 debt, and you have got $1,000,000 of oil off it. Don't you think you ought to help me out and give me a little something?" The man said, "Why, certainly my friend. I think I owe you something." He called his clerk and he said, "Come here, Jim. Go back of that counter and get this man a bottle of Sloan's liniment. He may have the rheumatism for all I know." [Laughter.]

The great trouble with the Senator from Kentucky and those like him is that they imagine they are liberal to the American people, who are entitled to live in decency and respectability, and they think they have done those people a great favor when they hand them a little six- or eight-dollar dole by which they can live and barely exist in poverty and in misery; and still the Senator from Kentucky thinks he has brought blessings to his soul, and glorified the administration in Washington, and placed a crown of glory on the head of the chieftain, as long as he doles out a little money to allow a man to live on earth in misery, and below the line of any such thing as a respectable standard of poverty.

You can convince some people but you cannot convince the casehardened politician. When they get those ideas in their minds they will not see the facts. They cannot be made to see them. The President saw them. He said he saw them. But has he forgotten? We thought the Federal Trade Commission saw them. The Industrial Relations Commission saw them. The multimillionaires say they saw them. What do they say? I am reading from the biggest newspaper in the United States, owned by multimillionaire families. What does it say? It says this:

> It has happened time and again that when a nation's wealth has become concentrated in too few hands, and ways of redistributing part of it peaceably have not been worked out, ways of redistributing it by violence have been adopted in time—as in France and in Russia.

And this paper says that the wealth is concentrated in the hands of the few far more than I said it was, and that something has to be done about it.

Congress is going to adjourn, they say. I guess it will. It would have been better if it never had met. Congress is going to adjourn with nothing whatever done to increase the purchasing power of the masses. The only reform that is urged is to destroy a little more cotton, and a little more pork, and a little more sugar, and a little more molasses, and teach the hens not to lay eggs, and give lessons of birth-control to the swine and to the cattle, so that they will not raise too much of those products to flood the market for a public that has not the money with which to buy.

I was hoping that would convince these Senators so that now I could talk to them about the proposed legislation. If they will read what I have said, they will be convinced.

Perhaps these Senators think that what I have said is just a mistake. I should be glad if they would read what James Madison said. You have all heard of James Madison writing most of the Constitution of the United States.

Do you know what he said, Mr. President? He said, along about the time when the Constitution was being written, before it was written or shortly after it was written, according to an excerpt which I clipped out of a New York newspaper a few days ago, that the time would come when the wealth of America would get into the hands of the few, and that the only way in which the Constitution could exist and the Republic could exist would be for the American people to be farsighted and broad-minded enough to know that they had to redistribute the wealth into the hands of the masses, in order that the people could live in something like a decent, respectable status. That is what he said. He said that if they did not do it, the country would never survive. That was said not only by him, but by others. Daniel Webster, who was a great follower of James Madison, came along, and when he delivered his famous speech at Plymouth he made exactly the same statement.

Senators talk about the faith of the founders. I was amazed to read the remarks by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], about the faith of the founders of this country. The Senator from Arkansas failed to remember something he read long ago. Who were the founders of this country?

Does the Senator refer to the Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth in the year 1620? If he does, he has only to turn back and look to the law under which the Pilgrims settled this country.

In the year 1620, on July 1, when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, they displayed a compact that was to be the law of the country under which they were to live. It had been signed by every man on board the *Mayflower*, and article five of that compact of the Pilgrims provided that at the end of every seventh year they would wipe out every debt and redistribute the property equally among all the people who lived in this country at that time.

My friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, may never have read that, but that is how they settled the State from which he comes. When those people landed at Plymouth in the year 1620 their plan was not the conservative rule I am undertaking to bring about; it was the rule prescribed in the Bible absolutely, that at the end of every seventh year they should remit debts. They went the Bible one better, and provided that at the end of every seventh year they would redistribute all the property into the hands of all the people.

Why did they enter into any such compact? Because they knew they had to fight the Indians. They knew they had to develop the country. They knew they had to establish a new frontier every year, and they knew that the only way by which they would ever succeed was through the understanding of one for the other, and that each and every one of them would travel along under a plan of mutual assistance.

When the forefathers came to write the Constitution of the United States, and even before that time, when they came to write the Declaration of Independence, in July 1776, the one thing about which they were careful above all things was to write in there words and symbols which meant that the wealth of this country should always be kept reasonably distributed in the hands of the people.

I shall not read all that Madison said; I shall not read what Ralph Waldo Emerson said; I shall not read what that famous son of New Hampshire, and who adopted Massachusetts as his State, said; but I have all those various and sundry declarations here, and if anyone wishes to see them, I shall be pleased to give him whatever information along that line he may request.

I now come to the year 1935. I am sorry the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky have left the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am still here. The Senator is blinder than I am. I am sitting here close enough to him to touch him, and he says I have gone. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. That is correct; the Senator is absolutely correct. These associations are catching, they are contagious. Being around the Senator from Kentucky tends to blindness even with me. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator was impervious to any influence I might exercise over him.

Mr. LONG. Oh, no. I listened to the Senator once, and I have been sorry ever since. I let the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky advise me one night, when I did not know whether to vote for a bill or against it. I was against half of it and for half of it, and the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New York suggested that I had better vote for it, and I did so, and the Senator from Missouri has been jumping on me about it ever since.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Louisiana had been guilty of voting blindly on only one occasion, we might forgive him, but he has been following that practice ever since.

Mr. LONG. Let us hope it has never been that bad.

Mr. President, the Senators from Arkansas and Kentucky want me to tell them how I would draw the legislation. I do not have to have a pencil and a piece of paper. I have drawn it up many times, and I will give it to them without a pencil and paper. These remarks will be down in writing, and they can be read tomorrow by whoever wishes to read them. I could dictate them without having to change a word if I had plenty of time just to stand here and outline it to the reporter. I will not take the time necessary to do that, but will state what the plan is.

First. I would guarantee that there would be no such thing in the United States as a man possessing more than somewhere around 100 to 200 times the average family wealth. What would that mean in the United States today? It would mean that there would be nobody in the United States who could own more than between a million and a half and three million dollars as a fortune. I might get it down a little below that.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the resolution which the Senator offered on January 4, 1934, he provided that each person might own $50,000,000.

Mr. LONG. As a limit.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a limit; yes.

Mr. LONG. And in the one before that, a hundred million.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator is now getting down to about five or six million, as he stated in the last speech he made.

Mr. LONG. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the speech the Senator made in Des Moines a few days ago, he said he would let each man own as much as five or six million.

Mr. LONG. Somewhere around that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Prior to that he had said three or four million.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there is not much difference between three or four and five or six million.

Mr. LONG. And before that, $50,000,000; and before that, $100,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator is gradually coming down——

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Until he may after a while get to a point where there would be a division of wealth which might be regarded as a sharing of the wealth.

Mr. LONG. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as in 1929 there were only 1,700 people who owned as much as $4,000,000 worth of property, and the aggregate wealth was only $20,000,000,000, and inasmuch as in 1932 there were only 800 who owned more than $4,000,000, and the aggregate wealth was about fifty billion, how does the Senator figure that any such division as could be regarded as a sharing of the wealth program which would only divide or share the wealth of some 800 or at most 1,700 people with one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and thirty million, would be such a sharing of wealth as would produce the results to which he refers?

Mr. LONG. First, the figures of the Senator from Kentucky are not at all correct, not half correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the Senator's authority for that?

Mr. LONG. The figures of the United States Census as to the United States wealth and income; the figures of the United States Federal Trade Commission——

Mr. BARKLEY. The figures I have quoted are taken from the official reports of the United States——

Mr. LONG. What reports?

Mr. BARKLEY. As accurately as they can be obtained through the Treasury Department.

Mr. LONG. Oh, my! They must be some Mellon figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the nearest to an accurate census of property in the United States, the census for taxing purposes.

Mr. LONG. No, Mr. President; the United States wealth is in the shape I have previously indicated, as the figures have been examined by the New York Daily News here with a corps of experts. They found my figures to be very conservative; they say it is more concentrated than I figured. They reviewed the tables I gave beginning in 1916, going as far as 1930, and there is no question about it.

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

Mr. LONG. No; just let me answer the last question. I want to get through with the last question. The Senator asked me three questions.

No. 1. More than 59 percent of the wealth of this country is in the hands of 1 percent of the people, and according to the News' survey on a readjustment, 63 percent of the wealth is owned by one-half percent of the people at this date. That is the report based on their survey.

No. 2. The Senator's question was as to why I started in limiting fortunes at $100,000,000, then $50,000,000, then $10,000,000, then $5,000,000, then $3,000,000. I undertook to get any kind of a limit before the Senate. I tried to drive through the policy that there had to be some kind of a limit on fortunes of some kind or other set up as a policy of the Congress of the United States. I was trying to get a principle vindicated, so I mentioned $100,000,000, then $50,000,000, until I drove it into the minds and into the consciences of a number of people of the United States that there had to be some kind of a limitation of fortunes. Then when people noticed it, I came down to an amount and to a set plan, which I am now setting out. I never have been able to pass any kind of such law establishing any limit as yet. I will, though, if any country is left here.

I am stating how the legislation would be drawn, since the Senator from Kentucky wants to know. Now I have to start all over again. I ask the Senator to let me complete just this statement, and then I will yield for questions.

Section 1: No person shall own or possess wealth or property in the United States of America beyond an amount in excess of 200 times the average family fortune.

This means that we would limit fortunes tomorrow to somewhere around $3,000,000.

Section 2: There shall be guaranteed a homestead to every family in the United States of America.

This is nothing new.

The goods and properties hereinafter enumerated are not to be alienated without the consent of a court, and then only for the purpose of reinvestment in another homestead, under authority of law, which said homestead itself shall not be worth less than one-third the wealth of the average family in the United States of America.

That is just as simple as falling off a log. It fixes a limit. It is nothing new. Louisiana has such a law, as have Texas and Florida. The homestead cannot be seized for debt, and in Louisiana it cannot be seized for taxes to some extent. That is nothing new.

No one should have a homestead worth less than one-third the average family fortune. How much would that have

been, according to the United States estimates, in the prosperous days, and if my plan were adopted you would not find a record of a time in the past when our people were as prosperous as they would then be.

There was national wealth amounting to around $421,000,000,000 at one time, according to the estimates. Take that $421,000,000,000 and divide it into 24,000,000 families in the United States, and you have an average wealth of $17,000 to the family.

Guarantee to every family a homestead of one-third that amount, somewhere between five and six thousand dollars, and that will mean that every family of an average of four and a half to five people, according to the figures—the number varies depending on whether times are good or bad—would have a shelter under which to live, and would have those things necessary to enable them to live in respectable comfort and happiness. They would be able to have a home in which to live, land to till if they were farmers, and the furniture and the accoutrements of a house up to the value of $5,000, free of debt, and there would be no trouble about it. Each family might have some kind of automobile and radio. All free of debt.

No. 3. Listen to this. It will make the Senator from Kentucky shudder to hear how simple it is.

The income of every family of America shall not be less than from one-third to one-half the average family income of the particular year. The income of no one person shall be more than 100 times the income of the average family for that year.

What does that mean? Now I have to refer to some books, so that the Senator from Kentucky will know I am telling him the truth. Here is one of the books. A while back, when this "share our wealth" movement got so strong in the United States that societies were being formed everywhere, the departments of this Government thought they would have to do something to show how ridiculous the whole scheme of things was.

So they got some experts, and they put them in the Interior Department, I am told, to gather up the statistics to show that there could not be enough earned in this country to do such a thing as I was advocating. So, I am told, they called in a number of men and they went to work to get up the figures, and they got up the figures and laid them on the desks of the chieftains, figures which the chieftains expected to use to show that there could not be such incomes to distribute so as to make every family in America affluent and independent. But what happened? When the investigators got ready to lay these charts on the doorsteps of those men who were going to use this information in order to send it to the college professors and the school teachers so that their learning might be diffused down to the lowest strata, and their scholars would learn from their lips and from their pens that what I was advocating and what others like me were advocating was ridiculous and absurd,—when they laid their data down the result was that everyone of those who had done that work was fired. When the data was laid down, those who received it did not do what the Daily News did, which, when it found the true facts, did not hesitate to publish them. The newspapers said, "We are surprised", but nevertheless it published the facts. Not so with the Government.

Here are the facts. They fired every "dad-gummed" one of the investigators. However, those investigators took the data out with them. This is the information given to me. What I have stated may not be correct. It is the information, however, given to me by some of these gentlemen. I understood the document was coming out in a few days. Lo and behold, the next thing I heard about this document which was going to come out and the figures which were going to confound the figures I was giving was one day when I was called out into the reception room, and a young man said, "Senator LONG, I wish to give you a book", and he gave me this book on which was inscribed:

To Senator LONG, with my heartiest compliments. Samuel Willig, 1907 North American Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Another gentleman, not so closely connected with the matters I have just mentioned, came to me a few days later and handed me another book, an entirely private publication.

However, here is the book which this young man handed me in the reception room. It is "The Chart of Plenty." It is published by Harold Loeb and Associates. In it he gives a chart and every datum that could possibly be required, and shows that without the least trouble at all there can be at least an average family income of around $5,000 a year in America if wealth and income are reasonably distributed, so that people can purchase, and mechanical appliances can be used, rather than prohibited because of a lack of distribution of income and capital.

Therefore if it can be guaranteed that a family will never be below the poverty line of somewhere around $2,000 in annual income, it would still leave somewhere around one-half of the income of the head of such a family, if not more—perhaps two-thirds of it—to be used and to be garnered by the man with better intellect and by the financial masters who weave not, but who nevertheless are arrayed in such manner that not even Solomon in all his glory appears as one of them.

How would this be done? What will we do with the hours of labor?

Mr. President, I am an advocate of short working hours, and the short working week, and the short working year, but I am not so sure that we would reduce the hours of labor nearly so much as I originally advocated, because the day we begin to diffuse these products to be consumed among the people we have a great amount of work to do. Why? Because, according to this book entitled "The Chart of Plenty", the colleges of the United States would have to be five times their present size. Imagine such a thing! According to this book, the day that plan would be put into effect, or some plan which would guarantee the diffusion of the wealth of this country, the colleges of the United States would have to be five times their present size.

According to these statistics, we would have every reason in the world to expand. We would have a flood-control program. We would not be fighting the flood waters in Louisiana and Missouri and Mississippi and Arkansas and Tennessee. We would have a quarrel in this country over where we would get water enough to supply the various needs. We would have, in effect, that plan which has been worked out by the United States Army, to the point where there would never be a dust storm, to the point where there would never be a desert, to where there would never be any flood, or any season of the year when there was not water enough for year-around navigation. There would not be any drought then. That is the condition we would have. We would have a country here where mankind could enjoy these things rather than to be penalized without them.

How are we going to get this money? That is very simple. It is very simple how we are going to get the money. The Lord tells us how to get it. The Lord says how—and He was pretty smart. The great trouble is most of our Senators and Representatives refuse to abide by the laws which are propounded in the Scriptures. Those laws are not dead. I desire to tell the Members of the Senate that, in my opinion—and I am like Daniel Webster was about that—the same law which allows the sun to rise in the morning, which allows the moon to shine at night, the same law which allows the earth to turn around on its axis, the same law which allows the stars to shine, is the divine law of our Creator, the same divine Creator who said that wealth had to be redistributed every 49 years, and who said that debts had to be remitted every 7 years.

I say, Mr. President, that the law is just as compulsory to a nation and a people, a law which says that we have to remit debts every 7 years and says we have to redistribute wealth—that law is just as compulsory as the law which allows the stars to shine and allows the sun to rise. The Creator is as much the controller of one natural law as He is the controller of another natural law, and the only way you can keep the people of any country from becoming can-

nibals is to see that what is on earth for mankind is consumed and shared by mankind, and so long as we allow one man to have 10,000—yea, 100,000 times more than the average man has, so long as we allow 600 families in the United States of America to have three or four times as much as 123,000,000 people have, just so certain are we to send the people to the damnition bowwows of eternity as we are, Mr. President, doing this very day, because we undertake to contravene the laws of God.

Mr. President, how are we going to get this money? We are going to take into the ownership of the United States of America every dollar, every bit of property that anybody owns above a few million dollars, and we are going to distribute that property, either by selling it and distributing it or otherwise, to those who have less than a homestead, of around $5,000. That is how we are going to get it.

It is said that cannot be done. It has been done. The Bible says it has been done. The Bible says it can be done. The Bible says that every man will rest under his own vine and under his own tree, and that they who have houses, goods, and things of which they have no need, will bring them in to those who rule, and those who rule will distribute them out to those who have need of them. That is what is said in the Bible. You do not have to go very far to find out how it is all going to be done, or how it must be done.

Now, Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senate recessing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know of anything which the Senate would rather do at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield the floor?

Mr. LONG. Yes, Mr. President.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, yesterday or the day before, when I was discussing the bill then pending to amend certain sections of the T. V. A. Act, I intended to ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a report made by a member of the Board on the general subject of the T. V. A. electrical program. I forgot it and did not make the request. I now ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD at the close of the few remarks which I am about to make.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to invite the attention of Senators very briefly to what the report is and to comment on one or two statements in it. It is a general and brief history of what is being attempted to be done and what is being done by the T. V. A. It gives some statistics, which are very illuminating, as to the cost of the production of electricity, its generation, transmission, and distribution. It calls attention to the work of the T. V. A. in generating electricity and transmitting it, and then to the fact that after it is transmitted and sold to the municipalities it becomes the duty of the municipality to do the distributing.

The report shows there is not much difference in the cost of generation and transmission of electricity, but the great difference in cost comes in its distribution to the consumer. The report refers to what has taken place in a few of the towns which are purchasing electricity from the T. V. A., and disposes of many objections which are so often made—for instance, with reference to taxes and other similar objections which are made.

The report refers, as an illustration, to what is being done in the town of Tupelo, Miss., and other towns in which the electricity generated at Wilson Dam and controlled by the T. V. A. is being sold. The average price of electricity to the consumers in the homes is 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour, which is less than half the general average paid by consumers over the entire United States for electricity. The schedule, which they provide must be put into effect before they will sell electricity to a municipality, commences with a top rate of 3 cents per kilowatt-hour, and the rate is reduced so that the average, during the time they have been furnishing electricity, is 2.2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

By a table attached to the report is shown what has been taken into consideration. For instance, taking Tupelo as an example, at the end of the first year of operation this city had met all charges, including a large tax payment, and still was able to show a profit of $24,875.

I notice in the table attached to the statement, from the financial activities that have occurred during that time, that taxes are paid. The municipality is required to pay, in lieu of taxes, an amount sufficient to equal the taxes if the property used in the distribution of electricity were privately owned. The taxes in that town, for the year in which this report was made, were $6,657.32. Depreciation of $5,227.31 was charged. They are also required to pay to the city—something that has never been done by any private company—interest on the amount of property used in the business owned by the city. The operation of the plant must pay interest to the city based on the ownership of the property. The interest amounted to $2,580.56. The return on the investment of the city was $4,570.54. After all these things were done, after all these payments were made, the city still had a net income above all expenses of $24,874.84.

EXHIBIT A

A STATEMENT OF FACTS CONCERNING THE T. V. A. ELECTRICITY PROGRAM

The Tennessee Valley Authority announced the wholesale and retail rates at which it would dispose of surplus power from Wilson Dam in September 1933. These rates were set up on the principle that consumers of electricity must pay all the costs of furnishing that electricity without any contribution from taxpayers. It is these rates which have been described as a yardstick with which to measure and compare the rates charged by private utilities.

THE COST OF GENERATING ELECTRICITY IS SMALL

The cost of furnishing electricity to citizens may be divided, for the purpose of such comparisons, into two parts, namely, (1) the cost of generating and transmitting the power to the city gate, (2) the cost of distributing the electricity within the city to the consumer. With the first item of cost there appear to be only small differences between the rates charged by private utilities and by the T. V. A.

The Mississippi Power Co. has contracted to furnish the municipal plant at West Point, Miss., wholesale power at a flat rate of 7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The Alabama Power Co. sells power at wholesale to Birmingham Electric Co. at the city gate for as low as 5.8 mills per kilowatt-hour.

T. V. A. rates for similar service average approximately 6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

THE LEGITIMATE COST OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME

From this it would appear that the differences in cost of generation and transmission of electricity is not very great, even with the further reduction in generating costs which T. V. A. will be able to make when an integrated development of the river has been accomplished. But this portion of the yardstick is only a small fraction of the cost of electricity to citizens. The average rate paid by residential consumers in the United States is 5.2 cents per kilowatt-hour. On the basis of delivering power at a city's gate at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, and distributing it to the consumer at an average of 5.2 cents per kilowatt-hour, it is evident that the cost of generation and transmission of electricity by private utilities accounts for less than one-eighth of the cost to the consumer. More than seven-eighths of the yardstick involves the distribution of the power from the city's gates to the residential consumer. The cost of the generation and transmission of electricity is by far the smallest factor of cost—the yardstick has its chief importance in disclosing the legitimate cost of bringing the electricity from the city gate into the consumer's home. And here the figures are startling.

T. V. A. CITIES SERVE CONSUMERS AT ONE-HALF—MAKE LARGE PROFITS

Residential consumers being served by municipalities distributing T. V. A. electricity pay an average of approximately 2.2 cents a kilowatt-hour—less than one-half the national average charged by private utilities. How have these municipalities fared in buying T. V. A. power at about 6 mills and reselling it at yardstick rates which reduce the cost of electricity to their citizens from 40 to 60 percent? They have been able to meet all the costs of operation, taxes, amortization, depreciation, interest on investment, in fact every legitimate charge faced by a private utility and still return from 20 to 25 percent of all gross revenue to surplus. This has been true of all municipalities distributing T. V. A. power. As an example, we may take Tupelo, Miss. At the end of the first year of operation this city[1] had met all charges including a large tax payment and still was able to show a profit of $24,875, or almost 20 percent net profit on the investment in property

[1] Statement of income and expense of Tupelo electricity department on pp. 7, 8.

and plant. In Alcorn County, Miss., including the city of Corinth, where T. V. A. power is retailed by a nonprofit country-wide cooperative association, a surplus, after all charges, is accumulating at a rate that will permit this association to retire the entire cost of its original distributing facilities within a period of less than 4 years.

NO "WATER" IN VALUATION OF T. V. A. PLANTS

Municipalities and associations distributing T. V. A. power must agree by contract to set aside, among other items, a sum to cover local, State, and county taxes; and carry their plants on their books at actual values. The significance of this latter provision in the yardstick becomes apparent when it is recalled the Federal Trade Commission reported to the United States Senate on February 5, 1935, that as a result of its 6-year investigation in the public-utilities field it had found write-ups amounting to $1,400,000,000 in top holding, subholding, and operating companies.

So, by comparison with wholesale rates of private utilities it appears that the T. V. A. wholesale rate is not too low, and by actual experience in cities reselling this power at T. V. A. retail rates the yardstick is found to be a full 36 inches in length.

In the face of these results special interests which seek to thwart T. V. A.'s program and prevent the American public from learning the true cost of furnishing electric service have sought to becloud the issue with arguments concerning the generation of power at Wilson Dam. The cost of generating electricity, as is well known, accounts for a very small fraction of the total price charged residential consumers. The allegation is made that private utilities could sell electricity to consumers as cheaply, if not cheaper, than T. V. A. if they were granted the same "subsidies" and "privileges" that T. V. A. enjoys. Let us examine some of these charges.

THE ACTUAL VALUE OF WILSON DAM

Spokesmen for utility interests have said that the cost of Wilson Dam (T. V. A.'s present source of electricity) was $60,000,000 and that T. V. A. has written this down to $19,000,000.

Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals was begun during the World War as a war measure. Twelve separate appropriations were made before the work was finished, which was not until 1925. Several major interruptions of construction with attendant disbanding of personnel occurred. Engineers have estimated that at least $10,000,000 could have been saved had the construction been carried out as a single operation.

The historical cost of Wilson Dam is a little under $47,000,000, not $60,000,000. Eliminating the waste which occurred in construction, and allowing a fair amount for depreciation since date of completion, the present worth of the dam is $33,000,000.

To apportion the value of Wilson Dam among navigation, national defense, and power, the Authority first set aside those parts of the structure which are of exclusive use to one or another purpose: The locks to navigation, the power house to power, certain buildings and roads (not otherwise useful) to national defense. The remainder (chiefly the long spillway section in the middle) was divided between navigation and power.

The result was to allocate approximately $10,000,000 to navigation, $22,000,000 to power, and $1,500,000 to national defense. These figures are tentative, as the study of costs ordered by Congress is not yet completed. All private bids for the plant have been far below this valuation.

Allocation of cost of dams on the Tennessee River to navigation, flood control, national defense, and power provided for by law is not an advantage claimed by T. V. A., but is a definite national policy which has been made available to private utilities. The Congress in 1930, under a previous administration, authorized that $75,000,000, estimated as the cost of low dams for providing a 9-foot navigation channel on the Tennessee River to Knoxville, should be contributed to States, municipalities, or private corporations if they constructed high dams (such as the T. V. A. is doing). In another river and harbor act of Congress a very large contribution—some $12,000,000 of Government funds—was provided to be paid to a private utility planning a high dam at Aurora Landing on the Tennessee River. This was a national appropriation to a private agency made because the power dam it proposed to construct would aid navigation to the extent of this sum.

The simple fact, then, is that, as required by law, the Tennessee Valley Authority has placed the value of Wilson Dam for power purposes at its actual "present value."

T. V. A. SETS ASIDE FUNDS COVERING TAXES

The T. V. A. Act requires that 5 percent of gross sales of power be paid to the State where T. V. A. power is generated as compensation for loss of tax revenue. This figure was set up by Congress, subject to change should it prove in practice either too high or too low.

To keep the yardstick absolutely fair, however, the T. V. A. sets aside an additional 7½ percent of its gross revenue, making a total of 12½ percent for the generation and transmission of power in lieu of taxes. For utility operations in the United States as a whole the taxes amounted to 12.7 percent of gross revenue in 1933, when the T. V. A. rates were established. The taxes paid by the four utilities operating in the Tennessee Valley region averaged 11.8 percent of gross revenue at that time.

This 12.5 percent which T. V. A. carries is on generation and transmission. The taxes on properties used for distribution of T. V. A. power are borne, as stated previously, by municipal distribution systems.

T. V. A. figures its tax equivalent upon the basis of percent of gross revenue in order to establish comparison with the various tax systems in use throughout the country. No matter whether taxes are levied against income, property valuation, or volume of business, they can all be reduced to the common denominator of a percentage of gross revenue. The percentage of income T. V. A. set up as an equivalent of taxes paid conformed to the national average for utilities when the rates were fixed and was higher than the average at that time of the four companies operating in the T. V. A. region.

T. V. A. INTEREST RATES IN LINE WITH THOSE OF PRIVATE UTILITIES

In computing electric rates, T. V. A. figured an interest rate of 3½ percent on its investment. This is higher than the actual cost of money to the Government, including fiscal expense of the Treasury, and it is not out of line with the rates at which some private utilities are now carrying out refunding operations. Whatever slight advantage accrues to T. V. A. on interest rates is more than offset by the costs of services of a public character which T. V. A. is glad to assume and which are not assumed by private corporations.

Among these may be considered wage rates for both skilled and unskilled labor. These average from 50 to 75 percent higher than those paid by public utilities on similar construction in this area. Likewise, in areas where T. V. A. has purchased electric systems from private utilities the employees were found to be receiving wages from 10 to 30 percent below those which T. V. A. pays for similar work.

Some of the other advantages ascribed to T. V. A. by special interests are pure fiction. The T. V. A. does not use its franking privilege in sending out electricity bills; T. V. A. does not purchase materials unless the seller agrees to comply with the N. R. A. code; it pays all other governmental departments for services rendered and foots the bill of defending litigation brought by public utilities and others, which has held up the sale of surplus power from Wilson Dam and delayed the time when T. V. A. can begin paying back to the Government the costs of Wilson Dam and thus salvage a wartime investment.

ONE ADVANTAGE SAVES A DIME IN A LIFETIME

Seeking to obscure the real issues, special interests have made much ado over the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority receives a reduction in freight rates on some of its hauling. Land-grant railroads in consideration of the land originally given them grant a 33⅓-percent reduction on all Government hauling. The T. V. A. receives this reduction on that part of the equipment and materials used in dam construction which travels over land-grant railroads.

Of the total cost of a dam, however, the freight charges play so small a part that a one-third reduction amounts to three ten-thousandths of a cent per kilowatt-hour of power generated. This means a saving of 1 cent for every 3,300 kilowatt-hours used or, turning this around, the average residential consumer saves 1 cent every 5½ years as a result of reduced freight rates granted T. V. A. He would have to pay power bills for more than 50 years to net himself a dime.

WHY T. V. A. ELECTRIC RATES ARE LOW

The T. V. A. in its electric operations submits to all legitimate charges to which a private utility would be subjected. Its success in making available cheap electricity lies in the cost assumed by some private utilities which T. V. A. does not pay. A few of these may be mentioned. The attempt to pay dividends on the $1,400,000,000 of write-ups exposed by the Federal Trade Commission, expensive campaigns to influence legislation, excessive fees to affiliated engineering and management companies as well as the tremendous salaries paid to officers of both the holding companies and the operating companies.

CITY OF TUPELO, MISS., ELECTRICITY DEPARTMENT

Statement of income and expense for 12 months ending Jan. 31, 1935

	Amount	Percent of gross operating revenue	Per kilowatt-hour sold
			Cents
Gross operating revenue	$88,295.04	100.00	1.55
Operating expenses:			
Cost of power purchased	36,449.01	41.28	.64
Distribution:			
Operation	3,796.16	4.30	.07
Maintenance	980.53	1.11	.02
Commercial and new business	1,114.37	1.25	.02
Utilization	569.77	.65	.01
General	2,052.64	2.33	.03
Total operating expenses	44,962.48	50.92	.79
Taxes	6,657.32	7.54	.12
Depreciation	5,227.21	5.92	.09
Uncollectible accounts	69.89	.08	
Total	56,916.90	64.46	1.00
Net operating revenue	31,378.14	35.54	.55
Nonoperating revenue, miscellaneous	647.80	.73	.01
Gross income	32,025.94	36.27	.56

Statement of income and expense for 12 months ending Jan. 31, 1935—Continued

	Amount	Percent of gross operating revenue	Per kilowatt-hour sold
Deductions from gross income:			*Cents*
Interest	2,580.56	2.92	.04
Return on city's investment	4,570.54	5.18	.08
Net income	24,874.84	28.17	.44
Appropriations to long-term debt: Retirement reserve	3,173.96	3.59	.06
Balance to surplus	21,700.88	24.58	.38

Balance sheet as of Jan. 31, 1935

Assets:		
Plant and equipment		$138,762.41
Current assets:		
Cash	$16,319.80	
Accounts receivable	9,208.36	
		25,528.16
Miscellaneous assets		3,334.65
Deferred charges		1,856.67
Total assets		169,481.89
Liabilities:		
Investment, city of Tupelo	79,261.26	
Consumers' surplus invested in plant	1,522.22	
		80,783.48
Funded debt		36,250.00
Current liabilities, accounts payable		6,658.53
Accrued liabilities		11,644.04
Miscellaneous liabilities		5,834.65
Reserves:		
Depreciation	4,958.57	
Bond retirement	1,651.74	
		6,610.31
Unappropriated surplus		21,700.88
Total liabilities		169,481.89

DONALD R. RICHBERG

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it had been my hope during the course of the day to have an opportunity to obtain recognition to address the Senate as briefly as may be upon what I consider the most brazen exhibition of impudence on the part of a bureaucratic official that has fallen under my observation during my lifetime. I refer to the exhibition by a bureaucrat—thank God, a temporary bureaucrat!—Mr. Donald R. Richberg, in calling together yesterday some 1,500 of his own appointees, and abusing the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States for assuming to perform the functions ascribed to them by the Constitution of the United States.

As I say, to my mind that is the most amazing exhibition of impudence which has fallen under my observation in my lifetime.

Owing to the length of the daily diatribe of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], it has been impossible for me to gain recognition today; and I do not desire to address the Senate at this time upon the matter to which I have referred. I give notice, however, that tomorrow, as soon after the meeting of the Senate as I may be able to obtain recognition, I desire to address the Senate very briefly on the subject of Mr. Donald R. Richberg and his ambition to be a Mussolini in the United States.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1958) to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have the first committee amendment stated, so that it may be pending before the Senate for consideration at the meeting of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to insert in the subtitle the words "findings and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, reported favorably the nomination of Leo F. Sanchez, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Santa Fe, N. Mex., vice Maurice F. Miera, resigned.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nominations (for promotion) of the following officers in the Coast Guard:

Commander LeRoy Reinburg to be captain, to rank as such from May 1, 1935, in place of Capt. Herman H. Wolf, retired; and

Lt. Comdr. Elmer F. Stone to be commander, to rank as such from May 1, 1935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first business in order on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

This completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. WALSH. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Clyde L. Seavey, of California, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1940 (reappointment).

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Richmond B. Keech, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1935 (reappointment).

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Michael L. Igoe, of Illinois, to be United States attorney, northern district of Illinois, vice Dwight H. Green, appointed by court.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Alexander M. McDaniel, Bunnell.
Elwin A. Acree, Groveland.
Elizabeth A. Cantrell, Kissimmee.
Mark L. Calder, Titusville.
Albert W. Kelso, Winter Haven.

WYOMING

Cecil W. Clark, Newcastle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.

It lays upon us solemn obligations; it enjoins obedience to the highest and best; it counsels righteousness and gives rich compensations. Almighty God, may we heed its call. Let us be severely true with ourselves by cultivating impartiality of judgment, sincerity of demeanor and action. With so many, blessed Father of mercy, this world means toil and trial; they climb the steep, barren, and rugged ways of life. We beseech Thee to sanctify their misfortunes; cheer them with Thy presence and help them to learn how to break forth into sweet song. Mercifully regard those who are prosperous and happy; deny them not of these blessings. The Lord God lead them to understand that every man's surplus is another one's need. Out of their abundant store may rich treasures of comfort and contentment overflow to others. Spare us from that egotism that blinds us to our brother's right and violates his property, reputation, and happiness. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 8, 1935, the President approved and signed joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution extending the gratitude of the Nation to Admiral Byrd and to the members of his expedition; and

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a special joint committee to meet with other representatives of the Government in greeting Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd upon his return from his second Antarctic expedition.

PRESIDENT'S FARM ADDRESS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon the President of the United States addressed a gathering of 5,000 farmers on the White House lawn. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting that militant speech.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday 5,000 farmers from 25 States came to Washington, at their own expense, in order to express their deep gratitude and appreciation to the President and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the agricultural program. The like of this great demonstration has never before been witnessed in Washington. It was a fine and truly representative body of farmers, who from the depths of their hearts came here to attest to a program that is today restoring American agriculture. While it could be properly termed a meeting of thanksgiving, this great assemblage let it be understood in no uncertain tones that this program must go on, and that they would stand like a stone wall against all efforts to weaken or destroy it.

Gathered on the lawn of the White House yesterday afternoon, they were addressed by the President of the United States, the man who is both their hope and inspiration. I take pleasure in extending my remarks by inserting this militant speech.

THE TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FARM SPEECH—THIRD YEAR OF POLICY OF ADJUSTMENT BEGUN, HE POINTS OUT

I am glad to welcome you to the National Capital. We can think of this occasion as a kind of surprise birthday party, for it was just 2 years and 2 days ago that the Agricultural Adjustment Act became a law. And I well remember the fine group of representatives of farmers from every part of the Union who stood around me on that occasion when I signed the act.

In record time you and thousands of other farmers took hold and set up machinery to control your own affairs and put the new law to work.

I remember, too, the many high and mighty people who said you could not do it—that it was no use for you to try—intimating clearly that their only remedy to improve your situation was to let the sheriffs' sales go on. That was the old and very familiar way the high and mighty balanced farm production with demand. Those people did not understand and many of them do not understand today that, if the farm population of the United States suffers and loses its purchasing power, the people in the cities, of necessity, suffer with them. One of the greatest lessons that the city dwellers have come to understand in this past 2 years is this: Empty pocketbooks on the farm don't turn factory wheels in the city.

Go back for a minute to the spring of 1933—when there was a huge carry-over of almost 13,000,000 bales and a price, because of that carry-over, of 6 cents a pound. You and I know what 6-cent cotton means to the purchasing power of the Cotton Belt.

There was a huge carry-over of tobacco and the price of tobacco during the preceding 6 months was the lowest on record for many years—wheat, with a carry-over of nearly 400,000,000 bushels, and a price of 35 cents on the farm; corn, with a price of 15 cents a bushel on many farms; hogs, selling at 3 cents a pound.

You and I know what that meant in the way of purchasing power for 40,000,000 people.

When we came to Washington we were faced with three possible programs. The first involved price fixing by Government decree. This was discarded because the problem of overproduction was not solved thereby.

DUMPING POLICY SHUNNED

The second was a plan to let farmers grow as much as they wanted to and to have the Federal Government then step in, take from them that portion of their crop which represented the exportable surplus and, in their name, on their behalf, dump this surplus on the other nations of the world. That plan was discarded because the other nations of the world had already begun to stop dumping. With increasing frequency they were raising their tariffs, establishing quotas, and clamping on embargoes against just that kind of proposition.

Therefore, we came to the third plan—a plan for the adjustment of totals in our major crops so that from year to year production and consumption would be kept in reasonable balance with each other to the end that reasonable prices would be paid to farmers for their crops and to the end that unwieldy surpluses would not depress our markets and upset the balance.

We are now at the beginning of the third year of carrying out this policy. You know the results thus far attained. You know the price of cotton, of wheat, of tobacco, of corn, of hogs, and of other farm products today. Further comment on the successful partial attainment of our objective up to this time is unnecessary on my part—you know.

I want to emphasize that word "adjustment." As you know, a great many of the high and mighty—with special axes to grind—have been deliberately trying to mislead people who know nothing of farming by misrepresenting—no, why use a pussyfoot word—by lying about the kind of a farm program under which this Nation is operating today.

LED ASTRAY BY IGNORANCE

A few leading citizens have gone astray from ignorance. I must admit it. For example, the prominent city banker who was driving through upstate New York with me 4 or 5 years ago in the late fall. Everything was brown. The leaves were off the trees. We passed a beautiful green field. He asked me what it was. I told him it was winter wheat. He turned to me and said, "That is very interesting. I have always wondered about winter wheat. What I don't understand is how they are able to cut it when it gets all covered up with snow."

The other was the editor of a great metropolitan paper. He visited me down in Georgia when the cotton was nearly grown, but before the bolls had formed. Looking out over the cotton fields, he said to me:

"What a great number of raspberries they grow down here."

Raspberries was right. At 4½ cents a pound for cotton, his mistake was perhaps a natural one.

I was speaking of adjustment. It is your duty and mine to continue to educate the people of this country to the fact that adjustment means not only adjustment downward but adjustment upward. If you and I agree on a correct figure for a normal carry-over, it means that if we have a bumper crop one year we will by mutual consent reduce the next year's crop in order to even up that carry-over. At the same time, if we get a short crop in a given year, you and I agree to increase the next year's crop to make up the shortage. That is exactly what we are doing today in the case of wheat.

NOT PLOWING UNDER

It is high time for you and me to carry by education knowledge of the fact that not a single program of the A. A. A. contemplated the destruction of an acre of feed crops in the United States, in spite of what you may read or be told by people who have special axes to grind.

It is high time for you and for me to make clear that we are not plowing under cotton this year—that we did not plow it under in 1934, and that we only plowed some of it under in 1933 because the Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed after a huge crop of cotton was already in the ground.

It is high time for us to repeat on every occasion that we have not wastefully destroyed food in any form. It is true that the Relief Administrator has purchased hundreds of thousands of tons of foodstuffs to feed the needy and hungry who are on the relief rolls in every part of the United States.

The crocodile tears shed by the professional mourners of an old and obsolete order over the slaughter of little pigs and other measures to reduce surplus agricultural inventories deceive very few thinking people, and least of all the farmers themselves.

CITES DESTINY OF HOGS

The acknowledged destiny of a pig is sausage, or ham, or bacon, or pork. In these forms, millions of pigs were consumed by vast numbers of needy people who otherwise would have had to do without.

Let me make one other point clear for the benefit of the millions in cities who have to buy meats. Last year the Nation suffered a drought of unparalleled intensity. If there had been no Government program, if the old order had obtained in 1933 and 1934, that drought on the cattle ranges of America and in the Corn Belt would have resulted in the marketing of thin cattle, immature hogs and in the death of these animals on the range and on the farm. Then we would have had a vastly greater shortage than we face today.

Our program saved the lives of millions of head of livestock. They are still on the range. Other millions are today canned and ready for the country to eat.

I think that you and I are agreed in seeking a continuance of a national policy which on the whole is proving successful. The memory of old conditions under which the product of a whole year's work often would not bring you the cost of transporting it to market is too fresh in your minds to let you be led astray by the solemn admonitions and specious lies of those who in the past profited most when your distress was greatest.

PRICES STILL HELD INSUFFICIENT

You remember, and I remember, that not so long ago the poor had less food to eat and less clothes to wear and that was at a time when you had to practically give away your products. Then the surpluses were greater and yet the poor were poorer than they are today and when you farmers are getting a reasonable although still an insufficient price.

I have not the time to talk with you about many other policies of your Government which affect the farm population of the country. I have not the time to go into the practical work of the Farm Credit Administration which in all of its ramifications has saved a million farms from foreclosure and has accomplished the first great reduction in exorbitant interest rates that this country has ever known.

Because your cause is so just no one has had the temerity to question the motives of your "march on Washington." It is a good omen for Government, for business, for bankers, and for the city dwellers that the Nation's farmers are becoming articulate and that they know whereof they speak.

I hope you have enjoyed your stay in Washington. Seeing your Government at first hand, you may have a better idea why its efforts at times seem lumbering and slow and complicated. On the other hand, you may have seen that we are moving faster and accomplishing more practical results than you have been led to believe by the high and mighty gentlemen I have spoken of. I want to thank you for your patience with us. I want to pledge our whole-hearted cooperation as you go forward.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I am in receipt of the following letter from the Secretary of the Interior advising of the loss of enrolled bill H. R. 6084, authorizing a bond issue for the town of Ketchikan, Alaska:

I regret to report the loss of enrolled bill H. R. 6084, authorizing a bond issue of Ketchikan, Alaska, which was delivered to my office on May 3 by a messenger from the White House. The bill was receipted for by a messenger at my door, who has no recollection, however, of this particular document. The practice is for the messenger to deliver enrolled bills to the man in charge of the incoming mail for my office, who sends them to the file room for recording. There is no record of the receipt of this bill by the recording clerk. In fact, a thorough search of the entire Department, including Public Works, has failed to discover the bill, and no one has any recollection of having handled it. I have caused everyone to search all papers in and on their desks, but without result. I am chagrined to have to report the loss of this bill in spite of the care with which enrolled bills are handled in the Department. I recommend that you ask the Congress to authorize the preparation of a duplicate. The last approval day is tomorrow, May 15.

In the circumstances, I recommend that a duplicate bill be authorized by concurrent resolution.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1935.*

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill H. R. 6084, entitled "An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed $1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes", and that the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit the same to the President of the United States.

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

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, what department was this lost in?

Mr. DIMOND. According to the letter, it was lost in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SNELL. Is that the same Department that lost $50,000,000, which was afterwards found to have been used for relief purposes? Probably the bill will be found in somebody's hip pocket later, and if it is so found, what becomes of it?

The SPEAKER. It will not be signed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is the Department in which all of my requests for jobs are lost, and it is probably mixed up with some of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNELL. That being so, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there is precedent for the signing of a duplicate bill. On February 3, 1921, a similar situation arose, and a duplicate bill was signed.

Mr. SNELL. We are not objecting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Clerk to read that this involves a bond issue of $100,000,000?

The SPEAKER. One million dollars. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS—ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the committee during the current session on the bill S. 1130, the Economic Security Act.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

GEORGIA'S ANSWER TO HER GOVERNOR

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein a copy of a speech I delivered over the radio last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over the radio last evening:

My friends, I wish, at the outset, to express my appreciation of the courtesy extended me by the Columbia Broadcasting System in permitting me to address you.

I appear as a Member of Congress from Georgia to answer a recent address made over this system by Governor Talmadge, of that State, in the hope that I may set right the people of the State in the eyes of the Nation.

Governor Talmadge did not speak for the people of Georgia in his bitter attack upon President Roosevelt and his administration. He spoke for himself alone and for motives which will subsequently become apparent.

The speech the Governor made was little more than a fault-finding tirade and would be of no importance except for the fact that it is an attack upon a Democratic President by a Democratic Governor of a rock-ribbed Democratic State in which the President makes his part-time home.

No one would deny to the Governor the right of criticism. Independence of thought and willingness to make public declaration of views are to be commended wherever found, but there is a broad distinction between legitimate criticism and what the Governor has done—as broad as the difference between lawful procedure and anarchy.

As a Member of Congress I have indulged in criticisms myself but have undertaken to make them advisory rather than destructive. I have not accepted without resistance all the measures offered with Presidential sanction. I opposed the adoption of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and I think upon good and substantial grounds, and have not changed my views. I did not support the $4,000,000,000 unemployment relief bill because I thought it placed a burden upon the future which the needs of the present did not justify. I have complained of what I have taken to be a tendency toward the centralization of too much power in the Federal Government through a too liberal interpretation of the Constitution, but I have recognized that the country has been in a state of emergency and quick and effective relief has demanded direct and vigorous treatment which has called for concentration of authority and power.

Governor Talmadge condemned in no unmistakable words the relief activities of the administration as extravagant waste, yet this same Governor within 2 weeks before he addressed you, wrote letters to every Member of the Georgia delegation in Congress pleading for a direct grant of $2,000,000 for the university system in Georgia. Governor Talmadge enjoys the distinction of being the first executive of any State in the Union out of whose hands the right to administer relief was taken. His whole grievance against the administration dates back to this incident. It was alleged that he was undertaking to make a political organization out of the State relief forces; that his then executive secretary, who is now commissioner of agriculture and advocating secession from the Union, was on the relief rolls, although at the same time he was drawing a sizeable salary from the State of Georgia. There were other similar complaints which need not be detailed.

Governor Talmadge condemned the activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration as a program of scarcity. He insists that farmers should be permitted to produce to the limit of their capacity, and yet while he was commissioner of agriculture he joined with Senator LONG, then Governor of Louisiana, in inaugurating the first movement for a cotton holiday in the South. It seems paradoxical to disclose at this late date that Senator LONG, as Governor of Louisiana, had his legislature pass a law prohibiting cotton growers of that fertile and productive State from planting a stalk of cotton in 1931, and after the Louisiana Legislature had passed this dictatorial act, Senator LONG, who was then Governor of the State, called upon all the Southern States to join in the movement, and his representative in Georgia was Governor Talmadge, then Commissioner of Agriculture.

Governor Talmadge called a mass meeting of farmers in Atlanta at that time and made every effort to force Governor Russell, who is now Senator from Georgia, to call an extraordinary session of the State legislature and fall in line with Louisiana by passing a law to prohibit the farmer of Georgia from planting a stalk of cotton during an entire year. We now find these two distinguished gentlemen, Senator Long and Governor Talmadge, as the leading critics of the agricultural adjustment program, condemning administration benefits to the farmer as a fallacious program of scarcity and attempting to tell the farmer that the abolishment of the present program would result in better prices for his products. In this connection it will interest you to know that there is today in Washington a delegation of more than a thousand farmers from the State of Georgia who have come here to protest the speech of Governor Talmadge, to express confidence in the President and approval of the administration's farm program.

The task of the A. A. A. has been that of coordinating the efforts of the American farmer to win his way back to a place in the American economy. In the 2 years following March 15, 1933, prices of the seven farm commodities originally named as basic in the Agricultural Adjustment Act—cotton, tobacco, hogs, corn, wheat, rice, and milk—more than doubled. In 1933, $162,000,000 in rental and benefits were paid to farmers cooperating in the adjustment program, and in 1934, five hundred and fifty-six millions were paid in rental and benefit payments and drought livestock purchases, bringing the total cash income from $4,328,000,000 in 1932 to $5,051,000,000 in 1933, and to $6,090,000,000 in 1934.

Now, what about Georgia?

In 1932 receipts from farm marketings yielded Georgia farmers $58,311,000, but by 1934 receipts rose to $95,886,000, and with $14,215,000 of rental and benefit payments the total returns were $110,101,000. In other words, Georgia's farm cash income for 1934 represented a gain of 90 percent over their farm cash income of 1932. In addition to this, up to February 1, 1933, Georgia cotton growers had received $5,060,261 on cotton options held by them, as a result of the 1933 cotton program, and up to the same date Georgia farmers had taken advantage of the cotton loan to borrow $42,255,149 on 701,072 bales of cotton. What has happened in Georgia is typical of what has happened in every other agricultural State.

The increase in this well-being of the farmer that followed the improvement in farm income just mentioned meant not only that the farmer has been able to buy more of the things he needs than he has for a number of years, but the city workers have in turn profited by the revival of markets due to his purchases.

These are some of the benefits that have flown to the farmer and the country as a direct result of the agricultural program, but still Governor Talmadge says it is all wrong and should not continue, that it is a program of scarcity, that it stagnates business and is hurtful to the farmer. I am unable to see how the farmer is hurt by doubling his income on the same investment and effort. I am sure that Governor Talmadge has no conscious intention of hurting the farmer. He has simply gotten into water that is over his head and rather than call for help he is willing to drown.

The Governor has threatened to campaign the country against the processing tax, but even if he should give up this proposed trip and decide to stay at home he cannot get by with telling the farmers that "the processing tax has stagnated the cotton industry in America and is causing the importation of cotton here every day." The figures on cotton imports for the 7 months ending February 1935 and the comparison with the same 7 months last year happen to be as follows:

Cotton unmanufactured, imports for consumption, by countries of production, for 7 months ending February—

Country of production	1934	1935
	Pounds	*Pounds*
Mexico	680,492	508,869
British West Indies	13,107	4,496
Argentina	2,737	
Brazil		1,608
Peru	1,578,694	345,050
British India	5,576,876	6,995,056
China	6,118,838	1,297,123
Netherland India	209,726	157,560
British West Africa	31,574	
Egypt	26,530,230	22,950,204
Total	40,742,274	32,259,966

Neither can the Governor get by with bewailing that the "thousands of cotton goods and fabrics that were once made in America and shipped to China and Japan are now made in China and Japan and shipped back here to the United States on account of this foolish processing tax", when the cotton farmers know well enough that imported raw cotton pays the same processing tax as domestic cotton when it is made up in an American mill, and when they know equally well that imported cotton textiles pay a compensating tax equal to our domestic processing tax, in addition to the regular tariff.

In addition to this, nothing would be more foolish than shutting out imports of cotton goods from Japan which is but a fraction of 1 percent of domestic production when Japan is the world's best customer for American cotton.

The Governor objects to all activities of the Government that compete with private enterprise. This puts him in opposition to the development of Muscle Shoals and makes him unwittingly a special pleader for the Power Trust and fertilizer combine which for many years succeeded in the killing off all legislation making use of this Government property. It puts him in opposition to the services that this development is intended to render—cheap fertilizer, rural electrification, and cheap power. Take the Government out of business, the Governor demands. Let me ask him what would have become of the distressed farm owners and home owners if the Government had not come to their rescue. He, of course, knows that the insurance companies, building and loan associations, and other lending agencies would own them all by now.

If the Government is in business, it is because business had failed and the country had to be saved. It was business that first obtained security through governmental aid. Big business that 2 years ago came to Washington with hat in hand, now haughtily demands that the recovery program under which it was saved cease, and Governor Talmadge joins in asking that this be done.

In his frenzied attack upon the President, Governor Talmadge has thrown himself into the very arms of big business, for it is from this source that comes greatest objection to the effort being made to give some kind of relief and security to people who toil. I am opposed to the regimentation of business and of life. I believe in government by law and not by men; but a state of war demands war measures, and until we come out of the slump into which the country has fallen we will have to put up with things with which we are unaccustomed. There is no intention anywhere to filch from the people their liberties, but, on the other hand, the determination to make them secure in the enjoyment of all their natural and legal rights.

Governor Talmadge blames the administration for the continued unemployment of thousands of unfortunate people and in the same breath he damns the President for relief activities which are designed to give these unfortunates a temporary means of living until they can be absorbed by industry. He complains of millions of dollars being spent for relief, but he fails to mention the widespread suffering that would result but for this humanitarian policy. He manifests greater concern in the profits of business than in the lives of the people. What would he do for the poor? There is no work to be had and they cannot live on grass.

In denouncing the administration farm program as an effort to build prosperity from scarcity, he fails to refer to the miserable economic conditions prevailing in American agriculture when large surpluses in cotton, wheat, and other major commodities depressed prices to the point where farmers were unable to recover the cost of their operations. In making the false claim that curtailment of acreage put millions of people off the farms, he said nothing of the tremendous increase in farm revenue that has resulted from this acreage curtailment. Perhaps his major recommendation for restoring normal conditions is the laughable suggestion that the Agricultural Adjustment Act be abolished and all outstanding contracts to the farmers be paid off and agriculture be forced to return to the old unorganized status it occupied during the early days of the depression. If this were done, a rule of ruin would follow. Expansion of acreage would be the first step, overproduction would ensue, the Government's policy of making commodity loans would be abandoned, market prices would collapse, and in less than a year American agriculture would find itself back in the depth of despair from which it is just now emerging.

The Governor has apparently overlooked the fact that the problem that confronted the President in 1932 was a complex one. That among other things it involved both recovery and reform. Recovery could have unquestionably been accomplished more speedily had all effort been concentrated upon that single phase of the problem, but the opportunity for reform would have passed, and reform was essential to the general good as recovery.

New treatment for both old and new problems had to be applied, and this called for experimentation which involved error. Errors have, of course, been made. In so vast an undertaking as saving the country from rack and ruin, calling for the speedy setting up of new machinery for administration purposes and the expenditure of huge sums of money, error was inevitable. No reasonable person would have expected such an undertaking to be free of inequalities, injustices, and waste. The question is: Have general conditions improved under the treatment that has been applied?

The Governor would judge things upon the basis of their weaknesses rather than their strength. His demand is for perfection in everything. Because of a lack of infallibility on the part of the President and perfection in the institutions and men set up and appointed to administer governmental affairs, he would hold that the President has been a complete failure and would set him aside and have another elevated to this high station, and the Governor seemingly intended, in this connection, to invite attention to himself.

The controlling passion of the President, as gathered from his public utterances and what he has done, has been to save America, and in the prosecution of this lofty and noble purpose he has probably found it necessary to accept as temporary expedients things that he would oppose being made permanent policies of government. The effort has been to give emphasis to the fact that government is the concern of all, that it is a social union, that it exists not alone for the protection of property but for the protection of person and property and all the good that government can be made to bestow. It is in the light of actualities that we must judge if we hope to judge rightly. The laying down of broad general principles of justice upon which to ground a rule of governmental conduct is not a simple undertaking.

Is it to be understood that the Governor has teased himself into the funny position of bidding for three nominations? A place on the national Democratic ticket, or if that cannot be had then on the Republican ticket, and if that be denied him then a place on the ticket of any third party that may come along? To be a contender for any one of these places a candidate should be able to start out with the support of his own State which in this instance will never be the case, for Georgia has but one candidate for the Presidency in 1936, and that candidate is the President himself.

But as serious as is the political apostasy of the Governor, his most grievous offense was his violation of all laws of decency and propriety committed in a recent speech in which he derisively referred to the physical infirmities of the President. For this one offense, if for none other, public sentiment should lash him out of public life.

CRITICS OF A. A. A.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the President's denunciation of the critics of his destructive A. A. A. policies as liars includes a very wide category of Democrats and initiates a New Deal Ananias Club, including Senators Glass, Byrd, Tydings, Bailey, George, Walsh, Gore, Copeland, and Long, and Governor Talmadge of Georgia, Bainbridge Colby, former Democratic Secretary of State, Alfred E. Smith, John W. Davis, Albert C. Ritchie, Newton D. Baker and, lastly, Father Coughlin, who has been one of the severest and bitterest critics of the A. A. A. program, and practically all of New England.

One of the main pledges of the new-deal administration was to promote the export of our agricultural products, but instead, because of the half-baked program of the A. A. A., the export of wheat, cotton, pork, and other farm produce has reached a vanishing point.

"Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad." Confused and confounded by the marked swing away from the unsound and socialistic new-deal policies, the President lost his head—and that is the mildest term that can be applied—when he called his critics "liars." The facts are seeping through to the people in spite of the radio barrage of the "new dealers" and honeyed words and sugar-coated phrases of the President in his fireside chats, that the impractical, visionary, and magical schemes of the Wallaces, Tugwells, and Ezekiels to destroy crops, regulate the birth control of pigs, and provide a program of scarcity when there are more than 11,000,000 unemployed and over 20,000,000 Americans on relief, have increased unemployment and lost our world markets for wheat and cotton, formerly our greatest sources of real wealth.

Naturally the cotton farmers, with cotton pegged at 12 cents, have flocked to Washington to applaud the President for temporary benefits, regardless of the fact that they are following the "new deal pied pipers" in a dance of death toward vanishing world markets and ruin and desolation for the South. If the cotton farmers and the South want to commit economic suicide for temporary profit, that is their business, but it does not change the facts by one jot or tittle. Lenin was right when he said that the capitalists would commit suicide for temporary profit, and that applies to the farmers as well. The cotton farmers have already lost over 50 percent of the world markets and will lose the balance to Brazil, Egypt, India, and Soviet Russia within the next 2 years, bringing economic and financial ruin to the South. The wheat export markets have already been lost and we are importing more wheat than we export, and shiploads of oats, corn, and rye are being unloaded in the United States at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes to reply to the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the President of the whole United States. He is the Democrats' President. He is the Republicans' President. For months he has been working day and night in the interest of the American people. When the President's shoulders are bowed down just now with the great burdens of government, I cannot conceive of the kind of man who will get up on this floor day after day and try to hamstring him. [Applause on Democratic side.] He deserves a little encouragement once in a while, he deserves a little cooperation once in a while, he deserves efforts on both sides of this aisle to help hold up his hands in these trying times.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has to get up and take his swipe at him; and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has to get up and take his swipe at him; and now the new tentative leader, the tentative candidate for President on the Republican side, Mr. FISH, has got to take his political swipe at the President.

Mr. Speaker, I wish these gentlemen on the other side of the aisle could have attended a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel last night, where 710 farmers from the great State of Texas met to thank and eulogize their President. They did not want anything, they did not come here to demand anything, but they came here merely to thank the Congress and the President for what the Congress and the President have done for them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have been here for 18 years in Congress. This is the first time I have ever heard of the American people being so full of gratitude to their President and to their Congress that they would make a trip of 2,000 miles, at their own expense, to thank their Congress and thank their President and his administration for giving them a square deal.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. It is time this sniping ought to stop; it is time this shooting from ambush ought to stop. Even the people of Potsdam do not appreciate it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my only thought in getting this time is this: After listening to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] make his wonderful appeal to the Membership of the House to stand by and support the President, I am wondering whether or not gentlemen on his side of the aisle are going to support the President in his position on the bonus.

Mr. BLANTON. No, we are not; but that has nothing to do with it, because we are not attacking him and we are not sniping at him all the time.

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

FRED C. AINSWORTH ENDOWMENT LIBRARY

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the late Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth left a bequest of $10,000 to establish in Walter Reed Hospital the Fred C. Ainsworth Library. The Judge Advocate General of the Army has held that action by Congress permitting the War Department to accept this money to have the library established is necessary.

Unless acceptance is made by the 5th of June the bequest will fail. It is, therefore, an emergency that we take up and pass this bill.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 98, to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth for the purpose of establishing a permanent library at the Walter Reed General Hospital to be known as the "Fred C. Ainsworth Endowment Library."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 98, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital be, and is hereby, authorized to accept the bequest of the late Maj. Gen. Fred C. Ainsworth, or such amount thereof as is available, as contained in his last will and testament, and such interest as may have accrued on the funds covered by such bequest, and to receipt therefor on behalf of the United States, and to deposit the funds so received in the Treasury of the United States as a special fund dedicated to the purpose of establishing a permanent library at the Walter Reed General Hospital, to be known as the "Fred C. Ainsworth Endowment Library", said fund to be subject to disbursement for such purpose upon vouchers submitted by the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital and to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the Treasurer of the United States, upon the written request of the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital so to do, is authorized to invest and reinvest any part or all of the corpus of this bequest, as well as any income therefrom, in interest-bearing United States Government bonds, and retain custody thereof, if, in the judgment of the adjutant it will best serve the objects of the bequest: *Provided further*, That the Treasurer of the United States, upon the written request of the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital so to do, is authorized to dispose of, for cash, any part or all of any bonds in which such funds may be invested, and redeposit the proceeds thereof, as well as all interest received from time to time upon any such bonds, to the credit of such special fund and subject to withdrawal and disbursement and reinvestment, as above provided for: *And provided further*, That the administration, control, and expenditure of this fund and its application to the purposes intended shall be according to the sole discretion of the adjutant Walter Reed General Hospital, and the exercise of his discretion and authority in regard thereto and his decision thereon shall not be subject to question or review except by the Secretary of War and courts of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. The necessary space or a separate room in any building at the Walter Reed General Hospital is authorized to be set aside for the purpose of establishing the said library.

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

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is necessary to have a resolution of this kind, in order to take advantage of the bequest?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. That is the opinion of the Judge Advocate General, stated to the War Department, and conveyed in a letter from the Secretary of War to the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

A similar House joint resolution was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to extend until April 1, 1936, the provisions of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2357. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1933.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House to sign a duplicate copy of the enrolled bill H. R. 6084.

RESEARCH IN CONNECTION WITH AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges.

This is a bill for research and land-grant colleges. It has the unanimous report of the committee. I feel that there is no opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 7160, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, as far as the bill itself is concerned, I do not know that there is any objection to it. I do not see the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, present.

Mr. JONES. I spoke to the gentleman from Kansas about it. He did not know it was coming up just at this time, but he helped prepare the bill and is supporting it. I telephoned his office. He is on his way. I notice there are other members of the committee on the minority side present.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any explanation that should be made in connection with the bill?

Mr. JONES. I will be glad to make any explanation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, is this one of the bills for which the gentleman has requested a rule?

Mr. JONES. No; I have not requested a rule on this. I may have listed it as one of the bills we wanted to take up, but this is the land-grant and research bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman requested a rule on another bill which had a unanimous report, and it was stated there was no objection to it. It was unanimously reported and everybody was for it, but at the hearing before the Rules Committee some objection arose. That is the forestry bill. It is being held up awaiting further explanation.

Mr. JONES. I do not think I listed that bill. I think the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] listed that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Many of these bills that are reported out unanimously by committees develop much controversy before the Rules Committee.

Mr. JONES. That rarely happens in matters reported by our committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not going to object, but in my opinion this is not the way to enact legislation.

Mr. JONES. I was simply trying to save time for the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. What is to be the program for today? As I understood it, the Committee on Agriculture had the call.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The committees will be called as soon as the House disposes of business on the Speaker's table.

Mr. JONES. The Foreign Affairs Committee desires to take up several bills.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the Committee on Agriculture had the call.

Mr. JONES. If this bill is passed, we will be out of the way. We will present nothing further today.

Mr. SNELL. And the gentleman's committee will lose its call.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Foreign Affairs Committee will take up the balance of the day. They have enough bills to take up the balance of the day.

Mr. JONES. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will have the call, and I was trying to save time for them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture just what this bill provides?

Mr. JONES. This bill provides for two things: It provides for research into problems affecting agriculture, and a search for new markets and new uses. It also provides additional funds for the land-grant colleges.

Mr. TRUAX. Does it involve any additional appropriation?

Mr. JONES. Yes. For the research it involves at the start $1,000,000 a year, gradually increasing to $5,000,000. Then it also provides for an additional fund for the land-grant colleges, beginning with an $8,000,000 annual appropriation and increases to twelve million. I think the gentleman's own State has a land-grant college.

Mr. TRUAX. Yes. That is the reason I am interested.

Mr. JONES. It provides additional funds made necessary by reason of the administration of the farm program.

Mr. TRUAX. Can the gentleman enlighten me as to the research work, just what field will be entered?

Mr. JONES. The research will be into basic lines of agriculture. Sixty percent of the research funds will be allocated to the States, to be matched by the States, the research conducted by the States, into problems of marketing and new uses, and laws and principles affecting agriculture generally. Sixty percent of that money will be allocated to the various States, to be matched by the States.

Mr. TRUAX. And it will go to the colleges and experiment stations?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. Are those all the agencies that will secure this money?

Mr. JONES. Those are all the agencies that will secure this money that is allocated to the States for the extension service. Then a percentage of the research fund is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, 20 percent to be spent wherever he sees fit, and 20 percent in regional investigations in various regions.

Mr. TRUAX. I wonder if the gentleman would welcome a suggestion that part of these funds be used for researching more intensely into the cost of production of basic commodities? I think we are all interested in that.

Mr. JONES. The Secretary could do that out of this fund. It covers in a broad way research into the basic laws of production, the quality and improved methods of production, as well as the search for new uses and new markets.

Mr. TRUAX. It could be done?

Mr. JONES. In my judgment it could be done; yes. The Secretary will have discretion in a broad way in the use of these research funds.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Texas say that it can be done. If we had less professorial research and less professional "bug" hunters on Government pay rolls, it would then be possible to determine each year with great accuracy the farm cost of production of each basic agricultural commodity. This would provide an opportunity for real and lasting service to farmers of untold value. Tell us, without guessing, what it costs to raise a bushel of wheat, a bushel of corn, a hundred pounds of pork, and a hundred pounds of beef; then, and then only, can we expect national legislation by the Congress to guarantee to the farmer that cost plus a reasonable profit.

I always favor adequate appropriations for worth-while projects under the jurisdiction and direction of land-grant colleges. On the other hand, I am opposed to certain types of so-called "research work" conducted in the past under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating with the various experiment stations. I refer to the somewhat abortive attempt made in 1926, 1927, and 1928 to control the European cornborer. At that time millions of dollars were expended by both Federal and State governments.

One of the schemes tried out was an attempt to develop a type of corn that would be immune and act as a repellent to the attacks of the borer. Nearly $3,000,000 were spent by the United States Department of Agriculture in the purchase of tractors, trucks, plows, oil burners, and other machinery in the vain hope of destroying the borer by mechanical means, quite overlooking or ignoring the fact that the natural flight of the moths when they emerged from the larvae was the most prolific means of spreading the pest and cannot be stopped or controlled by human agencies or mechanical means. Needless to state that these attempts resulted in foredoomed failure.

Recently I received a copy of a speech by a Member of the Senate which listed more than 1,000 positions now held by college graduates in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I think it is wholly wrong to deny the same opportunities of employment to outstanding and forward-facing farmers simply because they have been denied the advantages of a college education and training. I hope that this

apparent discrimination in favor of the college graduate which penalizes those farmers who have not had the time nor the means to attend college will be corrected in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objections.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the call lies with the Committee on Agriculture today unless the committee waives the call.

Mr. JONES. Yes; but there are a number of bills the Committee on Foreign Affairs desires to dispose of.

Mr. MICHENER. The Frazier-Lemke bill and the gentlemen's own bill, from his own committee affecting agriculture are on the calendar, and the rules of the House provide that on Calendar Wednesday the committee having the call may bring up such bills as the committee has reported out. Has the gentleman's committee taken action to waive its call on Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. JONES. No; the gentleman has not taken action to do that. We have a number of important bills on the calendar which are more or less controversial and which could not be finished in 1 day, and we feel there is no use wasting a lot of the time of the House. The gentleman understands that Calendar Wednesday is only for 1 day, and no important controversial bill can be passed in 1 day. There will be requests for rules on those various bills because they are controversial. They will excite a lot of discussion and it would be impossible to pass them in 1 day. It is not our policy to take up a lot of the time of the House in the consideration of controversial measures that could not be passed in a day. They must be brought up in the regular way so they can be finished.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman is going to ask for rules on those bills, of course, that is a better way of bringing them up.

Mr. JONES. We will ask for rules on several bills.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct scientific, technical, economic, and other research into basic laws and principles and processes relating to the improvement of the quality of, and the development of, new and improved methods of production of, distribution of, and new and extended uses and markets for, agricultural commodities and byproducts and manufactures thereof. Research authorized under this section shall be in addition to research provided for under existing law (but both activities shall be coordinated so far as practicable) and shall be conducted by such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as the Secretary may designate or establish.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is also authorized and directed to encourage research similar to that authorized under section 1 to be conducted by agricultural experiment stations established or which may hereafter be established in pursuance of the act of March 2, 1887, providing for experiment stations, as amended and supplemented, by the allotment and payment as provided in section 5 to States and Territories for the use of such experiment stations of sums appropriated therefor pursuant to this title.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this title there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and for each of the 4 fiscal years thereafter $1,000,000 more than the amount authorized for the preceding fiscal year, and $5,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Moneys appropriated in pursuance of this title shall also be available for the purchase and rental of land and the construction of buildings necessary for conducting research provided for in this title, for the equipment and maintenance of such buildings, and for printing and disseminating the results of research. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this title shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, appropriations for research or other activities of the Department of Agriculture and sums appropriated or otherwise made available for agricultural experiment stations.

SEC. 4. Forty percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under section 3 shall be available for the purposes of section 1. The sums available for the purposes of section 1 shall be designated as the "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture", and no part of such special fund shall be used for the prosecution of research heretofore instituted or for the prosecution of any new research project except upon approval in writing by the Secretary. One-half of such special research fund shall be used by the Secretary for the establishment and maintenance of research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural regions at places selected by him and for the prosecution, in accordance with section 1, of research at such laboratories.

SEC. 5. (a) Sixty percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under section 3 shall be available for the purposes of section 2. The Secretary shall allot, for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, to each State and Territory an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State or Territory bears to the rural population of all the States and Territories as determined by the last preceding decennial census. No allotment and no payment under any allotment shall be made for any fiscal year in excess of the amount which the State or Territory makes available for such fiscal year out of its own funds for research and for the establishment and maintenance of necessary facilities for the prosecution of such research. If any State or Territory fails to make available for such purposes for any fiscal year a sum equal to the total amount to which it may be entitled for such year, the remainder of such amount shall be withheld by the Secretary. The total amount so withheld may be allotted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the States and Territories which make available for such year an amount equal to that part of the total amount withheld which may be allotted to them by the Secretary of Agriculture, but no such additional allotment to any State or Territory shall exceed the original allotment to such State or Territory for that year by more than 20 percent thereof.

(b) The sums authorized to be allotted to the States and Territories shall be paid annually in quarterly payments on July 1, October 1, January 1, and April 1. Such sums shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury upon warrant of the Secretary of Agriculture in the same manner and subject to the same administrative procedure set forth in the act of March 2, 1887, as amended June 7, 1888.

SEC. 6. As used in this title the term "Territory" means Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this act.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SECTION 21. In order to further develop the cooperative extension system as inaugurated under the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture", approved May 8, 1914 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 341–348), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the expenses of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics and the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the same, the sum of $8,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and for the fiscal year following the first fiscal year for which an appropriation is made in pursuance of the foregoing authorization the additional sum of $1,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter an additional sum of $1,000,000 until the total appropriations authorized by this section shall amount to $12,000,000 annually, the authorization to continue in that amount for each succeeding fiscal year. The sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under the act of May 8, 1914, except that (1) the allotments to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii shall be in the proportion that the farm population of each bears to the total farm population of the several States and Hawaii, as determined by the last preceding decennial census, and (2) the several States and Hawaii shall not be required to offset the allotments authorized in this section. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated under such act of May 8, 1914, as amended and supplemented, or sums otherwise appropriated for agricultural extension work. Allotments to any State or Hawaii for any fiscal year from the appropriations herein authorized shall be available for payment to such State or Hawaii only if such State or Hawaii complies, for such fiscal year, with the provisions with reference to offset of appropriations (other than appropriations under this section) for agricultural extension work.

SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States entitled to the benefits of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts", approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 301–328; Supp. VII, sec. 304), there are hereby authorized to be ap-

propriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

(a) For the fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, and for each fiscal year thereafter, $960,000; and

(b) For the fiscal year following the first fiscal year for which an appropriation is made in pursuance of paragraph (a), $500,000, and for each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter $500,000 more than the amount authorized to be appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, and for each fiscal year thereafter $1,500,000. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States in the proportion which the total population of each such State bears to the total population of all the States, as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the act entitled "An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862", approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 1, beginning in line 5, after the word "conduct", strike out the balance of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and on page 2 all of line 1 to and including the word "thereof" in line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "research into laws and principles underlying basic problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects; research relating to the improvement of the quality of and the development of new and improved methods of production of, distribution of, and new and extended uses and markets for, agricultural commodities and by-products and manufactures thereof; and research relating to the conservation, development, and use of land and water resources for agricultural purposes."

Page 3, line 20, after the figure "1", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of the sums appropriated may be used for the administration of section 5 of this title."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in view of the brief discussion on the bill just passed, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the cotton farmers are in Washington today and I am delighted that they are here. I wish that every Member from the Northern States and every Member from the Southern States, every Member who grows cotton, every Member who has a textile plant in his district, whether he be from the North or the South, at a big meeting of the Members and the cotton farmers could discuss our whole cotton problem. It is not a problem for the South alone, it is not a problem for the North alone. We need the South and the South needs us.

Those farmers who have their processing taxes know very well that if the northern markets are gone and if the southern mills lose their foreign market that King Cotton will be dethroned.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair realizes that the northern Members who have spoken have not said that the farmers should not be reimbursed for their cotton; they have said that the wheels of the cotton textile industry must turn, that the people must have work.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why there have been the bitter attacks upon New England by the Secretary of Agriculture, by Members of Congress from the South. [Cries from the Democratic side of "Regular order!" "Regular order!"] You know very well, my friends on the Democratic side, that you need us just as we need you. We have cast no aspersions on the South or the southern workers, but many aspersions have been cast upon our manufacturers and upon our New England workers of foreign descent, who are so fine. I am pleading for the whole country, Mr. Speaker, not for just my section.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an inquiry. I have heard of Democratic Congresses and Republican Congresses, but I now want to ask if I am justified in referring to the present Congress as a piscatorial Congress, since we have a "kingfish" at one end of the building and a "poor fish" at the other end? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. I would like to know if the gentleman who just spoke is a Member of Congress. I have never seen him before. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, but the Chair will answer the inquiry of the gentleman from New York by saying that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a very prominent and able Member of the House.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will permit, I would say to the gentleman from New York that if he had been present at the sessions of the House attending to his business, as I have been, instead of touring the country maligning the Chief Executive, he would know I am a Member of this House. [Applause.]

OUR BANKING POLICY

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a request sent to the Congress by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles, Calif., and also a letter from Mr. Siegfried, an economist.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Banking Act of 1935 has been passed by the House and is now under consideration in the Senate. It was my privilege to participate in the debate on the bill, and in closing my remarks I recommended further study of our banking problem on the part of Congress, and not only on the part of Congress but on the part of commerce, agriculture, and industry. It seems that we have been given to theorizing, and the solution of the problem has not been sought on a factual basis. We must marshal the facts if we expect to treat the subject scientifically. Whether the House or Senate performs this service, now or in the future, it is a duty which remains with the Congress.

Only recently Members received at their offices a document containing suggestions for the act from the well-known economist, Mr. Thorwald Siegfried, of Los Angeles, Calif. Accompanying it was an official request from the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles for consideration of his proposal which had for its purpose the embodiment of economic equity.

The request of the supervisors, it will be recalled, was as follows:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Los Angeles, Calif.

To the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress:

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles hereby request that due consideration be given the proposal of Mr. Thorwald Siegfried, as presented to the Banking and Currency Com-

mittee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Mr. Siegfried's known position as economist and author on economic issues of the day is one that the board of supervisors is familiar with. His position in the community is one of long standing and he is looked upon with high regard.

Very truly yours,

MAME B. BEATTY,
Chief Clerk Board of Supervisors.

From Mr. Siegfried has come to me the following letter under date of May 9, 1935:

MAY 9, 1935.

Hon. EDWARD A. KENNEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Complimenting you on having said on May 3 (pp. 7186–7187) the only fundamental things that have appeared in the RECORD up to that time on the subject of banking and currency. All the rest is symptomatic, superficial, emotional, speculative; but the bill of exchange, the self-liquidating item monetized by check, is the core of Anglo-Saxon and American superiority in commerce. When more men wake up to that fact we may have truly scientific banking policy, either by voluntary action of intelligent bankers or by legislation.

If your remarks should be reprinted, I should value having a number of copies for distribution, up to several hundred; also of anything more that you say on this line.

I take this opportunity of handing you another, and marked, copy of the broadside on the currency and banking bill, which was sent to you and other Members last week.

Very sincerely yours,

THORWALD SIEGFRIED.

It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate now or this House at the earliest opportunity sift the fundamentals relating to banking, whereupon there should be no difficulty in establishing a "truly scientific banking policy."

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. McREYNOLDS (when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6504) to amend an act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor", and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America and providing compensation therefor", approved February 23, 1931, be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. That all appointments and promotions of Foreign Service officers shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such officers may be commissioned as diplomatic or consular officers or both: *Provided*, That Foreign Service officers now or hereafter appointed or promoted during a recess of the Senate shall be paid the compensation of the position to which appointed or promoted from the date of such appointment or promotion until the end of the next session of the Senate if they have not theretofore been confirmed by the Senate, or until their rejection by the Senate before the end of its next session: *Provided further*, That if the Senate should reject or fail to confirm the promotion of a Foreign Service officer during the session following the date of such promotion, the Foreign Service officer shall automatically be reinstated in the position from which he was promoted, such reinstatement to be effective, in the event of rejection of the nomination, from the date of rejection; and in the event of failure of the Senate to act on the nomination during the session following a promotion, from the termination of that session: *And provided further*, That all official acts of such officers while serving under diplomatic or consular commissions in the Foreign Service shall be performed under their respective commissions as secretaries or as consular officers."

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

UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7909) to amend the act creating a United States court for China and prescribing the title thereof as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to ask some questions. What is the necessity for creating these additional employees to send to China? I notice that the bill provides that this clerk to be appointed may act for the judge when the judge is not there. My idea is that the judge ought to be there. There are too many officials who go to foreign countries representing the United States Government and do not stay there and attend to their business. They come back home and stay 2 or 3 months, and some spend their time here lecturing around the country. They have been doing this for 20 years. They want somebody to attend to their business while they are gone.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt the wisdom of passing this bill, although I do not like to put my judgment up against the judgment of the gentleman and his committee. The gentleman, the chairman of this committee, is one of the leading Members of the House. I should like to feel that he watches these things and is not going to approve a bill for extra employees unless it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. May I explain the situation to the gentleman. This is the situation in China. We have one district judge and this judge not only has Shanghai, but he also has to go to two or three other places as far separated as Boston is from San Francisco. All rights of American citizens are determined in this court and it is impossible for the judge to stay in Shanghai all the time. When this situation occurs there is no chance for the settlement of litigation of any kind or for the treatment of prisoners even.

Mr. BLANTON. The thought I have in mind goes back to the passage of the Dyer China Trading Act. When they brought that bill up here for consideration, I called attention to just what would happen; that is, we would have so-called "Americans" going over to China and engaging in business in China for their own commercial advantage. The rest of the people of the United States are not interested at all. These people who go over there are there to make money. I called attention to the fact that this Congress would be called upon year after year to appropriate a lot of money to take care of and protect them and the first thing you know their rights would be invaded over there and we would have to spend a lot of money to protect them. And then over my objections, Mr. Dyer passed another bill to exempt these Americans trading in China from paying an income tax. That law should be repealed.

There is no reason in the world why there should be so many Americans in China doing a private business over there so that the United States Government has to furnish courts in China for them and extra officials to take care of their business.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that there are 4,000 American citizens resident in Shanghai. The gentleman must remember that our marines and soldiers are constantly in that territory.

Mr. BLANTON. But their rights are not protected by this court.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANTON. Their rights are protected by the United States Army and Navy.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. But if they have to be tried they have to go before that court.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman what is the objection to going into Committee of the Whole and considering this matter?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Not in the least.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not care to waste that time. I just want to ask one question. The gentleman stated there are 4,000 Americans doing business in China.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. In Shanghai.

Mr. BLANTON. In China, which includes Shanghai.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Only in Shanghai.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way do they benefit the people of the United States? Our people are not interested in them, or their money-making schemes in China.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and Mr. TABER demanded the regular order.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7909) to amend the act creating a United States court for China and prescribing the title thereof, as amended, with Mr. HOUSTON in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an understanding as to time.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee first?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I want an understanding as to the division of time.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman will have 1 hour's time at his disposal.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I hope at the outset that the gentleman from Tennessee or the sponsor of the bill will explain it to the House. This may save a good deal of time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. All I want to know is what benefit it is to the 125,000,000 people of the United States to have these 4,000 people in China doing business for themselves? How does it benefit our nationals here in the United States?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I may say to the gentleman that his question might be pertinent if we were establishing a court at this time, but the court has already been established years ago. Our citizens are over there. They are going there all the time. They are coming away from there. Many of them live there. It is for their protection that the court has been created, and it is for the purpose of giving a speedy trial to those persons involved in litigation.

Mr. BLANTON. I have this thought in mind. I know of men who have gone down into old Mexico to try to get rich by going in the mining business, in the oil business, or in the cattle business. As soon as they got down there they would get into some trouble they ought not to get into, and then call on the Government to spend a lot of money to protect them when probably they should not be protected.

I have found sometimes when they go down there and do wrong they are not entitled to any protection from this Government and this is going on all over the world. We ought to make American citizens stay out of these foreign countries if they are going to expect the Government to be spending money in their behalf all the time.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does that include Mexico, too?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I notice in the report accompanying this bill there is a letter from the Attorney General.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The Attorney General does not seem to warm up to the feature in the bill that the commissioner is to be appointed by the district judge to act as district judge in his absence, and he suggests there be a special or substitute judge appointed by the President. It seems to me that notwithstanding this suggestion and this recommendation of the Attorney General the committee has brought in a bill which does the very thing which the Attorney General objects to, and I would like to have the chairman explain that situation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman is in error about that. The gentleman is misconstruing the first section of the bill. The first section of the bill amending section 10 merely applies to the consulate court. We have a consulate court there now and he acts in these matters ex officio as judge, and this is merely authority for the judge to appoint his clerk as the consulate court, and not to act for the judge in the other matters referred to. The consulate court is more like a justice-of-the-peace court in this country, with certain limited jurisdictions. The gentleman has misconstrued the language. This bill was drawn in the Attorney General's office, and this letter came in response to another bill which had been introduced. This bill was substituted for the other bill in conformity with the request of the Attorney General, and there was a unanimous report by the committee.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. This bill does not create a new, all-time salaried office, does it?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. It simply provides that the judge may appoint a local attorney to act in his behalf at a per diem of $10 when the judge is necessarily absent from Shanghai on business in other parts of the country.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman is correct. It does not create any additional office. We have a judge in China and under present conditions we have also a consulate court. The consulate court, as I stated a moment ago, is more like a justice-of-the-peace court. When the district judge is not there, there is no one available who can take up these matters, and all the rights of Americans are determined in this district court of the United States. The district judge not only has Shanghai, where there are 4,000 Americans, but he has to go to two other places in China to hold court where we have American citizens and where American rights are involved, and these places are as far apart as Boston from San Francisco. This measure is to apply only in the case of an emergency. If the judge is sick, or if the judge wants to take a vacation of 30 days, he cannot take it. When the change was made over there and the new judge was appointed, there was some lapse of time involved and the people had to go without such a court, and when the former district attorney was before the committee he stated that on account of this condition, at times when the judge is in some other place, American citizens are held in jail for months before they can get a trial.

This does not create a new office. This is simply for the purpose of allowing the President to designate someone in an emergency when the judge cannot be there, who is to receive a paltry sum for his services when the judge is absent. Your committee was unanimous in its report.

Mr. FISH. I would ask the gentleman to spread a little of his wisdom to the Members on this side.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I thought the gentleman, being a member of this committee, was converted and needed no further information.

Mr. FISH. I am with the gentleman, but I want the gentleman to give some information to this side.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think the Members on that side are all with the committee.

Mr. FISH. No; there is a little opposition here.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Tell me the opposition.

Mr. TABER. I have a suggestion to make to the gentleman, if he will bear with me a moment.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. TABER. This bill says, in line 21, page 2:

> Such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation and the same allowances for expenses and transportation when acting outside of Shanghai as are paid and allowed the judge of said court.

The bill does not say he shall be paid only during the time he is acting during the three instances when he is permitted to have such jurisdiction. It seems to me this language could be clarified quite considerably with reference to the compensation of the judge and show that he should only receive the compensation when he is actually serving under

the conditions set out in the three lettered subdivisions of the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman, and if he will draft such an amendment I shall be pleased to support it.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I think the purpose can be accomplished by changing the position of a comma, moving the comma after the word "compensation", in line 22, to line 23, after the word "transportation", making it read:

Such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation and the same allowances for expenses and transportation, when acting outside of Shanghai, as are paid and allowed the judge of said court.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid it would not.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The Chairman agrees with you, and if you can arrange an amendment I am willing to accept it.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The suggestion of the gentleman from New York can be accomplished by transposing the words "when acting outside of Shanghai" to the beginning of the paragraph, making it read:

When acting outside of Shanghai such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation—

And so forth.

Mr. TABER. I think that would accomplish it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that while the judge has jurisdiction over 4,000 people, in reality he will have jurisdiction most of the time over 8,000 because there are a great many sailors and marines placed there?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That is true. I want to say to the House that the committee does feel that this is a measure of relief that should be granted.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Gladly.

Mr. FISH. Did not the committee a few years ago take up the question of abolishing extraterritorial rights and privileges in China?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That has been done with reference to other courts. There was a consular court at Shanghai composed of the consuls of our Government and other governments and also China. That court which had jurisdiction in China is now strictly a Chinese court.

Mr. FISH. Has the committee considered the question whether we should have extraterritorial rights in China?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No; it has not been reached.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman think we should continue it?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. At this time I am not prepared to say.

Mr. FISH. Then why should we pass this bill?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Because we have this situation.

Mr. FISH. Would the gentleman be in favor of legislation to abrogate them?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further demand for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act creating a United States Court for China and prescribing the title thereof", approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 814), as amended, be, and it is hereby, amended by the addition of the following sections:

"SEC. 10. That the judge of the United States Court for China is hereby authorized to appoint, as in the District Courts of the United States and with similar powers and tenure of office, a United States commissioner, who shall in addition to his other duties be judge of the consular court for the district of Shanghai, with all the authority and jurisdiction exercised prior to June 4, 1920, by the vice consul at Shanghai. Said commissioner shall receive for his services as commissioner and judge of said consular court such compensation as may be fixed by the Attorney General, not exceeding $10 per day for each day of service actually rendered. In the event of a vacancy in the office of said commissioner or the disability or disqualification or absence of said commissioner, the judge of the United States Court for China may appoint the clerk of said court temporarily to perform the duties of commissioner and judge of the consular court for the district of Shanghai without additional compensation therefor.

"SEC. 11. The President may appoint a special judge of the United States Court for China to act temporarily when necessary—

"(a) During the absence of the judge of said court;

"(b) During any period of disability or disqualification, from sickness or otherwise, to discharge his duties; or

"(c) In the event of a vacancy in the office of judge.

"Such special judge shall receive the same rate of compensation, and the same allowances for expenses and transportation when acting outside of Shanghai, as are paid and allowed the judge of said court."

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "court" insert "No compensation shall be paid to said judge except in the actual discharge of his duties provided by this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOUSTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7909, to amend the act creating a United States Court for China and prescribing the title thereof, as amended, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted until midnight tonight to file a report and minority views on the bill (H. R. 8052) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE AND PHARMACY

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 249, to provide for participation by the United States in the Eighth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy, to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in June 1935, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up House Joint Resolution 249, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Eighth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses; purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, periodicals, and maps; stationery, official cards; printing and binding; entertainment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee. Is not this a junketing bill?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the purpose of this to spend $8,000 on a junket to Brussels for certain medical men in one branch of our Government?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Perhaps the gentleman should have waited for the chairman to explain the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I just want an answer yes or no.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No; it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, nevertheless, that it is, after all, a junketing resolution without my friend knowing it, and I am afraid there are some more junkets in some other bills on today's calendar.

Incidentally, it is well known to my colleagues here that I have never been on a junket since I have been in Congress. I have paid my own expenses out of my own pocket every time I have been to a funeral, and every time I have checked up Government projects in different parts of the United States, and not one dollar has the Government ever reimbursed me for it.

Yet in the Washington Times yesterday appeared the following malicious statement:

When the House committee was named to attend the funeral of the late Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, Representative THOMAS L. BLANTON was selected as a member of the group.

When the committee was first named, it was thought that the services would be held in New Mexico.

Had that been true, BLANTON would have had the opportunity to stop off at Abilene, Tex., his home. And his trip would have been paid for by the taxpayers of the Nation whom he always contends he wants to protect.

When it was announced, however, that services would be held in New York instead of in New Mexico, BLANTON made a long speech asking to be replaced on the committee.

He suggested the appointment of Representative MATTHEW J. MERRITT, of New York.

BLANTON apparently was not interested in a New York trip.

Those of you colleagues who were not then present should look at the RECORD and see the brief request in just a few words I made asking the Speaker to appoint in my place our distinguished colleague, Hon. MATTHEW J. MERRITT, who is Congressman at large from the entire State of New York.

As this funeral was to take place in New York, I felt that honor could be done our deceased friend, the late able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, by having a Representative of the whole State of New York to attend this funeral.

Yet, even on such a subject, Hearst's Washington Times could not forget its spleen and malice against me long enough not to refrain from misrepresenting the facts, and misleading the public about the real facts.

Since I have been a member of the subcommittee which handles and frames the War Department appropriation bill, I have been one of the official visitors to the United States Military Academy, at West Point, and could have had the Government pay all of my expenses to West Point, N. Y., and back every year, yet not one dollar have I had the Government pay out for such purpose. I could have had the Government pay my expenses on a trip to Panama each year to inspect Government property there, for which my committee appropriates, yet not one dollar has this Government ever paid out for me on any trip to Panama. I could have had the Government pay my expenses whenever I have inspected Government property and projects owned by our Military Establishment, yet not one dollar has the Government ever paid out for same.

I have inspected Government property and Government projects in many parts of the United States, but invariably I have always paid all of the expenses of same out of my own pocket.

Not one junket have I ever taken. Not a single trip have I ever taken at Government expense. I have always paid for my own trips.

Last year I spent quite a large sum of money out of my own pocket checking up Government projects, so that I would have first-hand information about them when our committee is called upon to make large appropriations for same. I could have been reimbursed for all of it by merely filing expense accounts, for there was money already appropriated to cover just such expenses, yet I filed no expense accounts, and did not ask for reimbursement, but paid all of such expenses myself.

And it is an infamous outrage on the part of this Hearst newspaper continually to make these malicious misrepresentations. It is hurting Hearst and not me, for his readers are gradually learning that they cannot depend on anything they see in one of his newspapers.

But, getting back to this measure, has my friend from Tennessee investigated the necessity for spending $8,000 to have someone attend this medical conference in Brussels?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The committee investigated it very thoroughly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it absolutely necessary?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think it would be very beneficial. Everyone in this House knows the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], Mr. Speaker, and who knows his record knows that the gentleman is against junkets. The chairman of this committee is against them; but there are certain things in which we feel the Government ought to engage that are very beneficial.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have such confidence in the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], who is the chairman of this committee, and who is close to the Speaker—and I know that the Speaker is not going to permit any junkets if he can help it—that I shall not stand in the way of his bill or delay it any further, although I have not been fully convinced that we could not save this $8,000 and keep it from going out of the Treasury without injury to our interests.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The funds made available under this authorization shall be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of State."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS AT HELSINGFORS, FINLAND

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4448, to provide funds for acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishing thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of further carrying into effect the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, there is authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the amount authorized by such act, an amount not to exceed $300,000 for the purpose of acquiring a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishings thereof, for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland. Sums appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for the purpose and be subject to the conditions and limitations of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, if this were not for Finland, I would not be for it. Finland, geographically and financially, is one of the smallest nations, and yet it is the only nation that has had the honesty to pay back to the United States Government its obligations for borrowed money.

I take off my hat to little Finland. It is honest. It is reliable. It is dependable. It is grateful. It has appreciation. It is not an ingrate.

I used to be proud of the fact that my forbears came from England to this country and settled in Virginia. I used to be proud of it; but I am not proud of it any longer. After all this country did for Great Britain in the World War, when she had her back to the wall and France was on her knees, when Italy and Russia had been whipped out of the picture, this country came to their rescue and sent billions of dollars over there, money that was raised at great sacrifice by the American people. We put 4,000,000 men in uniform and sent our men and flag across the waters and saved their civilization. It is an infamous outrage that a great nation like Great Britain and France should disregard their obligations to this country. I have no patience with any ingrate. Talk about balanced budgets! There will be none in England or France until they make proper provision to pay the sacred debts of honor they owe us.

Little Finland, great honor to her! The first foreign country that I visit is going to be Finland. Here is to the health, happiness, and prosperity to Finland. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very proper gesture to a friendly nation, Finland, the only nation that has paid its war debts. I do not know that I can agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in singling out Great Britain for not paying its share of the war debt. I think it is only fair to tell the House that Great Britain has paid a far larger degree of its debt to the United States than any other foreign country except Finland. The money Great Britain paid back was for credit extended or money loaned during the World War. What I object to is the fact that there are a number of nations, and perhaps it is not wise to name them all, that have not even paid back the money that we loaned them after the war was won or after the armistice was signed. That was not the case with Great Britain. I did not take the floor to defend Great Britain or any other nation for not paying the war debts, on the very liberal adjustment made with them by the Congress and the Government of the United States, especially in view of the huge sums they are spending on military and naval armaments.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that if England and France had not defaulted, and had not deliberately refused to provide means to pay the interest on these debts, other countries would have followed suit. When they did default, the other countries followed what they did, and also defaulted. So, after all, that is the reason I blame those two great countries for leading in defaulting.

Mr. FISH. I blame them both, but particularly I blame France for not paying the money we loaned them after the armistice. Now, the joker of the whole situation is this: We have been paid approximately $2,000,000,000 by our former allies on these debts, most of it by Great Britain, which has paid about $1,400,000,000. Germany has paid to the Allies approximately $2,000,000,000 in the way of reparations and indemnities, but the American people have loaned German cities and industrial companies about $2,500,000,000. So that today Germany is in $500,000,000, over and above her payment of war reparations and indemnities.

But I did not rise to speak on that issue. I just wanted to join the committee and say that this is a very proper step to take and a worthy tribute of our esteem and friendship for Finland. Finland is one of the poorest nations of the world, but one of the most honorable. Their Members of Congress or the Diet receive less than $1,000 a year, and their members of Cabinet get approximately $2,500, and I think their President is paid a salary of $14,000. Finland is the only nation which has actually paid in full in accordance with the terms of the debt settlement with the United States. That speaks well for the Finnish people, both in Finland and in the United States. There are no more loyal, industrious, honest, or dependable people in our country than those from Finland. This bill should be passed by a unanimous vote, not only as a tribute to Finland, the one nation that has paid her debts to us, but to the people of Finnish origin in the United States in order to show our appreciation of their native land—honest little Finland.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will be passed by a unanimous vote by the House and in the Senate without any further delay and be enacted into law, and $300,000 be made immediately available for the purpose of acquiring a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishings thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland.

Let me ask this, as long as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is on his feet, what has happened to the $1,200,000 we appropriated for an embassy in Soviet Russia, which has refused to pay its debts? Can the gentleman enlighten this House on that? What a marked difference there is between Finland, formerly a part of Russia, and the present Soviet Government of Russia.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman from New York is a member of that building commission, and he has the same information as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FISH. I am inclined to believe that in view of the repudiation of its promises made when we recognized Soviet Russia that no American embassy will be built or ought to be built in Moscow until an agreement is reached to pay or reimburse American citizens for property seized by the Soviet Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of a great deal of pleasure to me that we have this bill before us for consideration, and I feel that the House is for it unanimously. I take some little pride in having originated the idea of providing for the erection of a building in Finland to house our diplomatic and consular activities in that country. I feel that it is a gesture in the right direction to that Nation, small though it be, which has shown loyalty to principle by paying its obligations to this Government. Not only is it a mark of respect we desire to show them but also it is thoroughly justifiable from the facts existing in Helsingfors. The other great nations of the world excepting the United States have creditable buildings in Helsingfors. Our forces, including our Minister, occupy the fifth floor of a store building. We pay nearly $12,000 per year in rentals. While the pending bill calls for an authorization of $300,000, our Minister to Finland states that he feels it will cost only $275,000 for the purchase of the property and the construction of suitable buildings which will be a credit to this Government. So, figured in this way, and considering that it will cost the Government only 2½ or 3 percent to procure this money, we shall have an ultimate saving in our rentals in Helsingfors and at the same time will be showing some honor and respect to that little nation which stands by its own obligations. I am sure every Member of the House will be glad to vote for this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

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

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 182, to provide for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History; and to authorize the President to extend an invitation for the next general assembly of the institute to meet in the United States in 1935, and to provide an appropriation

for expenses thereof, and ask unanimous consent that the House joint resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the United States to become a member of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually the sum of $10,000 for the payment of the quota of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to extend to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History an invitation to hold the second general assembly of the Institute in the United States in the year 1935;

SEC. 3. That the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of such a meeting, including personal services without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; stenographic reporting and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 4, sec. 5); rent, traveling expenses; purchase of necessary books and documents; newspapers and periodicals; stationery; official cards; printing and binding; entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger vehicles; and such other expenses as may be actually and necessarily incurred by the Government of the United States by reason of such invitation in the observance of proper courtesies, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation now under consideration, House Joint Resolution 182, has two objectives. First, it provides for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. Second, it authorizes the President to extend an invitation to the Institute to hold its next regular session in Washington, D. C. The bill also authorizes an annual appropriation of $10,000 to pay the pro rata share of the United States of the expenses of the Institute, and provides further for an appropriation of $10,000 to defray the expenses incident to the meeting of the Institute here next fall.

For the benefit of the House I will undertake to give a brief history of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. It was created by a resolution of the Sixth International Conference of American States in Habana, Cuba, on February 7, 1928. Article 8 of the resolution provides:

The seat of the institute shall be the capital of any American state chosen by the Pan American Union. The Government of the American state which accepts the locating of the institute in its capital shall provide a building appropriate for the labors hereinbefore enunciated which it must perform.

The governing board of the Pan American Union, after mature consideration, designated Mexico City as the seat of the institute. The Mexican Government having accepted the location has provided at its own expense a suitable and commodious building for its accommodation. On September 16, 1929, representatives from 19 American nations met in the national palace in the city of Mexico for the purpose of organization. The United States was represented at the meeting by Col. Lawrence Martin, Chief Division of Maps, Library of Congress; Prof. George B. Winton, professor of history, Vanderbilt University; and Dr. William Bowie, Chief Division of Geodesy, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, all having been appointed as delegates by the President.

The budget, accepted at this preliminary assembly, contemplated an annual expenditure of $52,000 with the part to be borne by the United States fixed at $31,750. At the first regular assembly of the institute, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1932, the total annual budget was reduced to $27,900, and the part to be borne by the United States was reduced to $10,000.

At the meeting in Rio de Janeiro the United States was represented by Hon. Edwin V. Morgan, Ambassador to Brazil, and Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, president of Clark University, Worcester, Mass. The assembly selected Dr. Atwood as executive president for the succeeding 3 years and Washington as the next place of meeting.

In a communication from Hon. Wilbur J. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, to Hon. KEY PITTMAN, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on June 7, 1934, the objectives of the institute were enumerated as follows:

The purpose of the institute should be to serve for the coordination, distribution, and publication of geographical and historical studies in the American States and to serve as an organ of cooperation between the geographical and historical institutes of America in order to facilitate the study of the publications which concern geography and history and to initiate and coordinate investigations which require the cooperation of several countries and to direct scientific discussion.

Topographic and geodetic maps, prepared under the supervision of this institute may be most helpful to the various American countries in the development of their natural resources. The data prepared by such agency might also be found most advantageous in promoting transportation facilities, including railroads, motor vehicles, and airplanes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It was the intention of the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCREYNOLDS], that the gentleman from Georgia should have 30 minutes in the Committee of the Whole to make his speech; and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may have an additional 25 minutes in which to finish his speech, which is the time he would have had in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker, the institute is essentially of a nonpartisan nature, but its services might become available where matters of dispute over border lines and kindred questions arise between American nations in the event that each government concerned might make specific request for such services upon the part of the agency.

In referring to the pending bill, Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, president of the institute, had the following to say:

As I mingle with the Latin-American people I realize more strongly each year that we must establish cordial cultural relations with them. They appreciate those finer things in life and they are much interested in coming to know us in other than commercial ways.

Our Washington meeting should do much to help strengthen the spirit of cordial good will and respect. In the end I believe it will aid greatly in promoting commercial relations.

In addition to the recommendation of Secretary Hull to our Foreign Affairs Committee of the House regarding the bill, I have a personal message from him, in part as follows:

From a scientific and educational point of view the aims of the institute are very commendable and the active participation of this Government will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the institute's work. I believe that this Pan American organ would ultimately prove of great value to many branches of the Government, scientific organizations, and educational institutions in the United States. * * * In my opinion the Pan American Institute of Geography and History is a worthy endeavor and I am convinced that its support by the United States would be received with great satisfaction by the other American nations.

A message from the President to the Congress, under date of February 20, 1935, is as follows:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, to the end that legislation may be enacted providing for an annual appropriation of $10,000 for the payment of the share of this Government in the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and requesting the President to invite the Pan American Institute of Geography and History to hold its second general assembly in the United States in 1935, and providing an appropriation of $10,000 for the expenses of such a meeting.

If by joining our efforts with those of our sister Republics to the south we can promote a closer relationship and a more thorough accord in the solution of our mutual problems, the civic, social, and commercial splendor of a new era for this hemisphere is assured. So in response to the expressed wishes of all our scientific organizations, and upon the request of the Secretary of State and our President, let us now pass, without further delay, this worth-while legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

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

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION AT BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, 1935

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 210 for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up House Joint Resolution 210 of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 73]

Amlie	DeRouen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rich
Andrews, N. Y.	Dirksen	Kerr	Richards
Bankhead	Drewry	Kimball	Robertson
Berlin	Driver	Kopplemann	Ryan
Bland	Duncan	Lamneck	Sabath
Brennan	Dunn, Miss.	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, La.
Buckley, N. Y.	Eaton	Lee, Okla.	Scott
Burnham	Flannagan	Lloyd	Scrugham
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	McClellan	Sears
Carden	Gasque	McFarlane	Shannon
Carlson	Gifford	McGehee	Short
Casey	Gildea	McLaughlin	Smith, W. Va.
Chapman	Gillette	Millard	Snyder
Claiborne	Goldsborough	Miller	Stubbs
Clark, Idaho	Gray, Pa.	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Cochran	Green	Montet	Sumners, Tex.
Collins	Greenwood	Nichols	Sutphin
Connery	Hancock, N. C.	Oliver	Sweeney
Cooley	Hartley	O'Malley	Thomas
Corning	Hennings	Peyser	Treadway
Cox	Hook	Pfeifer	Wadsworth
Cross, Tex.	Hope	Randolph	Walter
Culkin	Keller	Reece	Werner
Dear	Kennedy, Md.	Reilly	

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

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOME MORTGAGE RELIEF

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6021) to provide additional home-mortgage relief, to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, 1935

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210), for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935, with Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, there are some Members on this side of the aisle who want the joint resolution read; therefore I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the invitation extended by the Belgian Government to the United States to participate in a universal and international exhibition to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935 is hereby accepted.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner general to represent the United States in the exhibition. The commissioner general shall prescribe the duties of the commissioner and shall, under the direction of the Secretary of State, (1) make all needful rules and regulations relative to the exhibits from this country and its oversea territories, and for the expenditures incident to the installation of such exhibits, and for the preparation of reports of the exposition and the general results thereof; (2) furnish such information to private exhibitors and prospective exhibitors as he may deem requisite and feasible; (3) make all proper arrangements for the preparation, transportation, installation, display, and care of the exhibits from this country and its oversea territories; (4) with reference to such exhibits from this country and its oversea territories, and reports, cooperate with and secure the assistance of the various executive departments and branches of the Government participating in the exposition, which departments and branches may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner general, but no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed, plus such reasonable additional allowance for expenses as may be deemed proper by the Secretary of State; (5) employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary, and fix their reasonable compensation; and (6) purchase such material, contract for such labor and services, and cause to be constructed such buildings as may be necessary to carry out the general purpose of this act. The heads of the various departments and branches of the Government are authorized, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, to collect and prepare suitable exhibits for display at the exposition, accompanied by appropriate descriptions in the French, Flemish, and English languages.

SEC. 3. Officers and employees of the executive departments or branches of the Government in charge of or responsible for the safekeeping of any property of this country and its oversea territories which is proposed to be exhibited, may permit such property, on the request of the commissioner general, to pass from their possession for the purpose of being transported to and from and exhibited at the exposition. At the close of the exhibition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, if practicable, the commissioner general shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken; and if the return of any such property is not practicable, he may, with the knowledge of the department or branch from which it was taken, and with the approval of the Secretary of State, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

SEC. 4. In order to defray the expenses hereinbefore specified and all the singular expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, the sum of $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended. All expenditures shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of State and payable upon his certification, but shall not be subject to the provisions of any law other than this act regulating or limiting the expenditure of public money, but this provision shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any indebtedness to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 5. The commissioner general, with the approval of the Secretary of State, may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this act. The commissioner general is also authorized to receive contributions of material to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this act, and at the close of the exposition or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, under the direction of the Secretary of State, shall dispose of any such portion thereof as may be unused.

SEC. 6. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to Congress within 6 months after the close of the exposition a detailed statement of all expenditures, together with the reports hereinbefore specified and such other reports as he may deem proper which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, of all the bills introduced in the Congress of the United States on expositions, I think this bill is unique. In the first place, it does not authorize an appropriation for any junket. I heard someone a few moments ago say that this is only a junket bill involving $25,000. If the Members will read the bill they will find there are no salaries paid to any commission, which is rather unusual. It merely provides for the United States to participate in the exposition to be held in Belgium.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman will read paragraph 5, line 21, of page 2 for the benefit of the Members of the House?

Mr. BLOOM (reading):

(5) Employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary.

Now, what is the question?

Mr. TABER. I thought the Committee might be interested in knowing that the money could be used to employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants that may be necessary, and their reasonable compensation may be fixed.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; the gentleman is correct; but it is not a junket for the reason that only applies to the different departments who may send clerks over. There is a commissioner general provided for, who will be our Ambassador to Belgium, Mr. Morris. He is to act as the commissioner general, and the Ambassador has graciously offered to contribute the time necessary to make our part of it a success.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason these expositions are held is for the benefit of trade. That is why we participate and that is why we hold expositions.

Now, let us see what has happened to our export business to Belgium. In 1929 our exports were $114,855,000. In 1930 they dwindled to $86,000,000 and in 1931 they went down to $59,441,000. In 1932 the exports were $40,278,000. In 1933 they were $43,268,000 and in 1934, $49,814,000. The balance of trade in favor of the United States has gone from $40,807,000 to $23,640,000.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Has the gentleman any figures indicating what the balance of trade was before the war?

Mr. BLOOM. I have not those figures before me at this time.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I was wondering to what extent the favorable balance during the latter part of the decade of 1920 was due to the loans that were extended to European countries, and whether the dropping off in part represents only the cessation of credit?

Mr. BLOOM. Unfortunately, I have not the information before me, and I do not want to say anything or give any answer unless I am sure of my figures. I may say, however, that one of the principal reasons our export trade has dwindled down is because we keep on insulting the different peoples of the world. On the floor of this House there is always an exception to participating in friendly expositions, and you cannot expect to hold your world trade or increase your trade unless you are friendly and honest in your expressions of thought. That is a fact.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I want to assure the gentleman that was not my intention in asking the gentleman the question I did; however, I would like to know if somebody can give the information as to what part of this trade with foreign countries, especially with Belgium, during the latter part of the twenties was due to the credit that we extended to them and such artificial devices as that?

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman that I might have this information in my office. I did not think that question was going to be brought up here today. I will be very glad to insert the information in the RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that our export trade had dwindled to nearly nothing?

Mr. BLOOM. I did not say that.

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a few minutes ago?

Mr. BLOOM. Our exports in general have gone down.

Mr. SNELL. Did the gentleman say they had dwindled to nearly nothing?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Will you give that information to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], because yesterday I made a statement not nearly as broad as that and he disputed me. If you will give the gentleman that information to put in his speech it will make a much better speech.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to give the gentleman some information. Is the gentleman willing to receive some information along this line?

Mr. SNELL. Surely.

Mr. BLOOM. If our export trade, which was $114,855,000 in 1929, dwindled to $43,000,000, I would like to have the gentleman give the reason for it.

Mr. SNELL. I will give the gentleman some of the reasons if he will give me the time.

Mr. BLOOM. I will give the gentleman time, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SNELL. I spent about an hour day before yesterday giving some of the reasons our export trade had gone all to pieces, and my friend O'CONNOR said my statements were not correct, but the gentleman has now fortified me in the statements I then made.

Mr. BLOOM. I can assure the gentleman that the argument of the gentleman should go to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], and not to me. This is a different kind of argument.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman was speaking about trade balances?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman has seen the report of Mr. Peek, and if so, how he reconciles his statement with that report.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say to the gentleman I am going to stick to this Brussels exposition, and we are not going to get into an argument here that will take up the entire hour. I have enough trouble right here now, I admit. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. While the gentleman is giving us foreign-trade figures as between the United States and Belgium, will he not give us the figures showing how much our exports to Belgium have increased as a result of the trade agreement recently entered into?

Mr. BLOOM. With respect to the question the gentleman has just asked, in the first place, sufficient time has not elapsed to really give any figures or to find out how beneficial it will be, but to give you an idea of the friendly feeling between the two countries, and I am only speaking of Belgium now, this is an order of May 13, 1935, which is pretty close.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman is going to refer to lard.

Mr. BLOOM. How well the gentleman anticipates. I am going to refer to lard, and the gentleman already knows about it. Do not conceal the good things entirely, but bring them out; and for the benefit of the entire committee I would like to illustrate the friendly feeling between Belgium and the United States.

This is dated May 13, 1935:

The Belgian Ambassador informed the State Department today that his Government had decided to reduce the import license tax on lard from 100 francs per hundred kilos to 50 francs per 100 kilos. This action was voluntary on the part of the Belgian Government, for which no return concession was demanded.

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

Mr. BLOOM. I will yield in just a moment.

By the terms of the trade agreement between the United States and Belgium, which becomes effective on May 1, Belgium had already granted a generous quota on American lard. This proposed 50-percent reduction in the import license tax will be of benefit to hog producers, since the United States exports of lard to Belgium were 15,617,835 pounds in 1933. The reduction will bring the import charges into Belgium on United States lard down to approximately three-fourths of a cent per pound.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is simply a business proposition. Belgium, at the lowest ebb of exports, bought from us

$43,268,000 worth of goods in 1 year. In 1929 it was $114,-855,000, and this order was entered just a few days ago and shows the friendly feeling between Belgium and the United States.

You are now asked to authorize an appropriation of $25,000 just to show that the United States wants to participate and join with Belgium and be represented at the exposition there this year.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEY. Will the Commissioner General report to the Congress on our participation in this exposition?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Let me explain to you just what this means. When this bill first came up we were economizing in every way, and we knew we could not get an appropriation of $250,000 or $300,000, which is the sum usually appropriated for such purposes. Just the other day we appropriated $350,000 for the exposition in San Diego, which was a small sum for such an exposition. It should have been more.

We should be represented in Belgium and this bill only provides for the representative of our Government over there, so that he may participate in the various meetings that take place in connection with the representatives from the different countries of the world. This is all that it amounts to and it is not a junket. Even if we spent the entire $25,000, which I do not think we can the way we are going to participate, we would not be spending very much.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This is May 15, 1935. The Senate of the United States has passed on only a very few of the supply bills, and on only a few of the other major bills. It has all that legislation before it to pass upon and the exposition is now almost over in Belgium.

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. BLANTON. It is almost over, and does not the gentleman from New York know that before you could get this kind of bill through the Senate and passed there, by setting aside all the major legislation we are trying to get through over there, the summer would be over.

Mr. BLOOM. No; this appropriation will be in the next deficiency bill if this House passes it. There is nothing to the whole matter except $25,000.

Mr. BLANTON. The sum of $25,000 should not be wasted, and is worth saving. The House Appropriations Committee has passed every one of the supply bills.

Mr. BLOOM. But you have a deficiency bill pending now.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the last one to come up before our adjournment sine die.

Mr. BLOOM. That is time enough.

Mr. BLANTON. That will be about the first of July.

Mr. BLOOM. If you will pass this appropriation—give it to the Government——

Mr. BLANTON. If they give it to the gentleman he will find some way of spending it I know.

Mr. BLOOM. That is all right, but you just authorize it under this bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. How much did Belgium give or appropriate for the exposition at Chicago?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know, but I will say that that was one of the finest exhibitions at the Chicago exposition. We are asking other countries to participate in our expositions. We have two bills here asking them to participate in expositions, one of them in Texas next year. You cannot expect people to come over here and participate in our expositions, spend more money than we spend, it would not be right to ask them to come here all the time and we not participate in their expositions.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Texas centennial that comes off next year is not for the benefit of foreign nations. It is for the benefit of American citizens. It is the one State in this Union that has been a republic of itself. It has had its own flag.

Mr. BLOOM. Six flags.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; under six flags. It has been of tremendous benefit to the United States, not only to the great State of Texas but to the whole country, by causing the acquisition of much valuable territory to the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman from New York is a good judge of these matters, and looking at it not from a political standpoint but from sound economic principles, does not the gentleman think that this investment of $25,000 to participate in the Belgium exposition will be profitable to this country?

Mr. BLOOM. There is no question about it; but I do not look at it from that standpoint, for this reason: We should do something, and we do not want it to appear as if $25,000 was for real participation. If we participated in that exposition the way they participated in our exposition at Chicago, it would cost 10 times as much. But, as I said at the beginning, our Ambassador in Belgium has graciously consented to see that our representation abroad will be such that we will not be ashamed of it. It is necessary for us to delegate someone over there as commissioner general to represent the United States. That is why this resolution is brought on the floor today.

Mr. LUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUCKEY. Was not the Belgium exhibition in Chicago financed by private concerns?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. I am glad the gentleman asked that question; that is what this bill provides for.

Mr. LUCKEY. You authorize an appropriation of $25,000.

Mr. BLOOM. We have to have something to start in on and we could not make it any less.

Mr. LUCKEY. I think that this is another one of those junkets.

Mr. BLOOM. You cannot have much of a junket on $25,000 for participation in an exposition.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Certainly.

Mr. FIESINGER. How are you going to house this thing over there?

Mr. BLOOM. Whatever we have there we have to pay out of this $25,000. We are permitted to take donations.

Mr. FIESINGER. You will have to have some kind of housing?

Mr. BLOOM. No, not necessarily; they will furnish us space.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Here are the facts. This invitation was extended to the United States by Belgium in 1927.

Mr. BLOOM. Right.

Mr. BLANTON. That was 8 years ago.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. And the Cabinet discussed it at a meeting in 1933, 2 years ago.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And turned it down, did they not?

Mr. BLOOM. Not exactly turned it down. They did not approve of it.

Mr. BLANTON. They disapproved of it.

Mr. BLOOM. For what reason?

Mr. BLANTON. Disapproval is turning it down, is it not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. I would say so. I think disapproving it means turning it down.

Mr. BLOOM. As Al Smith would say, "Let us look at the record."

Mr. BLANTON. I compliment my distinguished friend from New York upon his pertinacity.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; not that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. For not taking "no" from the Department, because he has gone back to them again and again, and finally has gotten them to agree not to disapprove it.

Mr. BLOOM. Let us look at this. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says so many nice things about me that I think that last word, pertinacity, is something terrible. [Laughter.]

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the Department really did approve it.

Mr. BLOOM. Do you want me to read it to you?

Mr. TABER. Yes; if it did.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not say approve and I did not say they did not turn it down, but just let me read this to you, and this is from Secretary Hull:

I wish to reiterate, however, that considering the matter from the standpoint of the friendly relations existing between Belgium and the United States, there will be no objection to the passage of this resolution.

Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. BLOOM. Please wait a minute. This is one time that I do not want to yield. I leave it to the committee whether that is complete disapproval of this resolution. It is not. The gentleman from Texas spoke about this coming up in 1927. We have today two resolutions that invite the nations of the world to participate in the San Francisco exposition and in the San Diego exposition, I think in 1938. I do not know whether the resolutions have passed regarding the holding of an exposition in 1938. From 1927 to 1933 of course nothing was done. It did not come before any of the committees. They just had this invitation, and let it stay there. In 1933 they brought it up and said they could not appropriate any money at that time, because they did not have the money or did not want to spend it for that purpose, but Secretary Roper thought that he could raise the money from the outside. So we say that with this $25,000 we can participate, and I sincerely hope the committee will act favorably on this resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us when this exposition opens.

Mr. BLOOM. It has not opened yet.

Mr. TABER. When does it open?

Mr. BLOOM. I think I could tell you in a moment.

Mr. MICHENER. The lady here says that it opened last February and is just about through. Is that correct?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no. Perhaps on the Republican side that is so, but we still go by the calendar on this side. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, let us get the facts straightened out first.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has the gentleman any idea who is going to be the Commissioner General under this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know of a man whom I would prefer more than my good friend from New York [Mr. BLOOM]. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. He made such a valuable commissioner for the George Washington Centennial that I do not believe you could get a better one anywhere.

Here are the facts. I have here a copy of a letter from the Department. I want my colleagues to remember that foreign countries deal with our country through our State Department. Our State Department handles all business for this Government with foreign governments and when our Government wants to participate in some exposition abroad, the request comes from the State Department to the Congress asking us to let them make an exhibit, and asking us for the money. No such request has come from the Department. The request comes from our good friend from New York, SOL BLOOM. That is the reason I was complimenting him on his pertinacity. He would not give up. Listen to this letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 28, 1935.

Hon. SAM D. McREYNOLDS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR JUDGE McREYNOLDS: Hon. SOL BLOOM has requested me to submit a report on House Joint Resolution No. 210 providing for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition to be held at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935.

In a letter of March 6, 1935, I gave you a résumé of the steps taken subsequent to the receipt of the formal invitation from the Belgian Ambassador to the Government of the United States to be represented at the exposition, including a review of a previous letter dated June 16, 1934, and a statement of developments subsequent to that date. The pertinent parts of the letter of June 16, 1934, are as follows:

"The invitation was received in a note from the Belgian Ambassador dated January 22, 1927.

That was 8 years ago—

and since this time the Department has been in correspondence with the other interested departments with a view to deciding definitely whether the invitation should be accepted.

Now comes the main part of it:

As time passed, however, and it became desirable to make some definitive reply to the Belgian Ambassador, the matter was discussed at a meeting of the Cabinet held on November 17, 1933. The question of requesting Congress for a suitable appropriation to defray the expenses of American participation at the exposition came up for discussion but was not favorably considered.

They turned it down, but still it comes up. It is like Banquo's ghost. The gentleman from New York just kept after them, and finally the Secretary of State said, "Well, Sol, if you are going to worry the life out of me, go on and pass your bill and I will not raise any objection to it." There is the situation. It does not come from the Department of State, it does not come from the Secretary of State, it does not come from the Government of the United States, but through the Secretary of State it comes from the Honorable SOL BLOOM, and he says it in this letter which I have just read.

Now, let us see about the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. Why does the gentleman stop reading there? There are many more words after that.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the rest of that is what the gentleman from New York forced him to do. The gentleman forces me to do many things, I like him so well. He gets down close to you and you cannot turn him down. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman read about three more lines?

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. The gentleman will vote for the bill, will he not?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to save this $25,000. I am going to try to kill it, if I can, but want to kill it without pain and give it a decent burial. I want to kill it by an opiate that will not cause any pain. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield further.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman please read the other three lines?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute I will.

Now, the gentleman from New York told you emphatically that this was not a junket, did he not? He said there could not be any junket under this bill. The gentleman is not a lawyer; he is a contractor. If he were a lawyer, he would know there could be a junket under this bill. The language is plain and I want to read it—

Which Departments—

That is, our Departments of Commerce and State down here—

may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, designate officials or employees of their Departments or branches to assist the

Commissioner General, but no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the Department or branch thus employed.

Now, they employ a Commissioner General, who will be our good friend, SOL BLOOM. He cannot draw a salary more than his $10,000 salary, that is true; but he can draw his expenses, which means the expense of himself and his retinue of servants that he will take over there with him, because he could not travel without servants. He must have his valet [laughter] to help him put on the right colored necktie in the morning and to have the proper silk trousers shortened to the knee in the evening. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Now, let us see the next provision in the bill:

Plus such reasonable additional allowance for expenses as may be deemed proper by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State could allow them round-trip transportation and a per diem of $15, $20, $30, $40, or $50 a day if he wanted to. There is nothing in this bill to stop him. Just what he says shall be allowed will be allowed under this bill, because the gentleman from New York has so written it. Now, that is the way this $25,000 is going to be frittered away.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has every confidence in the world in our Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, has he not?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I did when he turned this $25,000 bill down.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman said he was going to try to kill the bill; but he should not try to murder it.

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am going to give it a sleeping potion, which will be just as deadly.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I do not know; but permit me to say this: The gentleman knows that that could not happen under the present rules and regulations of any Department.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say frankly if they are going to send anybody over there I want to see the gentleman from New York sent. I think he will do us more good than anybody else. But this is no time to be wasting $25,000 on an exhibition that is half over. That exhibition is going on right now. The gentleman will not deny that. It takes a long time to get up an exhibit. This is May 15, 1935. This bill has to go to the Senate and either displace some other important legislation or await its turn. How does the gentleman expect to have it passed over there and get it into law and set up an exhibition before this summer is over? The Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull and the Roosevelt Cabinet did right in 1933 when they met and considered this matter and turned down this invitation that was extended back in 1927.

Now, what are you going to do with a thing like this? What is this good business man here [Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut] who is one of the wisest business men on the Republican side of the House going to do? He is going to turn it down just as Secretary Hull did. I am such a friend of this administration that I am going to follow Secretary Hull and the Cabinet and try to save this $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman desire some more time?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like about 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman tell us about the manicure? I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not want Sol to go over there unless he was properly manicured [laughter]; and he will be. There is nothing that any of you society men do that he will not do over there. Sol, help us beat this bill. It ought not to pass. We ought to save this $25,000. The people back home need it.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say to the gentleman that after listening to him attack the bill I know he has left such a good impression that the bill is going to pass unanimously, and the gentleman himself is going to vote for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad my friend is optimistic, but he certainly has a great disappointment awaiting him, because we are not going to let this $25,000 bill pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I thought I was going to be able to get through the day without taking the floor to put up a fight against some of these bills which the Committee on Foreign Affairs brought out. I restrained myself with considerable difficulty on the last bill that was considered, because I believe that bill really ought not to have passed in the shape it was presented.

One other bill providing for about $10,000 was a severe strain on my good nature. The pending bill is brought before us without any hearings or statement whatever that would justify anybody in voting for it.

As I understand the situation it is something like this, and it seems to be undisputed: The Belgian Government decided on this exposition way back 8 years ago.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this bill from consideration. I take it the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TABER. I cannot object to that.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 210, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw House Joint Resolution 210 for the participation of the United States in a universal and international exhibition at Brussels, Belgium, in 1935 from consideration.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF AERIAL LEGAL EXPERTS

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6673) to provide for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee on Aerial Legal Experts and for participation in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the commissions established by that Committee, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill ought to be explained. I object.

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the Committee resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6673, with Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill contains two authorizations; the first is to take care of the dues of this country in the aerial legal congress, the second is to pay the expenses of the delegates who attend.

The purpose of this conference is to establish international laws on aviation and aviation rights. Experts are appointed by the different countries participating. At the present time 33 countries participate in this congress. The annual dues for each and every country, whether it be large or small, is 1,000 gold francs. It will be noticed that the first part of this bill is rather unusual. It authorizes an annual appropriation to pay the pro rata share of the United States in the expense of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts. Our fixed dues under the authorization of 1931 are $250, equal to the 1,000 gold francs.

The dues, as I stated, are the same for small countries as for large countries. This is unusual because in conferences of this kind, as a rule, the larger countries are taxed more than the smaller countries. The reason this provision is worded in this way is on account of the exchange, and you can see very readily why it is done. The dues, however, are 1,000 gold francs plus whatever the exchange may be; and this is the reason for the provision being drafted as it is.

We have been a member of this convention for some time, but have never sent any delegates to it at the expense of the Government. There have been people in this country who were so interested in trying to establish the aerial law of the world that they have gone at their own expense.

Two regular conferences have been held, one in Warsaw in 1929 and one in Brussels in 1933. This country was not represented at the Warsaw conference. At the 1929 conference the countries participating agreed on certain principles which they thought should be adopted as the law affecting certain aerial subjects. While we were not represented, yet when that memorandum or agreement was brought to this country it was ratified by our Senate and we became a party thereto. In the 1933 conference at Brussels, Mr. Cooper, an attorney from Jacksonville, Fla., was present at his own expense. Certain recommendations were made in that conference.

Nothing done at this international congress is binding on this country until ratified by the Senate, but I am sure the Members of the House can see the reason and the necessity for uniform aerial laws. For instance, we are close to South America, and our machines are flying over South American countries almost daily. There should be some uniformity of the laws in those countries controlling the rights to fly, license requirements, insurance requirements, and relating to the settlement of damages which may occur. Since the perfection and use of this modern means of transportation these matters become of the utmost importance not only in the Americas but also in Europe, where our people flying as passengers in European planes would be affected and where even our own planes sometimes fly.

If these laws are to be established as international laws wherein the people of the United States are so vitally interested is it not proper that we grant the small authorization here sought with this authorization granted we may send our representatives to these congresses to help formulate these laws?

We have a group of four men known as "commissioners", aerial experts, who are appointed by the State Department as members of a commission. They meet twice a year, in the spring and in the fall, and the general conference meets after their report.

The Department of Commerce recommends the pending bill and asks its passage. This, too, is the attitude and request of the State Department.

In this bill we ask only for an authorization of $6,500 to guarantee that we shall have delegates at the next conference which meets in Lisbon.

I trust there will be no opposition to this bill. I feel that it is to the great interest of the public of the United States that we be in on the ground floor and have a voice in formulating these laws, just as we have had in the formulation of the maritime laws operating throughout the world.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee that this proposal is sound, logical, and constructive. There is no real reason why we should not send delegates over to this conference in order to know what is going on and to help codify aviation laws. Certainly we cannot lose anything by it, and, on the other hand, may gain a great deal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from New York, the watchdog of the Treasury [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have not any doubt but what we need representation at this conference, but why we should need $6,500 to send a good lawyer from the Attorney General's office is beyond me. I believe that is the Department the delegate should come from if we are going to get one who is prepared to work out the situation. I feel we ought to cut this at least one-half.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman knows that this is merely an authorization. It will come before the committee of which the gentleman is a very distinguished member. If the authorization is too large, you gentlemen may pass on the amount, and I trust the gentleman will take that responsibility and withdraw his objection at this time.

Mr. TABER. When we pass an authorization the department is always after the peak of the authorization, and while this is not one of the big items that will come up from time to time, nevertheless it is an item that makes one feel we should not make authorizations bigger than we figure should be used by the department. I feel that this item ought to be cut at least $3,000. This is a rather large sum to take care of the expenses of one man over there, one good lawyer, and provide for such stenographic assistance as he might need, together with the $250 to cover the dues which are required. It seems to me that is all we ought to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any more time than just state that when the proper place is reached I shall offer an amendment to cut it down to $3,250.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, this is simply an authorization, and the item will come before the committee presided over by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], of which I am the ranking minority member. We will scrutinize very carefully any request for money to carry out this purpose. I believe we ought to follow the Secretary of State at this time who specifically requests the sum of $6,500 as an authorization, and I feel that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can leave the details to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and we will inquire very carefully into the matter when Mr. Hull comes before us next year. I do not think the Treasury is going to suffer very much from this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Resolution No. 118, Seventy-first Congress, approved February 1, 1931, providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts to be amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized an annual appropriation to pay the pro rata share of the United States in the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts.

"That not to exceed the sum of $6,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for the expenses of participation by the Government of the United States in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and/or of the commissions established by that committee, including traveling expenses; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the

Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; purchase of necessary books and documents; printing and binding; official cards; entertainment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 19, insert a new section, as follows:
"SEC. 2. That the provisions of these authorizations shall terminate June 30, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6673) providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, and for participation in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the commissions established by that Committee, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS AND ASSOCIATED UNIONS

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4901) to authorize appropriations to pay the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions and ask unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4901, with Mrs. NORTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State in paying the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions, including the International Astronomical Union, International Union of Chemistry, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Mathematics, International Scientific Radio Union, International Union of Physics, and International Geographical Union, and such other international scientific unions as the Secretary of State may designate, such sum as may be necessary for the payment of such annual share, not to exceed $9,000 in any one year.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Madam Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Madam Chairman, this bill asks for the participation of the United States in certain scientific union conventions, and calls merely for the payment of the dues of the United States and only for the dues. In the report will be found the various scientific unions and the amount called for in the case of each one, which runs from $63.47 a year up to $5,077 a year. We have been participating in these conferences since 1922. Last year the same bill passed and became an act, but did not get over to the Senate in time to get in the deficiency appropriation bill. I feel and anticipate that one of the objections of the Republican watchdog of the Treasury, as branded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], is that this will be an annual appropriation. In answer to that permit me to say that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], objected to the last bill because it was not an annual appropriation. He said if we were going to appropriate this every year, we should make it annually. That was his objection at that time.

Madam Chairman, there are a few arguments in favor of this bill which I would like to state, and at the same time I ask indulgence until I read some of the statements made by the scientific men of the different departments of the Government, as well as the chiefs of different universities and institutions of learning throughout the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Madam Chairman, before the gentleman does that I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This provides for participation in and payment of dues to these six or eight different conventions?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This will authorize our State Department to pledge our Government for the payment of these dues annually and it is also an authorization that would make in order an appropriation for us to participate each year. Suppose all of these eight conventions met at different times of the year, one meeting in February and one in March and one in April and one in May and one in June and one in November and one in December, if this bill passes, anyone from the floor, when the appropriate supply bill comes up, could offer amendments to appropriate sums of money for delegates to be sent to these various conventions to participate in them.

Mr. BLOOM. Not at all.

Mr BLANTON. Oh, the language providing for participation would authorize the sending of delegates.

Mr. BLOOM. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. This is simply for the payment of dues for the United States to participate. The delegates going over there would pay all their own expenses, all their railroad fare, their hotel bills, and everything else.

Mr. BLANTON. What I am talking about is the fact that this language used would authorize and make impervious to a point of order any amendment to pay expenses of delegates to participate, if the House saw fit to do so, but the main question I want to bring up is this: How is the gentleman from New York going to get around an adverse report by the State Department?

Mr. BLOOM. There is not an adverse report from the State Department.

Mr. BLANTON. The State Department before our Committee on Appropriations turned it down, did it not?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; the gentleman is reading the Belgium exposition report. This is a different one.

Mr. BLANTON. Was there not an adverse report made by Mr. Carr on this also, when Mr. Carr was before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BLOOM. No; there has never been an adverse report on this at any time.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I may say to the gentleman that the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Carr, before the deficiency subcommittee, when we had the hearings on the $112,000,000 deficiency bill a month or so ago, said they did not urge this appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I had in mind—the State Department, through Mr. Carr, did not urge it at all.

Mr. TABER. That is what occurred before us.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know whether the gentleman from Texas would call this urging it or not, but I would like to read from the letter of Secretary Hull, addressed to Hon. SAM D. McREYNOLDS, House of Representatives.

I am strongly of the opinion that the benefits which would be derived by American scientists and scientific organizations from the enactment of the contemplated legislation would far outweigh the modest expense involved. I therefore recommend the passage of H. R. 6781.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if Mr. Carr did not appear before the deficiency subcommittee after that date?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; it was sometime this spring.

Mr. BLANTON. And stated they did not urge it?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I only know what the Secretary signed and I shall have to go by that. Perhaps, Mr. Carr did not know about this particular bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the gentleman that this Mr. Carr knows everything there is to be known about everything there is in the State Department.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree that he is a most efficient able gentleman and knows about everything regarding the State Department.

If I may proceed, we must keep in touch with the inventions and developments in the field of science in all countries and we can do it best through these unions.

It permits our scientists to work in close contact with other scientists for the development of common problems.

The Scientific Unions set up standards of weights and measures, definitions, names for new products, and so forth, so that scientific works can be used in all countries.

The Scientific Unions help our scientists to learn new methods at first hand.

The Scientific Union helps toward international understanding and good will by the union of thought of the leading scientists of the world.

Even now the Geographical Scientific Union is engaged upon the production of an international map of the world, each sheet of the map being made according to the highest standards accepted by international agreement. Another study of this society is one of overpopulation, a report to be presented at the next congress of this society to be held in Warsaw, Poland, and published for scholars all over the world.

The cost per year is really nominal—$9,000 would be the maximum. Since the money is spent through the Secretary of State all unexpended balances would automatically be returned to the Treasury. No part of the money is used to pay transportation or personal expenses of any of the scientists who attend the international meetings.

The Scientific Unions publish pamphlets and bulletins of the latest information on various subjects which are sent to all the centers of learning in the United States including Government departments.

The presidents of 6 of the 8 international organizations are Americans. These are as follows: International Council of Scientific Unions, Dr. George E. Hale, honorary director Mount Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif.; International Astronomical Union, Dr. Frank Schlesinger, director Yale University Observatory, New Haven, Conn.; International Union of Physics, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, director Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Dr. William Bowie, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Washington, D. C.; International Geographical Union, Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president, American Geographical Society, New York City; International Scientific Radio Union, Dr. A. E. Kennelly, professor emeritus of electrical enginering, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Now, let me read from a few of the letters that have come from various people throughout the country, which will give you an idea of what the people in the different branches of the Government think of this measure, as well as people connected with various colleges throughout the country.

Dean Henry G. Gale, of the University of Chicago, writes:

Perhaps the greatest service of all has been to increase international amity and to secure recognition of scientific workers in the United States by European men of science.

Dr. S. A. Mitchell, director of the Leander McCormick Observatory of the University of Virginia, writes that the unions "are of very great importance to scientific work."

Dr. John A. Fleming, of Carnegie Institution of Washington, writes:

Already the activities of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics during the short period of its existence have stimulated and coordinated researches of the physics of the earth. Thus it has been the means of providing published data from all parts of the world, without which scientific and practical developments in geophysics, so useful to the United States, would have been much less fruitful and indeed largely impossible had our country stood alone in such work.

The Scientific Union publishes regularly data from 50 observatories in all parts of the world pertaining to the disturbances of the earth.

Dr. Isaiah Bowman, director of the American Geographical Society and president of the International Geographical Union, writes as follows:

I have left to the last the obvious advantages of personal contact with scholars working in the same field. This less tangible product of the congresses cannot be overemphasized. Not only does such cross-fertilization of ideas from country to country advance knowledge more rapidly through an exchange of facts but it introduces into the work of any given country the new methods and points of view that are so valuable in scientific progress. The effectiveness of American participation and the esteem in which our scholars are held are shown by the fact that 5 of the 7 unions now have American presidents. This of all times would seem to be the moment when we should reciprocate by cordial cooperation of the sort that official recognition alone can give.

Captain J. F. Hellweg, of the United States Navy and Superintendent of the United States Naval Observatory, states:

The international meetings have been of the greatest value in all the activities of the Naval Observatory. This value cannot be too strongly stressed.

Captain Hellweg says further:

During the last 30 years a large part of our fundamental work has been along lines in close cooperation with work recommended by the International Astronomical Union. The cooperative work on many technical details and programs covers many of our activities. For instance, there are 4 big catalogs, 2 of which have now been published and 2 are in the process of construction—fine examples of the cooperative work of the International Astronomical Union. In 1932 the investigation of the position of the equator was presented at Atlantic City and was in answer to the needed work along that line which was stressed by the union.

Mr. Henry G. Knight, Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils of the Department of Agriculture, states:

The work of the union has been of great benefit in securing international agreement upon questions of nomenclature, atomic weights, definitions, chemical constants, and other matters of general importance to all branches of chemistry, whether pure or applied. For this reason, if for no other, the work of the union should be continued, as there is no other organization performing a similar service.

Dr. E. C. Crittenden, Acting Director of the Bureau of Standards, speaking of advantages of the scientific unions to radio, states:

Radio is, of course, a subject in which the cooperation of agencies scattered over the whole world is desirable. Consequently, the work of this union has been particularly valuable and has given information which was not merely of interest scientifically but was also of great practical value in the discussion of international problems in the regulation of radio service.

Dr. William Bowie, Chief of the Division of Geodesy, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, states:

The International Geodetic and Geophysical Union has been of great benefit in the fields of geodesy and geophysics by bringing together at its assemblies the leading men of the adhering countries, about 30 in number, where they can outline and discuss problems, methods, and instruments. * * * I should view the discontinuance of these international assemblies as a national calamity. I cannot imagine our great country not making it possible to continue these congresses and to enable the geodesists and geophysicists from the United States to take an even more active part in them than has been the case in the past.

Dr. R. S. Patton, Director of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, states:

It would be most unfortunate if this country should withdraw from the International Council of Scientific Unions and of its subordinate unions. The cost to this country for adhering to these organizations is trivial as compared to the great benefits that result from such contacts.

Dr. Charles L. Reece, president of American Chemical Society, states:

I am satisfied that the chemists would regard the termination of the opportunities for international conferences as a calamity.

Dr. Robert A. Millikan, California Institute of Technology, states:

The cessation of activity of this sort and of the opportunities inherent in the Union of Pure and Applied Physics for establishing international contacts and understandings in other directions would be universally recognized among physicists as a major catastrophe.

Dr. Frank Schlesinger, president of the International Astronomical Union, states:

In my opinion the failure of the United States to adhere to the International Council of Scientific Unions would be something of a scientific calamity. The amount of money that would be saved by this failure is ridiculously small in comparison with the benefits that would ensue from the continuance of our adherence.

This resolution asks for $9,000 a year, and as I stated before, it is simply to pay the dues so that we may send our representatives to these various conferences and unions. It does not call for the use of any of this money for any other purpose except the payment of our dues; and the reason we are asking for $9,000 at this time, which is a little more than was necessary before, is on account of the difference in the exchange.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Madam Chairman, this bill is for the authorization of $9,000 for the participation of delegates to different scientific organizations throughout the world.

They run down as low as $63.47. One item runs as high as $5,000.

The thing that I want to call to the attention of the committee specifically is that a subcommittee of the Committee on State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor had hearings on the bill and did not include it. A subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee had hearings on it last spring, and Mr. Carr, Deputy Secretary of State, appeared before that committee and told us that he did not urge the thing, that it would not be a matter of importance, and he did not believe very strongly in it.

After these hearings it was turned down. If we are ever going to stop spending money, this is the time to begin. If a scientific organization is not important enough to pay its dues of $63, it ought not to exist.

Mr. BLOOM. It is important enough but they cannot pay the dues. If the United States joins, it must pay the dues. The organization cannot accept dues from individuals, it must be the country itself. The delegates pay their own expenses, hotel bills, and so on.

Mr. TABER. Why did the Deputy Secretary of State come before us and say that he did not urge it?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman will see in the letter of the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, that he would be very sorry if we did not join it.

Mr. TABER. Yes; I see what the Secretary of State said, but frankly, I do not see why we should do it, because after that letter was written the representative of the Secretary appeared before the Appropriations Committee and took the position that he did not urge the matter. Under these circumstances I cannot see why Congress should go ahead and authorize the expenditure of the money.

I appreciate that it is a small amount, and that is the only thing in favor of it.

Mr. BLOOM. We passed the same bill last year.

Mr. TABER. It was put on in the Senate.

Mr. BLOOM. No; the House of Representatives passed it.

Mr. TABER. It was put on in the Senate this year.

Mr. BLOOM. It came too late to be put on the deficiency bill.

Mr. TABER. It was turned down by our committee because we did not believe in it.

Mr. FISH. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. After listening to the debate, I cannot see any reason why we should not be willing to enter into these conferences. We might obtain from any one of them scientific knowledge that would be far more valuable than the few thousands it would cost the Government.

If this was a matter pertaining to the League of Nations, internationalism, sanctions, armaments, or relating to war or peace, that would be another matter. This relates to radio, chemistry, astronomy, and so forth. I see my colleague, a distinguished doctor [Mr. SIROVICH] over there on the other side. We have not got all of the best chemists in the world, and we might get scientific knowledge that would far outweigh in value this small sum appropriated in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, in paying the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions, including the International Astronomical Union, International Union of Chemistry, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, International Union of Mathematics, International Scientific Radio Union, International Union of Physics, and International Geographical Union, and such other international scientific unions as the Secretary of State may designate, such sum as may be necessary for the payment of such annual share, not to exceed $9,000 in any one year.

Mr. TABER. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from New York. Your committee of 25 has gone into this matter very carefully. We think it is proper and we feel that we have given it more study than anyone here can obtain from merely reading the report and talking about it on the floor. I ask you to vote down the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mrs. NORTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4901, directed her to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MARKETS FOR OUR FARM SUPPLIES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very interesting and inspiring address made by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] over the National Broadcasting Co. last night.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. RICHARD M. KLEBERG, of Texas, over the National Broadcasting Co. network, 10:30 p. m., May 13, 1935:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this complex economic world in which we live is full of problems. But it is not as full of problems as it was a few years ago. We have found solutions for some of them. We are finding solutions for more.

Let anyone who doubts this take a look around and then project his memory back to the drab hopelessness of 1932. The difference is stimulating, cheering. We are not out of the economic maze. But we are no longer stumbling around a deadly circle, either.

I believe that we now have in our hands, through legislative means, the solution of still another problem that has long beset a large and important class of our population. I speak of the problem of opening up new markets for our farm surpluses. Too often these surpluses have simply backed up on the millions that produced them.

If we can blast open a new channel for this dammed-up river and at the same time benefit all other classes, then we in Congress would be signally remiss in not blasting. It is encouraging to note that this new piece of economic engineering is simple and practicable. It will require no appropriation. It is easily administered. Its healthful and beneficial effects will be immediately apparent.

Of the 6,288,000 farmers of this country, nearly 6,000,000 are producers of fats and oils. By that I mean they produce cottonseed, corn, peanut, soybean, and other vegetable oils, or they raise livestock from which the equally healthful domestic fats are made.

These millions of American producers are now denied a huge market right at their front door. This market is largely in the possession of producers 5,000 miles away from our westernmost border. Now I am not an economic isolationist. All I say is that the edible fat market should at least be made available to American producers of fats and oils.

To give them this opportunity I have recently introduced a bill known as "H. R. 5587" in Congress, which will tax all margarine made of foreign oils 10 cents a pound. This will automatically and immediately replace Asiatic food oils in this industry by those produced on our own farms and ranches. It will open up new markets for our distressed American producers. Margarine offers the largest potential output for these surpluses of our home-grown fats and oils. The legislation I have offered has the simple purpose of putting the margarine industry on a domestic basis.

This legislation will not amend or in any way change the existing oleomargarine laws. It simply provides an effective means of compelling margarine manufacturers to use domestic products instead of foreign products. This will restore the market for domestic fats and oils to its pre-war status, without injury to any domestic group. Ninety-nine percent of the fats contained in margarine was of domestic origin before the war. Furthermore, my bill does not affect the importations of foreign oils for soap or other industrial uses.

Putting the industry on a domestic basis does not mean that the product will be substantially higher in price than when made from foreign oils. The difference is one of the relative price of foreign and domestic ingredients and whatever that may be is due to the difference in production costs and living standards of American and oriental producers. It will make possible the use of domestic fats in the higher priced edible uses. It is an economic waste to utilize these rich and desirable food fats as soap stock.

In order to adjust our agricultural plant to changed economic conditions at home and abroad we must find means of utilizing our acreage in the production of commodities for which there is a demand. The outstanding possibility along this line is the increased production of fats and oils, of which we import more than a billion pounds.

Because of the underconsumption of table spreads in the form of butter, due to the inadequate supply of this product and the inability of at least 25,000,000 of our citizens to buy it at prevailing prices, the largest market for our fats and oils is in the margarine industry.

If the legislation I have introduced is passed, it will prove immediately beneficial to American agriculture. At the present rate of margarine consumption, the replacement of imported oils by our own products would provide an additional annual market of over 150,000,000 pounds. This would require the cotton oil produced on 3,700,000 acres; the lard from four million six hundred thousand 200-pound hogs; or the edible fat from four million six hundred thousand 1,000-pound steers. In connection with the price of beef and pork to the consumer, the passage of this legislation will increase the value of the byproducts and offers an additional safeguard, therefore, against an increased price to the consumer for beef and pork. Thus more than 5,000,000 acres of our land would immediately be required in producing this quantity of additional fats, thereby relieving to that extent the need for production control of crops that are on an export basis.

The production of margarine needed to supply our deficiency in table spreads would require at least half the acreage that has been retired under the A. A. A. program, and would greatly benefit every agricultural section.

Thus we have an intensely practical method, through this legislation, of utilizing our retired acreage and in dealing with the problem of permanent adjustment of our national agricultural production.

From the standpoint of the public the enlarged use of domestic fats and oils in the margarine industry has a double significance: First, because the domestic product is of superior quality in physical texture and palatability; and, second, because of the effect of the increased buying power of American agriculture upon general business conditions.

It strikes me that everyone who is genuinely interested in the welfare of American agriculture must favor this legislation, when the benefits to agriculture are so obvious.

Certainly no consuming group can oppose the bill in view of the superior quality of the product when made from domestic fats and when its passage will speed up recovery.

Certainly the traditional policy of organized labor is in accord with the idea of advancing the field and earnings of American industry, thereby preserving the American standard of living.

Foreign oil interests are expected to oppose this legislation as they did the excise tax passed by Congress last year. Students of the subject believe that in the long run the Philippine Islands will benefit by this legislation, as they have from the excise tax. The error of their previous opposition is now recognized by many friends of the Philippine Islands. The Philippines now have a practical monopoly in the domestic market for coconut oil. This market will be further extended if our domestic oils move into the edible field, leaving the industrial field wide open to Philippine imports.

Certainly no friend of this administration and the existing policies of this Government to improve the buying power of American farmers can object to providing a practical means, without processing taxes, cash benefits, or expensive administrative costs, which will be helpful in bringing about and maintaining parity price for American-produced fats and oils.

For all of the reasons I have cited, we should pass this legislation promptly. It would benefit all classes and deprive none of any advantage.

The passage of my bill will not remedy the un-American laws which exist in some of the States, but it will make it possible for American consumers to buy a product with a standard of quality that will insure its wholesomeness and its nutritive value, and at the same time permit them to trade with the farmers of this country, who are anxious to buy the things which are produced in other sections and industries. It will in no way change the existing oleomargarine laws, but will correct the justifiable complaint of the butter industry toward margarine made from the products of the "coconut cow" and will provide a profitable outlet for larger quantities of home-grown fats and oils in the domestic market to the advantage of both producers and consumers.

Hearings on the Kleberg bill will take place tomorrow before the House Committee on Agriculture. Every American farmer and stockman within hearing of my voice is entitled to this information so that under representative government he may have time to express his interest in this legislation to his Congressman or Senators. By this means the voice of the people is heard in our Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

An expression of your views on this legislation will unquestionably be appreciated by your Representatives in both branches of the Congress. The question to be answered is whether or not American markets should be at least available to American producers.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, with Mr. JONES in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an appropriation of $20,000 annually is hereby authorized, $10,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group.

SEC. 2. That the American group of the Interparliamentary Union shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, including its expenditures under such appropriation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very heartily in favor of the pending bill. We have under consideration a bill passed by the Senate. I introduced a similar bill in the House. By reason of the fact that the Senate had already acted favorably upon this measure, the Senate bill was substituted by the committee for the bill which I introduced.

This bill provides for our participation in the Interparliamentary Union. The Interparliamentary Union had its in-

ception in 1888, when representatives of a few foreign countries gathered informally to discuss matters relating to peace, to arbitration, and to the preservation of parliamentary government. These informal conferences through the years led to the organization in 1899 of the Interparliamentary Union, which has since existed. It is an association of more than 40 of the leading nations of the world, both in the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. This association has meetings annually at various places in the world. Two of those meetings since 1899 have been held in the United States, one in 1904 at St. Louis and one in 1925 in the city of Washington. For each of those meetings the Congress of the United States appropriated $50,000 for the purpose of looking after the incidental expenses and taking proper care of the delegates from foreign nations. The United States has participated in each of those annual meetings since the first six. Since 1911 it has made annual appropriations for the support of this organization and, with the exception of 1 or 2 years, has also made appropriations for delegates to attend those annual sessions. Those annual meetings are simply, solely, and purely for the purpose of the discussion of matters of parliamentary, social, and economic problems common to many and sometimes to all of the countries which are members of the Union.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Gladly.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman tell us just what the primary results are of participation in the Interparliamentary Union? Is there a report made back to the House?

Mr. LANHAM. I am coming to that. I was trying to give a little incidental history by way of preface. This is a permanent organization to which the United States Government has for years contributed $10,000 annually. The appropriation, I think, for the current year was reduced to $7,500. The $10,000 which we have appropriated annually to this organization is in accordance with a similar contribution made by each of the countries of the world, members of that union, in our class with reference to population, resources, and so forth. This organization uses this money for the purpose of its necessary officers and for the further purpose of the study of the various questions which are considered by and discussed at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. Each year there are certain subjects of mutual interest which are discussed, and may I impress upon you that this union has no binding effect and can have none whatever, upon any member of the union or any representative of any country coming to attend these meetings.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I think this $10,000 we spend is money well spent, for it keeps up good feeling, especially between the Pan American countries and ourselves.

I am sure my colleague was here the last time this Interparliamentary Union met in Washington. There were over 40 countries represented right on the floor of this House. I attended every meeting daily and I was greatly impressed with the good that I thought came out of such meeting. I hope that the measure will pass.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is the most profitable expenditure of money our Government can make in any foreign contact, because it gives us an opportunity to know what the people of the various nations are thinking about problems they have that are similar to problems we have, without any binding effect or force or obligation upon this country whatsoever. I think that to continue this contact and at the same time to know what these foreign countries are thinking, what their attitude may be toward certain problems, makes this a most profitable investment, small though it be.

The American participation—and each Member of Congress is eligible for membership in this organization—the American representation is in the hands of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. Senator McKinley, of Illinois, was long the president of the American group. Lately, until he felt that he had to resign because of the state of his health, our beloved colleague from Virginia, Mr. MONTAGUE, was for many years the president of the American group. The delegates who attend from America report to the Congress of the United States the gist of the discussions held at the annual meetings and all things of interest that may pertain to problems similar to those we have in this country. This information also may be had at any time from the secretary of the American group. I repeat that in my judgment the good we get from this association, in which we have participated financially since 1911, is the greatest possible that could come from such a small expenditure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My colleague was a delegate to one of these meetings, a representative of our Government. I would like for him to state from his own personal experience whether or not the discussion of the problems there and meeting with members of groups of other countries of the world was, in his judgment, worth while?

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my colleague and shall be glad to recite my own experiences.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my pleasure to attend one, and only one, of these annual meetings. That one was held at Bucharest a few years ago, and my appreciation of this organization has resulted from my attendance upon that meeting and my subsequent study of the Interparliamentary Union and of America's participation in it. Forty or more nations were represented at that meet, South American nations, North American nations, European nations, nations from all over the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Although there were two or three official languages of that meeting, each delegate had at his seat an earphone and just by turning the knob on a dial to the language in which he wished to hear the speech, and adjusting the earphones he heard it in his own tongue or in a tongue with which he was familiar simultaneously with the delivery of the speech in a foreign tongue by one of the delegates. In this way the proceedings of the whole convention were readily understood by men who speak different languages.

One of the subjects which was discussed at that meeting was with reference to underprivileged children and children in industry, and we learned something of these problems as they affected the various countries. From this interchange of ideas we got many helpful suggestions. Through this contact, which entails no obligation upon us, the findings of which body have no binding force upon us, we promote good will and a more cordial feeling among the nations of the world.

In this day, when parliamentary government is so seriously threatened, surely our Government, which is the very keystone of parliamentary government as it exists in the world today, should in every way possible promote this good purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. At the last meeting in this country, which was held in this Chamber, there were delegates from South American countries who first spoke in Spanish, then would translate their own speeches into French, and then into English.

Prior to that meeting it was dangerous for an American to travel in many parts of old Mexico; there was such an unfriendly feeling in the hearts of a great many Mexicans against Americans; but I have noticed that since that meeting a better feeling prevails, and it is now safe for Americans to travel all over old Mexico. I believe that that meeting did more to bring this situation about than anything else that could have occurred.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Will not the gentleman give us a little more information as to the scope of these discussions at these meetings?

Mr. LANHAM. Each year certain topics are selected to be discussed. These topics are studied carefully by various committees, certain committees giving study to some of the topics to be discussed, and other committees giving study to other topics. These committees assemble all the data and information they can secure with reference to these common problems, and the benefit of this study of these problems is given at the annual meeting where the subjects are discussed.

As I say, this has no binding effect whatsoever upon us, but it does enable us in a cordial way to know what European countries are doing and to know what the European parliamentary representatives are thinking, and it gives us a contact that is most helpful.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. How many delegates from this country attend the meetings of this Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. LANHAM. Just as many as can be provided for with the funds appropriated. On the occasion I spoke of, when I was a delegate, I think there were 10. Of course, the only expenses are the expenses directly connected with going to and from the place of the convention and one's expenses while at the convention. As many delegates are sent as possible with the appropriations provided.

Mr. FIESINGER. And if there were 15 delegates the money appropriated would be divided to pay all or part of the expenses of the 15?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not very long ago one of my constituents, a very fine young man, was killed in Mexico. Justice is very slow in being arrived at. The State Department is having difficulty. The consul is having great difficulty in this case. I believe this Interparliamentary Union might tend to make Mexico realize what she is doing. I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. As against that one Massachusetts constituent killed in Mexico, the gentlewoman will remember two Mexican students who had been going to a university in the United States and on their way home were shot and murdered down in Oklahoma. This Congress paid their parents a large sum of money, because of their death. Those things happen interchangeably. Mexicans are killed in the United States and Americans are killed in Mexico. That always will happen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Many more are killed in Mexico than in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not believe that, because many Mexicans are killed all along the border. It will happen until the millenium comes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are far too many being killed in Mexico.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I say one or two things more? The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has just called my attention to one of the reports on the Interparliamentary Union appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 30, 1933, which was presented by Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Minnesota asked about that and may be interested.

Mr. LANHAM. This is one of the reports. More extensive reports in detail may always be had from the executive secretary of the American group.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. Can the gentleman tell us what topics will be discussed this coming year?

Mr. LANHAM. Personally I am not advised. Perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] can answer the question.

Mr. BLOOM. They have not as yet been given out. The council meets and they send over the list of subjects; then the President designates the people who are to go over there and be on the different councils in which the different subjects are taken up.

Mr. BACON. Can the gentleman tell us where the coming meeting will be held?

Mr. LANHAM. It will be held in Brussels, beginning the 26th of July. The meeting lasts about a week.

Mr. BACON. It is to be hoped that Congress will have adjourned by then?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. In order to give the gentleman an opportunity to clear the matter up, may I ask him this question? What connection, if any, does the Interparliamentary Union have with the League of Nations?

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad the gentleman asked the question, and I was just about to come to that. The Interparliamentary Union has no connection whatever with the League of Nations or any other international organization seeking to force its will upon any country in the world. It is purely advisory and purely for the purposes of discussion, information, and friendly contact of parliamentary representatives.

The Interparliamentary Union existed before the League of Nations was contemplated, is entirely independent and has no binding force or effect upon any nation and seeks to have none. Let me say further there was brought out in the hearings before the committee on this bill the exception taken by a member of the committee to the fact that at the last meeting of the Interparliamentary Union there was some discussion with reference to the Kellogg Peace Pact. Of course, no action could be taken that would be binding upon anybody; but if the Interparliamentary Union should discuss the Kellogg Peace Pact or any other policy of the American Government it is advisable that we have representatives there to hear what they say and to know what their attitude is. It is worth the money to know that, to hear it, and to learn what they think of us, because they cannot bind us nor can we bind them in this union.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. I appreciate it is entirely informal and involuntary, but will the gentleman explain what the mechanics are of translating those discussions into benefits so far as the legislative processes of this country are concerned?

Mr. LANHAM. Whenever questions arise of an international character, the information is available always in part with reference to the particular problems under discussion in the reports that are made annually to the Congress by the American group of the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union and in detail through the executive secretary, who has his office in the city of Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 55 minutes to America's greatest nationalist, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, this proposal is entirely different from every other proposal that has come before this Committee today. It is purely a political proposal; that is, it proposes that we participate in the political affairs and in the political discussions of Europe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman ever attended one of these interparliamentary meetings in Europe?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have not; but I have read the reports, and I have here the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I have attended two such meetings, and he is very much mistaken when he makes the statement it is a political meeting.

Mr. TINKHAM. I shall read the agenda for the coming meeting. Of course, under ordinary conditions international economics takes on a political character, and I should consider a discussion of international economics a discussion of international politics.

I read from an official bulletin, the Interparliamentary Bulletin. Forthcoming Interparliamentary Meetings.

Wednesday, April 24 and Thursday, April 25

Subcommittee on economic and financial questions

AGENDA

To discuss:

1. Economic problems: (a) The protection of agriculture in industrial countries and of industry in agricultural countries.

(b) The competition between sugar and saccharine.

2. Demographic problems. The position of overpopulated countries and the possibilities for colonization.

"The possibilities of colonization". This does not interest us. We withdrew from our last colonial possession in the East only recently.

3. Financial and monetary problems: Monetary stabilization and the question of an international currency.

4. Other proposals.

Friday, April 26, 4 p. m.

Subcommittee on juridical questions

AGENDA

The main questions before the subcommittee are: (a) The system of capitulations.

(b) Harmonization of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Covenant of the League of Nations.

This is certainly a political question. This certainly involves us politically.

(c) The codification of world law.

(d) Questions submitted as examples by M. V. V. Pella, vice president of the committee.

Saturday, April 27, 10 a. m.

Full committee on political and organization questions

AGENDA

1. To hear the report presented by M. H. Loewenherz (Poland) on the preliminary draft resolution submitted by the subcommittee on the representative system on the legislative function.

Poland is a dictatorship.

2. To hear the report presented by M. C. Costamagna (Italy) on "The Publication, Exchange, and Rationalization of Legislative Documents."

Italy is a dictatorship. How, in the circumstances, can Italy or Poland instruct in free parliamentary affairs? How can Europe do so?

3. To hear the report presented by M. Cosma (Rumania) on "The Organization and Work of Parliamentary Committees."

Who has ever said that Rumania had a free parliamentary system?

4. Other proposals.

5. To appoint one or more rapporteurs.

Full committee on the reduction of armaments

AGENDA

1. To consider the attitude to be adopted by the Union with regard to the question of disarmament.

This is a political matter which the League of Nations is considering. Armament and disarmament are matters of the highest political character.

2. To examine the question of the manufacture of arms, munitions, and war material.

This is purely a question for Europe, purely political in character and having to do with the League of Nations.

3. To consider the question of the trade in arms, munitions, and war material.

This is a question of the same political character. European disarmament and like proposals are European questions for the consideration of Europe. Europe should not be permitted to impose her policies and her political systems upon the United States.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Since we are not a member of the League of Nations, does not the gentleman from Massachusetts believe it advisable that we should discuss these questions where there are no commitments?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not believe we should put one foot over the threshold into European political affairs. If we put one foot forward, we are involved. I am going to show how our involvement through this very organization not only brought us into the World War but almost made us a member of the League of Nations.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman refers to them as European questions. They undoubtedly involve this country as well as the other nations of the world, and they are of concern to us.

Mr. TINKHAM. It does not seem to me that European questions, political in character, should be of any concern to us. This is the line of demarcation, it seems to me, which should characterize the American foreign policy and tradition which go back to the old admonition from Washington himself—no participation in the political affairs of Europe and no foreign entangling political alliances. If we become a member of an organization which is discussing these questions, political in character, we put our foot over the threshhold. If we put our foot over the threshold, we inevitably go further. I am now going to show how this very organization really involved us, in my opinion, in the World War, and how it also nearly precipitated us into the League of Nations.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Our State Department is carrying on conversations with the nations of the world at all times. Why is it not justifiable that groups of our citizenship should meet with groups of citizens from other nations and have a proper discussion of these questions?

Mr. TINKHAM. Again, I simply reiterate what I have said: I do not believe we wish, in any way, officially to discuss political questions with Europe. If we do, we are involved. I believe the United States should not participate in the political affairs of Europe. Had we not begun to participate in them by joining this very organization, we should not be in our present economic situation, with our institutions shaken to their foundations, with unemployment unparalleled in our history, with enormous and ever-mounting debts and taxes, as well as a constant rise in the cost of living.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. So far as I know, the American representatives have never participated in any discussion involving European questions which were solely and technically European; but what harm can there be at these meetings in listening to the discussions as to the situation that exists?

Mr. TINKHAM. Because it is a move in the wrong direction; it is a move toward the political affairs of Europe and involvement therein. The direction is all-important, particularly in relation to foreign policies.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. I am informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts is one of the greatest travelers in the country. Did he not do that in order to get information and reflect the information of other nations? Is not the gentleman indulging in the very thing he is charging against this measure?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have traveled considerably but I have never traveled in my official capacity of United States Representative. I reiterate I do not believe that the United

States should participate in any formal or official way in any organization which discusses the political affairs or even the economic affairs of Europe.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a further question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the constitution of the Interparliamentary Union every member of every parliamentary body in the world is technically a member, and the gentleman himself is a member. If we are members ought not we to have a right to participate in their considerations?

Mr. TINKHAM. The question is, Shall we?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a great traveler. He goes to Europe to furnish the G. O. P. with elephants. The Grand Old Party would run out of elephants if he did not go there. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINKHAM. Now, I am going to read the history of this organization. Why were we involved in the World War in Europe? Simply because we joined an international organization. We put our foot over the threshold and were then drawn into the maelstrom.

In 1887 a voluntary delegation of members of the British Parliament and of British trade unions came to the United States to present an address in favor of a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States. They were introduced to President Cleveland by Andrew Carnegie.

There is no treaty of arbitration yet between the two countries.

In 1888 there was a meeting in Paris of members of the English and French Parliaments, at which there was discussed a treaty of arbitration between England and France.

In 1889 there was a meeting in Paris of members of nine different parliaments, including the English and the French. At this meeting, for the first time, the name "interparliamentary conference" was adopted.

In 1899 these interparliamentary meetings were for the first time given the name "Interparliamentary Union." In 1889 also the First Hague Conference was held, the purpose of which was stated to be "for the specific settlement of international disputes." The Interparliamentary Union was the original promoter of that conference, which was limited entirely to the question of specific settlement of international disputes. In 1907 the Second Hague Conference was called. In 1905 and 1906 the so-called "Algeciras Conferences" were held in Europe. In those conferences the then President, Theodore Roosevelt, interfered because we had already moved in the direction of Europe by joining the Interparliamentary Union and in participating in the First Hague Conference. This was the first intrusion of the United States into the strictly political affairs of Europe.

After the beginning of the World War former President Theodore Roosevelt demanded that the United States enter the European conflict, because we had participated in the two Hague Conferences. From this trend of participation in the affairs of Europe came the arguments and influences for us to enter a league to enforce peace, to which President Wilson gave his adherence. This was the philosophy and thought which finally drew us into the World War, and which finally threatened us with the covenant of the League of Nations to enforce the Versailles Treaty, a treaty of war and not of peace.

Entering the Interparliamentary Union, or entering the First Hague Conference, both of which we entered purely for the purpose of promoting arbitration, gave no excuse for the United States to join any European political body. For us to have favored arbitration was correct.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does not the gentleman think from a political, social, and economic standpoint, it is a wonderful idea to have Members of this parliamentary body, the House and the Senate, send representatives over to an organization of that type, to at least present to them the finest example of what a constitutional parliamentary government stands for, without having any alliance with them.

Mr. TINKHAM. That goes exactly to the heart of the issue that we are discussing, whether we should have any political relationship with Europe.

Mr. SIROVICH. Not relationship, just an interchange of views.

Mr. TINKHAM. The French and English had an interchange of views regularly before 1914, and that policy developed into a commitment in the war which broke out in 1914. European history shows that preceding nearly every war there were interchanges of ideas, there were meetings of diplomats, all of which developed into commitments, either moral or legal.

My argument against joining this organization is that it has departed entirely from its original purpose, namely, to promote arbitration, and has become an organization which discusses political matters.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will my distinguished friend, for whom I have a wholesome admiration, state for the benefit of our colleagues where since 1889, there has been a commitment of the United States to any of the programs or policies of these foreign organizations, in which we have participated every year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have tried, apparently unsuccessfully, to show that if we move step by step in a certain direction, there is an inevitable result. I have shown that we first entered an organization promoting arbitration, that we then participated in a Hague Conference, which also was for the promotion of arbitration, that this led an American President, Theodore Roosevelt, not long after to interfere in the Algeciras Conferences, which were considering strictly European political affairs, basing his reasons for doing so on the fact that we were a member of this union and had participated in the Hague Conference.

Finally, after the World War was declared, he argued that we should enter the war because we had been parties to the Hague Conferences. That was followed by a much more ambitious proposal, namely, that we enter a league to enforce peace. Mr. Wilson was lured into the war to establish and to enforce peace; then he evolved a League of Nations, which has been repudiated by the American people.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to keep our missionaries and churchmen out of foreign countries?

Mr. TINKHAM. Oh, no; they are not political. It is political matters to which I refer.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is wrong on political matters, why is it not wrong on church matters?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not consider ecclesiastical matters political. Some people, during the past 20 years, have tried to merge the two, but I have always been opposed to it, believing in the soundness of the old American principle of the separation of church and state.

Mr. BLANTON. Why would it not eventuate in harm for us to inflict our church ideas on foreigners as well as our political ideas?

Mr. TINKHAM. If the Congress of the United States officially should attempt to do that, of course, it would be objectionable. What I am objecting to is the action of this Congress in participating officially in conferences in relation to political affairs. I do not think we should do so. I do not think it is to our interest to do so. In fact, perhaps it is to our ruin to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. But this is not Congress. This is merely the individuals themselves. Each individual Member goes.

Mr. TINKHAM. In passing this resolution the Congress officially approves the action of the officials of this Government, paid from the Public Treasury, in discussing political matters.

Mr. BLANTON. We passed a law that provides passports for the gentleman when he wants to go to Siam.

Mr. TINKHAM. But I go as an individual. There is a great difference.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. This Union discusses many questions that are economic and social. The gentleman does not construe all those questions to be political, does he?

Mr. TINKHAM. Probably not all of them, no; but enough, such a large number, as to make it very objectionable.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The United States of course has been in this organization for many years. In 1904 the annual convention was held in this country at St. Louis. In what political controversies of Europe during the time we have been in this Interparliamentary Union has it involved us?

Mr. SIROVICH. That is what I asked before.

Mr. TINKHAM. I have not read all these data about the Union. They are voluminous, and I cannot detail each issue, but my point is that the direction that this Union takes, the direction it has taken, the political character it has adopted, departing entirely from its original purpose previous to 1914, namely, arbitration, lead us toward Europe, toward European political questions. I believe this is a dangerous direction. I believe it is now more dangerous than ever before for us to meddle in the political affairs of Europe, a Europe which is governed by dictators, by homicidal Communists.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. Did not the gentleman from Massachusetts support the program for this country sending a delegate to the Agricultural Institute at Rome, which is also an international organization?

Mr. TINKHAM. Well, I had no objection to that. It was narrowed down to a specific subject, and I thought there might be some benefit in having the statistics which were reported to that Institute given to us, as they were the broadest statistics in relation to agricultural production that were produced. I regard that as different.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman tell us one benefit that flowed from that conference?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not know that I can.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I told the gentleman when I tried to get him to vote against it.

Mr. TINKHAM. That would be rather an argument on my side. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. On the same basis, why should the gentleman oppose the entrance of this country into the International Labor Organization, which deals with the problems of labor?

Mr. TINKHAM. I opposed our going into the International Labor Organization on the same general ground. The International Labor Organization was a part of the Versailles Treaty. It was the left wing of the League of Nations, the right wing being the political Court of the League. My argument in opposition was that if we entered either one, we should eventually find ourselves in the central part, namely, the Covenant of the League. As I do not believe that we should join any European political organization, my position is just as consistent here as it was in relation to the International Labor Organization. The Labor Organization is interwoven with the Secretariat of the League, with the political Court of the League, and also with the Council of the League, all political bodies, so I objected to making any commitments in that direction.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman is aware, however, that in the acceptance of the United States in the International Labor Organization, it was clearly stated that it was not to have anything to do with the League of Nations?

Mr. TINKHAM. That is true. That kept us out of the Covenant. But if we went into the League, if we went into the Court, which is the right wing of the League, and then went into the Labor Organization, which is the left wing of the League, of course, the argument would be overwhelming that we should go into the Covenant, and then we should find ourselves full members of the League. That is why I fought it so bitterly. So long as I remain a Member of Congress, at the proper time I shall oppose appropriations for the International Labor Organization and shall do everything else possible to withdraw the United States from that organization.

I wish also to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the resolution before us is entirely misleading. It is stated that the amount authorized, $10,000, is for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union "for the promotion of international arbitration." Any question concerning arbitration was disposed of entirely by the setting up of the League Court and by the assent of some of the nations of the world to the optional clause of the Court which made arbitration compulsory. So the resolution on its face does not reveal its real purpose.

Another thing—I hesitate to mention it—is not this a genteel form of international graft? Does it not give certain Members of this House, and only a very limited number, a European tour? Does it not dispense funds from the Public Treasury to give free European tours to Members of Congress? I do not think the American people will look with favor upon this proposition to send a certain few select Members of Congress regularly on European tours.

This bill proposes to make permanent what heretofore has been an annual appropriation. You must therefore determine as representatives of the people whether you wish to establish a permanent policy of annually sending a few select Representatives of this House on a European tour.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. It is only an authorization for a permanent appropriation, not a permanent appropriation. The appropriation still would have to be made each year; and, if for any reason the appropriation should not be made, it need not be made.

Mr. TINKHAM. It helps, of course, to have the appropriation made annually.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative.

Mr. BLANTON. On the question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me call his attention to the fact that our distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH] has been a delegate one time. Here is our distinguished friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who has been over there as a delegate once. Here is our friend from Oklahoma, JED JOHNSON, who has been over there one time.

Mr. TINKHAM. I have said nothing personally disparaging of the Members who have been delegates.

Mr. BLANTON. And here is our beloved friend, the distinguished former Governor of Virginia, whom we all love, Mr. MONTAGUE.

I ask the gentleman: Has it not been worth while, do we not get benefit from daily association with these eminent gentlemen who give us the benefit of whatever they have gotten over there? I think it is money well spent. I do not think this is a junket at all. They give the people in other countries the American viewpoint on all questions.

Mr. TINKHAM. My position, as I said, is that this Union is no longer accomplishing its original purpose, namely, to promote arbitration. The subject of arbitration is no longer an issue, with the League Court a reality, and with the right

of the United States to go to the League Court when it wants to submit any question to it for arbitration.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Would the gentleman restrict arbitration to its military connotation? Arbitration does not refer solely to war and belligerent enterprises.

Mr. TINKHAM. No; arbitration is a preliminary attempt to settle international disputes and to avoid war.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may make a point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. We should not dispose of a bill of this character with so few Members in the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. TINKHAM. I am very glad to have the gentleman make his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us finish the bill, we have waited here an hour to do it. How much time has the gentleman remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will agree to an adjournment immediately after the House acts on the pending bill, I will withdraw my point of no quroum.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will agree, so far as he is concerned, to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from California.

Mr. COLDEN. I am very much interested in the gentleman's discussion. I would like to know the gentleman's position. I would like to know whether he is in favor of this movement to support international arbitration which does not commit our country to any alliance or agreements with other countries?

Mr. TINKHAM. The League Court, which we all know is a political court, disposes of the question of the arbitration of disputes. First, it disposes of them automatically as between the members; and, second, resort may be had to it by nations which, like the United States, are not members of the League. So arbitration is no longer an active international or national issue.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman from Texas a while ago mentioned three or four Members of the House who on one occasion were delegates to meetings of this Interparliamentary Union. Has it not been the practice to appoint different Members each year to attend these meetings, or are some Members reappointed year after year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I think the honorable Representative will find that a small number of Members have gone a number of times.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am wondering if these meetings are a benefit to the Congress of the United States and to our people and whether or not the maximum benefit could not be derived by having different delegates attend these meetings, thereby spreading out the wisdom that is received and the inspiration that they might receive by having this contact with other parliamentary bodies?

Mr. TINKHAM. That might be so, and, again, it might not be so.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman state that the same men go year after year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have not looked over the record very carefully, but I think there are, as I stated a while ago, a number who make the European tour rather regularly.

Mr. BOILEAU. I have not had this information before and I have no knowledge of it myself; therefore I think it would be very illuminating to the Members of the House to know whether or not it has been the practice of having as many go as we can possibly accommodate with the small appropriation. Can the gentleman give us any information as to how the delegates are selected; that is, are they selected by the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, or by whom?

Mr. TINKHAM. I understand the selection is made by an executive committee of the American section of this organization. I suppose there are certain members who submit requests to go, and it may be that selection is made according to seniority or in some other way. I do not know. I think the honorable Representative from Texas can tell us how the selection is made.

Mr. LANHAM. It is made by the official board of the American interparliamentary group. Governor MONTAGUE has been president of this group up to this time. Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, is now president of the group.

Mr. TINKHAM. Have these gentlemen gone rather regularly to the conferences?

Mr. LANHAM. Senator BARKLEY, I believe, attended two. Governor MONTAGUE, as the president, attended regularly, because he has had in his charge necessarily over there the supervision of the conferences of the American group within itself.

Mr. TINKHAM. Are not the selections made by the executive committee of which they are members, or are they made by the president?

Mr. LANHAM. The president of the American group. Each Member of the American Congress is a member of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. The meetings of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union are held here each year. Each Member of Congress gets a notice. The gentleman from Massachusetts received notice of the meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union recently held, at which these matters were discussed. Of course, it has always been incumbent upon the president of the group to go if he can because he supervises the conferences of the representatives of the American group.

Mr. TINKHAM. Do I understand the president of the group selects the members who are to go?

Mr. LANHAM. It is made, I understand, by the President and other officers of the group. However, this has included from time to time many Members who have no connection whatever with the official organization of the American group. I had none. The gentleman from New York had none, and the gentleman from Oklahoma had none. At the one meeting which I attended there were only two, as I recall, who were members of the official body of the American group.

Mr. TINKHAM. The honorable Representative from Texas is then a little uncertain how the selections are actually made?

Mr. LANHAM. They are made by the American group itself.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does the gentleman mean by the whole group?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know. They have not been made as yet for this year. The American group will determine the matter for itself as to the representatives that will go.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Can the gentleman advise the House as to the number of delegates sent over there each year?

Mr. TINKHAM. I shall have to refer you to the honorable Representative from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that I made reference to that matter in my remarks upon this bill. The

number that can go is necessarily restricted, of course, by the appropriation, although it has been customary to try to get the presence of any Members of Congress who may be in Europe in addition to those who may be sent over under this appropriation. There are others who go at their own expense. It is sought to have as large a representation as possible. The expenses of all the delegates every year have not been paid in full. The expenses, too, I may say, are paid only to the meeting, during the meeting, and for the return trip. There is nothing allowed for incidental expenses. If one wants to travel around Europe or anything of that kind, no allowance is made. The amount appropriated is apportioned upon vouchers approved by the State Department for the expenses of the delegates. It may be said that sometimes the amount received by each delegate has not been sufficient to meet the actual expenses of going to the meeting.

Mr. BOILEAU. There are usually 5 members, 10 members, or 20 members?

Mr. LANHAM. On the one occasion I went, I should say there were 10 or 12.

Mr. BOILEAU. And the $10,000 is divided up equally among those who attend?

Mr. LANHAM. The money is not divided among them; no. They present vouchers covering their actual expenses. These vouchers are scrutinized by the State Department and gone over very carefully to see that they are restricted to the necessary expenses incident to the trip to attend the Interparliamentary Union and return.

Mr. BOILEAU. It means practically the same thing; that is, that the $10,000 is divided equally among the 10 who attend?

Mr. LANHAM. This money is appropriated for the purpose of paying the expenses of the delegates attending, although it has not always been sufficient in the past.

Mr. BOILEAU. My interest is not in the sense that I have a desire to go, because I could not be reelected from my district in Wisconsin should I attend a meeting of this kind at Government expense.

Mr. LANHAM. Personally I think the gentleman would make a good delegate. I think he would find it profitable if he attended one of these meetings and that he would be very enthusiastic about them.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to assure him that undoubtedly I would receive some benefit; but I doubt if it could be communicated back to the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit.

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have tried to follow the gentleman very carefully, but I do not know whether it is clear to me yet, and will the gentleman answer this question: Whom would I have to see if I wanted to go as a delegate?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to my colleague from New York that I am not a member of the official board of the American group.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have been trying to find out who it is.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me answer the question.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, my colleague from New York has had all kinds of difficulty getting any jobs out of this administration; can we not do something for him now?

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that, like himself, I am a member of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union through my membership in this body.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We cannot find out who picks these delegates to go.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit, does not Mr. Call pick them?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Who is the executive committee? What is all this mystery about?

Mr. LANHAM. So far as I am concerned, there is no mystery, and I may say that on the occasion when I went, it seemed difficult to get a sufficient number of delegates to attend.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no desire to go myself.

Mr. LANHAM. And Governor MONTAGUE, who was then president of the American group, asked me if I would go.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from New York.

Mr. TABER. It seems that the committee is divided into two groups, one of which is fearful lest they may be damaged in their districts because they go on a junket, while the other group is trying to find out how they can go on a junket. It is perfectly clear that this is a junket. It is perfectly clear that $10,000 of this money is for a junket. The report of the committee indicates that $7,500 of the money has heretofore been used in providing for the overhead of this international organization, and this bill proposes to raise that $7,500 to $10,000. It would seem to me that $10,000, or even $7,500, is a lot of money.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I have not the floor, but it would seem to me we ought to beat the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to say to the gentleman from New York that the annual appropriation has been $10,000 a year consistently, and it was reduced to $7,500 in the last appropriation, which has made it even harder upon the union itself, because of the variation in the exchange.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I cannot understand for what they even used $7,500.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Honorable Theodore E. Burton was president of this Commission for a number of years, and was very active in it and very much interested in it?

Mr. TINKHAM. He was very active in it and was also very much in favor of our entering the League of Nations. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The distinguished gentleman from New York asked who selected these delegates. I am wondering if it is not Arthur D. Call who selects them. He did several years ago, and I presume he is still doing it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He is not a Member of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You would not expect a Member of Congress to select them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman mean to say that an outsider, not a Member of Congress, picks the Members of the Congress who are to represent the Congress?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was my impression a few years ago.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, Senator BARKLEY, who is the president of the American group, was asked the question how these delegates are selected, and he said they are selected by the president of the local organization in connection with the executive council. There is no mystery about it, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, who is just as much a member of the organization as any other person in this body, and if he wanted to know or had any reason to have this information all he had to do was to attend the meeting when it was held. If he does not know, it is because of negligence on his part, and the gentleman should not try to cast any reflection here that there is any mystery about it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative of Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will look at the RECORD he will see a colloquy between myself and our former dis-

tinguished colleague, Hon. Theodore Burton, a Member of both the House and Senate during his service, where he stated that as president himself he had the control of the selection of the members to go over as delegates. He attended these meetings abroad many times. He had been the president, the same as Governor MONTAGUE has been president, and the same as Senator BARKLEY is now president. The president of our American group himself was the one who made the selection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Now, I have only 1 or 2 minutes left. The headquarters of this organization are in Geneva.

This legislation is taking us to Europe; it is taking us to Geneva, the political headquarters of Europe. There is no Member here who does not know that the vast majority of the people of this country are opposed to our interfering or meddling in the political affairs of Europe. Therefore, in my opinion, we are taking a step in the wrong direction if we approve this legislation.

This organization, in 1934, interpreted the Briand-Kellogg Pact, and at that time it was proposed that on Friday, April 26, 1935, there would be taken up by a subcommittee the harmonization of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Covenant of the League of Nations. This is a political act. It involves our treaty obligations. No foreign body should be allowed to interpret for us our moral or legal obligations. The course and direction of the foreign policy of a nation is one of vital importance. We are proceeding along the wrong road into European political affairs if we adopt the resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, this is one occasion when it is peculiarly distasteful to me to rise in opposition to a bill, due to the fact that its proponents, Members of this House who are interested in its passage, are my friends, the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. MCREYNOLDS, and my dear friend from Texas, Mr. LANHAM. I dislike to rise in opposition to a matter in which they seem so interested, but as to this apparently innocuous bill, a bill solely for the purpose of appropriating $10,000 for expenses of a delegation going to Europe and $10,000 for the expenses of the Interparliamentary Union, I feel as I did on the I. L. O., the International Labor Organization, when that measure came before the House. I opposed that bill and said that it was but another way of geting us entangled in European affairs. I do not want to go into a discussion of the labor situation, except to say that the American Federation of Labor 2 years ago passed a resolution, so far as the I. L. O. is concerned, excoriating it, and this last year, after Congress passed the bill, they merely mentioned it in their report, that since it was in existence they might as well have a labor man go over there. In this present bill you have the situation referred to by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], of discussing political matters in the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. In a moment. If this union was for the purpose solely of discussing parliamentary procedure, or anything like it, I would not oppose it, but when we get into a proposition with Europe, with Hitler and Stalin and Mussolini running their governments and our delegates supposed to sit in a conference, expecting to bring back from that conference something which is good for the American people, I doubt the wisdom of it, and I doubt the wisdom of their ever bringing anything back to us which will be helpful to our institutions in the United States. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman ever attended one of these Conferences?

Mr. CONNERY. I have not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Possibly if the distinguished gentleman had ever attended one he would not make the statement that it is a political conference. May I add also that the Interparliamentary Union, generally speaking, is composed of men and women from almost every civilized nation of the globe who are sincerely interested in preserving the peace of the world. Both Interparliamentary Peace Conferences I attended back in 1927 and 1929 made a profound impression upon me, and I am confident they did also on all the other delegates. I heartily agree with much the gentleman has stated, but I cannot agree that this is a political conference.

Mr. CONNERY. Of course the gentleman is entitled to believe that way. We had a disarmament conference down here in Washington that was not of the Interparliamentary Union. It was called by President Harding. They had the diplomats of the world there. The other nations scrapped blue prints, and we scrapped millions of dollars' worth of our ships. We do not want any more of those conferences. If we want disarmament conferences, we do not want them in the Interparliamentary Union under the auspices of the League of Nations. We want conferences where the President of the United States at any time can call over the premiers of foreign countries, or representatives of the governments of the world, to sit down at the White House where he may say, "Now, what are you going to do about disarmament?" Since the time the gentleman refers to, he knows that France and Germany and England and Russia and all the nations of Europe are armed to the teeth. They have plenty of money to arm their soldiers, but not a nickel to pay their debt to the United States. I do not think this is any time to be spending money to send delegates to conventions that are meaningless, so far as the United States is concerned.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. TRUAX. In my judgment the gentleman has made the most effective speech against this bill that I have yet heard. The gentlemen sponsoring this bill are good friends of mine, Mr. MCREYNOLDS and Mr. LANHAM, but I think the time has arrived when we must stop passing bills because of friendship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes more to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TRUAX. Europe secured a moratorium on her debt, and I think we ought to have a moratorium on European conferences, with our delegates' expenses paid by the Government.

Mr. CONNERY. So do I. I feel very deeply about this matter. As I say, I dislike to oppose two very dear friends of mine in Congress who are for this legislation, and sincerely so, but I think we have had enough of these conferences with Europe. To repeat that old axiom of Will Rogers, "We never lost a war and we never won a conference." It is true. It sounds humorous, but it is true. The diplomats that we send to deal with the European nations are not trained in diplomacy. Foreign diplomats are trained in diplomacy from childhood. We send over our amateur diplomats to deal with them, and the foreign diplomats always have the cards stacked against us before the game starts. That is the way we come out of all these conferences. I do not like that. I do not think there is any good for the United States in a conference of this sort. I am against it. I hope the House will vote down this proposition. It sounds like a small matter to say "$10,000." My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says it is worth $10,000. Mr. BLANTON is willing to allow $10,000 to go to Europe, but when we discuss labor matters on the floor he does not favor $10,000 appropriations for decent living wages for the workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] has expired.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. TINKHAM. For a moment.

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Now, the gentleman has had all the time he wanted to fight this out. I arranged the time to call this up for your convenience. Would the gentleman

under those circumstances undertake to make a point of no quorum when he thinks he is about to get beaten?

Mr. TINKHAM. I want to defeat this measure, which I believe is thoroughly unsound and unpatriotic, by any method that is legitimate. It is legitimate for me to make a point of no quorum and I insist upon it.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman can never have the help of this chairman hereafter in getting time.

Mr. TINKHAM. I am sorry. The gentleman did not give me the time. Does the gentleman from Tennessee try to impose upon me by saying he gave me the time?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Did I not tell the gentleman I would hold that until he could get onto the floor?

Mr. TINKHAM. Oh, that is a different proposition. The gentleman said he gave me time. He did not give me the time; the honorable Representative from New York did that. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. And then we had to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will, but I am going to insist upon my point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 13, noes 36.

So the Committee refused to rise.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has counted. Fifty-one Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 74]

Adair	Dirksen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rich
Andresen	Disney	Kerr	Richards
Andrew, Mass.	Dondero	Kimball	Robertson
Ashbrook	Doutrich	Kleberg	Robinson, Utah
Bankhead	Duncan	Kniffin	Rogers, Okla.
Beam	Dunn, Miss.	Knutson	Romjue
Bell	Eaton	Lambertson	Russell
Berlin	Engel	Lamneck	Ryan
Binderup	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Sabath
Bland	Ferguson	Lemke	Sanders, La.
Bolton	Flannagan	Lewis, Md.	Sauthoff
Brennan	Ford, Calif.	Lucas	Schaefer
Brooks	Ford, Miss.	McClellan	Schneider
Brown, Mich.	Fulmer	McFarlane	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Gambrill	McGehee	Scott
Burch	Gasque	McGroarty	Scrugham
Burdick	Gassaway	McLaughlin	Seger
Caldwell	Gearhart	McMillan	Shannon
Cannon, Mo.	Gehrmann	McSwain	Short
Cannon, Wis.	Gifford	Maverick	Sisson
Carden	Gildea	May	Smith, Wash.
Carpenter	Gillette	Meeks	Smith, W. Va.
Casey	Gingery	Merritt, Conn.	Steagall
Cavicchia	Goldsborough	Millard	Stubbs
Celler	Gray, Pa.	Mitchell, Ill.	Sullivan
Chandler	Greenwood	Montague	Sumners, Tex.
Claiborne	Greever	Montet	Sweeney
Clark, Idaho	Griswold	Moritz	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, N. C.	Haines	Mott	Thomas
Cochran	Hamlin	Murdock	Thompson
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock, N. C.	Nichols	Tobey
Colmer	Harlan	O'Day	Treadway
Cooley	Hartley	Oliver	Underwood
Corning	Healey	O'Malley	Walter
Crawford	Hobbs	Perkins	Weaver
Crosby	Hoeppel	Peyser	Werner
Culkin	Hollister	Pfeifer	White
Cummings	Houston	Pierce	Wilson, Pa.
Dear	Igoe	Plumley	Withrow
Delaney	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramsay	Wolcott
DeRouen	Kahn	Randolph	Wolfenden
Dickstein	Keller	Reece	Woodrum
Dietrich	Kennedy, Md.	Reilly	Zimmerman
Dingell			

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 257 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its session.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an appropriation of $20,000 annually is hereby authorized, $10,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group.

During the reading of the first section the following occurred:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TINKHAM: Page 1, line 3, after the word "of", strike out "$20,000."

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have made a motion to strike out the sum authorized to be appropriated. This legislation proposes for the first time a permanent authorization for a committal of the United States to this organization which is now discussing political affairs and not parliamentary matters. It meets at Geneva. It is a part of the general international set-up of affairs or mechanisms which is favored by internationalists and international Socialists.

In my opinion, the United States is absolutely opposed to any such internationalism and internationalists, and particularly to international socialism and international Socialists. By internationalism I mean political internationalism. The United States has learned its lesson and has paid in part the extortionate price.

When the vote is taken upon this amendment those voting will identify themselves as being either for traditional American principles and policies or for new international socialistic policies which would entangle us in European affairs.

It has been stated that none of the actions of the Interparliamentary Union are binding on the United States. The fact is, however, that before international commitments are made there usually are preliminary conditions and preliminary understandings which give character and direction to commitments. As I have stated, this is simply a movement toward Geneva, a movement toward entanglements in European political affairs. I have read the agenda which is to be considered by this organization, the Interparliamentary Union. I have shown that they are political and economic in character, that they do not relate to arbitration. Our joining this organization originally was because we were in favor of arbitration. I have shown how there is no more interest in arbitration and that now the matters that are discussed are political in character. Although it may be true that there are no binding commitments, nevertheless it is a movement in the wrong direction, toward political internationalism and European entanglements. One foot over the threshold into European political affairs and we are involved. What has been the result of our involvement in the political affairs of Europe, step by step, I stated to the committee perhaps an hour or an hour and a half ago.

I believe those Members of this body who are opposed to internationalism, international socialism, and to our participation in the political affairs of Europe should vote for the amendment which strikes out the amount to be authorized.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say to the Members of this House that my bewhiskered friend from Massachusetts is responsible for your being called over here at this late hour after we had heard him nearly 1 hour on this subject. In 2 minutes we would have been through, and I ask you to vote down everything they offer.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, the time on amendments under the rules is 5 minutes on a side. The gentleman has no right to debate this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word, which is an amendment to the amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy much of the time of the House. The distinguished chairman of the committee stated that my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is responsible for their being here. He is, and if he had not been responsible I would have been. [Applause.]

Any Member of this House is entitled to call the Members over here on any matter which he considers important to the people of the United States.

Now, this is the I. L. O., the International Labor Organization story all over again in another form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the last word.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, the last word is group. I will say, that to my mind, the Interparliamentary Union is a very bad group for United States representatives to join up with [applause], with foreign nations asking us to sit in on their Interparliamentary Union while they are passing out their foreign propaganda to us and then refusing to pay us a nickel of their debt to the United States when they are armed to the teeth, using our money to increase their armaments. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take further time of the House. I hope the House will vote down this European bill which is against the interests of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TINKHAM and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 178, noes 77.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to delay consideration of this bill, but I had hoped to have an opportunity of asking a few questions of the chairman of the committee.

I have been advised that there is a gentleman who acts as executive secretary for the Interparliamentary Union in this country. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether that agent is a paid employee or whether he is working gratuitously because of his interest in the subject matter.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman means the clerk of the committee?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I understand he is a paid employee.

Mr. BOILEAU. Now I ask the gentleman from what funds he is paid; who pays him?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I suggest that Mr. BLOOM answer that question.

Mr. BLOOM. The secretary gets $50 a month and has been there a great many years. He is now being paid out of an appropriation that was made by the Carnegie Institute, which made a donation out of which this salary of $50 a month is paid. This man has been with the Interparliamentary Union a great many years.

Mr. BOILEAU. The reason I asked that question was because of the fact that it has been suggested to me there was a paid secretary. I was wondering from what source these funds were made available. I find no fault with the situation, and do not desire to reflect in any way against the gentleman who acts as secretary. I wanted the information, and I felt the Members of the House were entitled to it, because the suggestion was made that there was some other source from which the funds were made available for him and that it was a larger amount. I am entirely satisfied with the explanation made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRUAX. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not this paid employee—and I understand his name is Call—selects the Members of Congress who are to represent the United States in these conferences? The Congress itself, as I understand it, has nothing whatsoever to do with the selection of these members.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I may say to the gentleman that he does not.

Mr. TRUAX. Then who does?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That question was asked Senator BARKLEY in the hearings before our committee. It is the duty of the president of the local union, which is Senator BARKLEY, in connection with the executive committee of the local union, to make this selection. The executive committee is elected by the Members of Congress who attend the meeting.

Mr. BOILEAU. Are there any other funds used to pay the secretary? Are there any other funds made available to pay any part of the expenses of the delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. None that I know of.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. How does the proposed appropriation in this bill compare with previous appropriations for the same purpose?

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand there was $7,500 appropriated last year.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. It is the same amount.

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand there was $7,500 in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing his motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman is speaking on the merits of the bill.

Mr. MAAS. Does the gentleman think there are enough parliamentary governments left in the world to necessitate such an Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not care to express an opinion on that matter, except to say that I hope there will be more of them in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] to strike out the enacting clause.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the American group of the Interparliamentary Union shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, including its expenditures under such appropriation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. TINKHAM rose.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House——

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TINKHAM: On page 2, after line 6, insert a new section, to be known as "section 3", to read as follows:

"That all appointments to the Union Conference shall be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and the new section just offered be closed in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, if Members of this House and Members of the Senate are to be sent to Europe at public expense, which is the issue involved here, the selection should be made by the officials of these bodies. They should be made by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. It seems to me this is self-evident. We have had a debate here running an hour or an hour and one-half and it has been absolutely and completely obscure as to how these favored Members are appointed to these favored positions, having their expenses to Europe paid to discuss political affairs—political affairs largely, if not entirely, the political affairs of Europe.

This is a legitimate amendment. It is offered for a legitimate purpose and I cannot see how the committee can reject an amendment which provides that if public funds are to be expended out of the Treasury they shall be expended by public officials designated for that purpose. How is it reasonable to oppose such an amendment? How is it possible to authorize private individuals to dispose of public funds? How is it proper to allow Members of Congress to be sent to Europe or sent to Geneva to discuss international matters which, in my opinion, are entirely improper and out of order for American representatives in their official capacities to discuss, and not have their own officials say who shall be selected?

How can such an amendment be rejected in the name of honest and decent legislation, in the name of orderly government and of proper procedure concerning expenditures from the Public Treasury?

I submit the amendment is a legitimate one, is offered in good faith, and should be taken seriously by the committee.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) the Chair announced there were—ayes 90, noes 82.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. CONNERY, Mr. McCORMACK, and Mr. MARCANTONIO rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee demands tellers.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Did the Chair announce the noes had it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not announced the result. The Chair had announced the vote but not the result. The gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to demand tellers.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. As the Chair indicates some uncertainty, I withdraw the demand.

Mr. BLANTON. O Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet to demand tellers at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Those favoring taking this vote by tellers——

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that business has intervened, that after the announcement of the ayes and noes on the rising vote, the gentleman from Tennessee was on his feet and moved that the Committee rise, and it was not until after that that a demand for tellers was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New Jersey in relation to the point of order that the Chair had announced the vote but had not announced the result, and it was not in order for the gentleman from Tennessee to make such motion until the result had been announced.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. When the Chair announced the ayes and noes, did he announce the noes first or the ayes first?

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes first, but the Chair did not announce the result.

All those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] Evidently a sufficient number, and tellers are ordered.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. McREYNOLDS and Mr. TINKHAM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 99 ayes and 89 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and two Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

[Roll No. 75]

Adair	Dietrich	Houston	O'Malley
Allen	Dingell	Igoe	Perkins
Andresen	Dirksen	Johnson, W. Va.	Peyser
Andrew, Mass.	Disney	Kahn	Pfeifer
Bankhead	Dondero	Kennedy, Md.	Pierce
Beam	Doutrich	Kennedy, N. Y.	Plumley
Bell	Duncan	Kerr	Quinn
Berlin	Dunn, Miss.	Kimball	Ramsay
Binderup	Eaton	Kleberg	Randolph
Bland	Engel	Kniffin	Rayburn
Bolton	Englebright	Lamneck	Reece
Brennan	Ferguson	Lee, Okla.	Reilly
Brooks	Fernandez	Lemke	Rich
Brown, Mich.	Fish	Lesinski	Richards
Buckley, N. Y.	Flannagan	Lewis, Md.	Robertson
Burch	Ford, Calif.	Lucas	Robinson, Utah
Burdick	Ford, Miss.	McGroarty	Rogers, Okla.
Caldwell	Fulmer	McLaughlin	Romjue
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	McLeod	Russell
Carden	Gasque	McMillan	Ryan
Carpenter	Gassaway	McSwain	Sabath
Casey	Gearhart	Maloney	Sadowski
Cavicchia	Gifford	Maverick	Sanders, La.
Celler	Gildea	May	Sandlin
Claiborne	Gillette	Meeks	Schaefer
Clark, Idaho	Goldsborough	Merritt, Conn.	Schuetz
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Penn.	Millard	Scott
Cochran	Greenwood	Mitchell, Ill.	Scrugham
Colmer	Greever	Montague	Seger
Cooley	Griswold	Montet	Shannon
Corning	Haines	Moritz	Short
Crosby	Hamlin	Mott	Sisson
Culkin	Hancock, N. C.	Murdock	Smith, Wash.
Cummings	Harlan	Nelson	Smith, W. Va.
Dear	Hartley	Nichols	Snyder
Delaney	Hobbs	O'Connell	Steagall
DeRouen	Hoeppel	O'Day	Stubbs
Dickstein	Hollister	Oliver	Sullivan

Sumners, Tex.	Tobey	Walter	Wolcott
Sutphin	Tonry	Warren	Wolfenden
Sweeney	Treadway	Weaver	Woodrum
Tarver	Underwood	Werner	Zimmerman
Taylor, Tenn.	Vinson, Ga.	Wilson, Pa.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fifty-nine Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were 72 ayes and 123 noes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 74, nays 172, not voting 185, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—74

Allen	Ekwall	Kinzer	Reed, Ill.
Amlie	Fenerty	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.
Andrews, N. Y.	Focht	Kramer	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Gavagan	Lambertson	Sauthoff
Bacon	Gehrmann	Lord	Schneider
Blackney	Goodwin	McAndrews	Secrest
Boileau	Granfield	McCormack	Stefan
Buckbee	Guyer	McFarlane	Stewart
Buckler, Minn.	Halleck	McKeough	Taber
Carlson	Hancock, N. Y.	Maas	Thurston
Cole, Md.	Hess	Marcantonio	Tinkham
Collins	Higgins, Conn.	Marshall	Truax
Connery	Higgins, Mass.	Martin, Mass.	Turpin
Cooper, Ohio	Hoffman	Michener	Wadsworth
Crawford	Holmes	Mott	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Hope	O'Brien	Withrow
Darrow	Huddleston	Pittenger	Young
Ditter	Hull	Powers	
Dunn, Pa.	Jenkins, Ohio	Ransley	

NAYS—172

Arnold	Dorsey	Kloeb	Polk
Ayers	Doughton	Kocialkowski	Rabaut
Barden	Doxey	Kopplemann	Ramspeck
Beiter	Drewry	Kvale	Randolph
Berlin	Driscoll	Lambeth	Rankin
Biermann	Driver	Lanham	Richardson
Blanton	Duffey, Ohio	Larrabee	Rogers, N. H.
Bloom	Duffy, N. Y.	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, Okla.
Boehne	Eagle	Lehlbach	Sanders, Tex.
Boland	Eckert	Lewis, Colo.	Schulte
Brooks	Edmiston	Lewis, Md.	Sears
Brown, Ga.	Eicher	Lloyd	Shanley
Buchanan	Ellenbogen	Ludlow	Sirovich
Buck	Evans	Lundeen	Sisson
Bulwinkle	Faddis	McClellan	Smith, Conn.
Burnham	Farley	McGehee	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Fiesinger	McGrath	South
Carmichael	Fitzpatrick	McLean	Spence
Carter	Fletcher	McReynolds	Stack
Cartwright	Frey	Mahon	Starnes
Castellow	Gingery	Mapes	Sutphin
Chandler	Gray, Ind.	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Colo.
Chapman	Green	Mason	Taylor, S. C.
Christianson	Greenway	Massingale	Terry
Church	Gregory	Merritt, N. Y.	Thom
Citron	Gwynne	Miller	Thomason
Coffee	Hart	Mitchell, Tenn.	Thompson
Colden	Harter	Monaghan	Tolan
Cooper, Tenn.	Healey	Moran	Turner
Costello	Hennings	Nelson	Umstead
Cox	Hildebrandt	Norton	Utterback
Cravens	Hill, Ala.	O'Leary	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Hill, Knute	O'Neal	Wearin
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Samuel B.	Owen	Welch
Crowe	Hook	Palmisano	West
Cullen	Imhoff	Parsons	Whelchel
Daly	Jenckes, Ind.	Patman	White
Darden	Johnson, Okla.	Patterson	Whittington
Deen	Johnson, Tex.	Patton	Wilcox
Dempsey	Jones	Pearson	Williams
Dies	Kee	Peterson, Fla.	Wilson, La.
Dobbins	Keller	Peterson, Ga.	Wood
Dockweiler	Kenney	Pettengill	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—185

Adair	Brennan	Casey	Culkin
Andresen	Brewster	Cavicchia	Cummings
Andrew, Mass.	Brown, Mich.	Celler	Dear
Ashbrook	Brunner	Claiborne	Delaney
Bacharach	Buckley, N. Y.	Clark, Idaho	DeRouen
Bankhead	Burch	Clark, N. C.	Dickstein
Beam	Burdick	Cochran	Dietrich
Bell	Caldwell	Cole, N. Y.	Dingell
Binderup	Cannon, Wis.	Colmer	Dirksen
Bland	Carden	Cooley	Disney
Bolton	Carpenter	Corning	Dondero
Boylan	Cary	Crosby	Doutrich
Duncan	Igoe	Nichols	Shannon
Dunn, Miss.	Jacobsen	O'Connell	Short
Eaton	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Connor	Smith, Wash.
Engel	Kahn	O'Day	Smith, W. Va.
Englebright	Kelly	Oliver	Snell
Ferguson	Kennedy, Md.	O'Malley	Snyder
Fernandez	Kennedy, N. Y.	Parks	Somers, N. Y.
Fish	Kerr	Perkins	Steagall
Flannagan	Kimball	Peyser	Stubbs
Ford, Calif.	Kleberg	Pfeifer	Sullivan
Ford, Miss.	Kniffin	Pierce	Sumners, Tex.
Fuller	Lamneck	Plumley	Sweeney
Fulmer	Lee, Okla.	Quinn	Tarver
Gambrill	Lemke	Ramsay	Taylor, Tenn.
Gasque	Lesinski	Rayburn	Thomas
Gassaway	Lucas	Reece	Tobey
Gearhart	Luckey	Reilly	Tonry
Gifford	McGroarty	Rich	Treadway
Gilchrist	McLaughlin	Richards	Underwood
Gildea	McLeod	Robertson	Vinson, Ga.
Gillette	McMillan	Robinson, Utah	Wallgren
Goldsborough	McSwain	Robsion, Ky.	Walter
Gray, Pa.	Maloney	Romjue	Warren
Greenwood	Mansfield	Rudd	Weaver
Greever	Maverick	Russell	Werner
Griswold	May	Ryan	Wilson, Pa.
Haines	Mead	Sabath	Wolcott
Hamlin	Meeks	Sadowski	Wolfenden
Hancock, N. C.	Merritt, Conn.	Sanders, La.	Wolverton
Harlan	Millard	Sandlin	Woodrum
Hartley	Mitchell, Ill.	Schaefer	Zimmerman
Hobbs	Montague	Schuetz	Zioncheck
Hoeppel	Montet	Scott	
Hollister	Moritz	Scrugham	
Houston	Murdock	Seger	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Kimball.
Mr. Maverick with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. Millard.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Seger.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Short.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Andresen.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Brennan with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Brunner with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Rudd with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Dear with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. May with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Dietrich with Mr. O'Malley.
Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Crosby.
Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. McGroarty.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Luckey with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Pierce with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Russell.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Ford of California.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Reilly with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Schaeffer with Mr. Gambrill.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Smith of Washington.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Sadowski.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Greever.

Mr. Stubbs with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Hobbs.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Tonry.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Houston.
Mr. Warren with Mr. Zimmerman.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Zioncheck.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Werner.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Wallgren with Mr. Hoeppel.
Mr. Igoe with Mr. Griswold.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Gassaway.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Cummings.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. Carden with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
Mr. Carpenter with Mr. Casey.
Mr. McLaughlin with Mr. Peyser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 105, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 155, nays, 89, not voting 187, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—155

Arnold	Dies	Johnson, Okla.	Polk
Bacon	Dingell	Johnson, Tex.	Ramspeck
Barden	Dobbins	Jones	Randolph
Beiter	Dockweiler	Kee	Rankin
Biermann	Doughton	Keller	Richardson
Blanton	Doxey	Kloeb	Rogers, Mass.
Bloom	Drewry	Kocialkowski	Rogers, Okla.
Boehne	Driscoll	Kopplemann	Rudd
Boland	Driver	Kramer	Sanders, Tex.
Brooks	Duffy, N. Y.	Kvale	Sears
Brown, Ga.	Duncan	Lambeth	Shanley
Brunner	Dunn, Pa.	Lanham	Sirovich
Buck	Eagle	Lea, Calif.	Sisson
Bulwinkle	Eckert	Lehlbach	Smith, Conn.
Burnham	Edmiston	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Eicher	Lewis, Md.	South
Carmichael	Ellenbogen	Lloyd	Spence
Carter	Fiesinger	McGehee	Starnes
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	McGrath	Taylor, Colo.
Castellow	Fletcher	McLean	Terry
Chapman	Frey	McReynolds	Thom
Christianson	Gingery	Mahon	Thompson
Church	Gray, Ind.	Mapes	Tolan
Citron	Green	Martin, Colo.	Turner
Coffee	Greenway	Mason	Umstead
Colden	Gregory	Massingale	Utterback
Cole, Md.	Gwynne	Merritt, N. Y.	Vinson, Ky.
Cooper, Tenn.	Hancock, N. Y.	Monaghan	Wallgren
Costello	Harter	Nelson	Welch
Cox	Healey	Norton	Whelchel
Cravens	Hennings	O'Neal	White
Cross, Tex.	Hildebrandt	Owen	Whittington
Crosser, Ohio	Hill, Ala.	Palmisano	Wilcox
Crowe	Hill, Knute	Parsons	Williams
Cullen	Hill, Samuel B.	Patman	Wilson, La.
Daly	Hook	Patton	Wood
Darden	Huddleston	Pearson	Woodruff
Deen	Imhoff	Peterson, Fla.	Zioncheck
Dempsey	Jenckes, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.	

NAYS—89

Allen	Crawford	Gehrmann	Kenney
Andrews, N. Y.	Crowther	Goodwin	Kinzer
Arends	Darrow	Granfield	Knutson
Ayers	Ditter	Guyer	Lambertson
Blackney	Dorsey	Halleck	Lord
Boileau	Duffey, Ohio	Hart	Ludlow
Buchanan	Englebright	Hess	Lundeen
Buckbee	Evans	Higgins, Conn.	McAndrews
Buckler, Minn.	Faddis	Higgins, Mass.	McClellan
Carlson	Farley	Hoffman	McCormack
Chandler	Fenerty	Holmes	McKeough
Collins	Focht	Hope	Maas
Connery	Ford, Miss.	Hull	Marcantonio
Cooper, Ohio	Gavagan	Jenkins, Ohio	Martin, Mass.
Michener	Powers	Secrest	Truax
Miller	Rabaut	Stack	Turpin
Mitchell, Tenn.	Ransley	Stefan	Wadsworth
Mott	Reed, Ill.	Stewart	Wigglesworth
O'Brien	Reed, N. Y.	Sutphin	Withrow
O'Connor	Rogers, N. H.	Taber	Young
O'Leary	Sauthoff	Taylor, S. C.	
Patterson	Schneider	Thurston	
Pittenger	Schulte	Tinkham	

NOT VOTING—187

Adair	Doutrich	Lee, Okla.	Robsion, Ky.
Amlie	Dunn, Miss.	Lemke	Romjue
Andresen	Eaton	Lesinski	Russell
Andrew, Mass.	Ekwall	Lucas	Ryan
Ashbrook	Engel	Luckey	Sabath
Bacharach	Ferguson	McFarlane	Sadowski
Bankhead	Fernandez	McGroarty	Sanders, La.
Beam	Fish	McLaughlin	Sandlin
Bell	Flannagan	McLeod	Schaefer
Berlin	Ford, Calif.	McMillan	Schuetz
Binderup	Fuller	McSwain	Scott
Bland	Fulmer	Maloney	Scrugham
Bolton	Gambrill	Mansfield	Seger
Boylan	Gasque	Marshall	Shannon
Brennan	Gassaway	Maverick	Short
Brewster	Gearhart	May	Smith, Wash.
Brown, Mich.	Gifford	Mead	Smith, W. Va.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Meeks	Snell
Burch	Gildea	Merritt, Conn.	Snyder
Burdick	Gillette	Millard	Somers, N. Y.
Caldwell	Goldsborough	Mitchell, Ill.	Steagall
Cannon, Wis.	Gray, Pa.	Montague	Stubbs
Carden	Greenwood	Montet	Sullivan
Carpenter	Greever	Moran	Sumners, Tex.
Cary	Griswold	Moritz	Sweeney
Casey	Haines	Murdock	Tarver
Cavicchia	Hamlin	Nichols	Taylor, Tenn.
Celler	Hancock, N. C.	O'Connell	Thomas
Claiborne	Harlan	O'Day	Thomason
Clark, Idaho	Hartley	Oliver	Tobey
Clark, N. C.	Hobbs	O'Malley	Tonry
Cochran	Hoeppel	Parks	Treadway
Cole, N. Y.	Hollister	Perkins	Underwood
Colmer	Houston	Pettengill	Vinson, Ga.
Cooley	Igoe	Peyser	Walter
Corning	Jacobsen	Pfeifer	Warren
Crosby	Johnson, W. Va.	Pierce	Wearin
Culkin	Kahn	Plumley	Weaver
Cummings	Kelly	Quinn	Werner
Dear	Kennedy, Md.	Ramsay	West
Delaney	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rayburn	Wilson, Pa.
DeRouen	Kerr	Reece	Wolcott
Dickstein	Kimball	Reilly	Wolfenden
Dietrich	Kleberg	Rich	Wolverton
Dirksen	Kniffin	Richards	Woodrum
Disney	Lamneck	Robertson	Zimmerman
Dondero	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wearin (for) with Mr. Gilchrist (against).
Mr. Thomason (for) Mr. McFarlane (against).

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Marshall.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Walcott.
Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Ekwall.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Amlie.
Mr. Moran with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. West with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Berlin with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Binderup.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Gildea with Mr. Hoeppel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, BOND ISSUE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MAY 15, 1935.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 21, Seventy-fourth Congress, I have this day presented to the President of the United States the signed duplicate copy of the enrolled bill, H. R. 6084, entitled "An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed $1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SCOTT, at the request of Mr. COLDEN, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HOBBS, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, on account of important business.

To Mr. OLIVER, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, with the understanding that no business of importance will be transacted between the hours of 11 a. m. and 12 m.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House that I may explain the reason. We hope to conclude general debate on the legislative appropriation bill and to have a vote in time to adjourn over Saturday. We have numerous requests on both sides of the Chamber for time, and it would be a great accommodation to a number of gentlemen who want to speak on the bill if we could have this extra hour. That is the reason for the request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman had sufficient applications to speak to take up all of tomorrow in general debate?

Mr. LUDLOW. More than enough. We will probably run over a couple of hours on Friday. Tomorrow, with the consent of my colleague on the gentleman's side, it is my purpose to ask to close debate at 2 o'clock on Friday afternoon. That would give us plenty of time to complete the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not the intention of the gentleman to read the bill tomorrow?

Mr. LUDLOW. No.

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

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have a resolution being acted on by the Committee on the Judiciary. It went over yesterday as the unfinished business of today and will be the first order of business tomorrow morning. I do not know how that request will affect that resolution tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. It would not affect the resolution at all, because, as the gentleman stated, that is the unfinished business.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALY] is reporting on that resolution. Has he been informed about this?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have consulted on your side of the Chamber with the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, and also the ranking member on the subcommittee, Mr. POWERS, and I believe both gentlemen are agreeable to my request. I hope the gentleman from New York will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this extra hour is for the purpose of allowing more Members to speak?

Mr. LUDLOW. That and nothing else.

Mr. TRUAX. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the small attendance now and the small attendance that will be here tomorrow at 11 o'clock, the same result would be accomplished by permitting Members to extend their own remarks?

Mr. LUDLOW. These gentlemen would like very much to have an opportunity to speak. I think no harm would be done to the public service or to any Members of this House by granting the request.

Mr. TRUAX. Only that we continually violate the N. R. A. and the 30-hour week.

Mr. LUDLOW. It will be an accommodation to a number of gentlemen who will obviously be crowded out unless we give them that extra hour. I would like for the House to know that in making this request for time I am thinking of a lot of very fine gentlemen who are our colleagues in this House, who would like to speak under the privilege of general debate on the legislative appropriation bill. I would like to accommodate everyone of them. That is why I am making this fight for extra time.

Mr. TRUAX. Does the gentleman assure us that no other business will be taken up at that hour in the morning?

Mr. LUDLOW. I can assure you that there will not be any other business of importance.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, that is just the point. That resolution will come up tomorrow morning.

Mr. LUDLOW. The unanimous consent request was that when we adjourn tonight we adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning so that we can get in an extra hour that will be devoted exclusively to debate and nothing else of any importance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is not controversial.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that the unfinished business tomorrow is the resolution to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] referred, which has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How would that be affected by my unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. That would be the unfinished business, and that would have to be disposed of first on tomorrow.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I think that is perfectly all right. It will have to be disposed of in any event during the day. If we meet 1 hour earlier we will gain that much time, and the same end will be served. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CONNERY. Reserving the right to object, for the protection of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], will the gentleman permit me to ask the gentleman from New York what that resolution calls for?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is a resolution of inquiry calling for certain information from the Attorney General's office on the kidnaping at Gallup, N. Mex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO OUR OLD-FASHIONED PIONEER MOTHERS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a very interesting and illuminating speech by my colleague, Mr JOHNSON, of Oklahoma.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 12, being Mother's Day, there was delivered in this Capital City a most eloquent and inspiring address by my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The address, on the subject entitled "Mother", was delivered before the Vaughn Bible Class, of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., one of the largest men's Sunday-school classes in the United States. This beautiful tribute to motherhood is of such Nation-wide interest that I have asked permission to have my colleague's address printed as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is worth reading and preserving. The address is as follows:

Members of the Vaughn class, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, today is Mother's Day in every town, hamlet, and community in this land. This is the one day of all days that good citizens everywhere, of all walks of life, of all trades and professions and avocations, pause to pay humble tribute to the sweetest, tenderest, and most revered of all names—that of Mother. As church bells this morning pealed forth what seemed to be the enchanting words, "Mother's Day"—"Mother's Day", the chimes of 10,000 bells rang out in our memory. This hour brings back to all of us the vision of the dearest face we have ever known. It revives all the countless and hallowed memories of the sweetest voice we

ever heard. Although that voice for many of us here today is now stilled, yet we rejoice in the thought that we know in our hearts her sacrificial life filled with helpful and kindly deeds to others lives on and on, with undiminished power.

To those of you who still have your mother with you, let me remind you how fortunate you are this Mother's Day. This should be a day of special rejoicing and thanksgiving for you. Today is a great homecoming for millions of mothers. It is a day of unusual happiness to the living mothers of this land. Let me suggest that if she is not too far away you go to that old mother of yours before the close of this day and pour out your heart to her as you did when you were a child. Tell her how dearly you love her and how much she still means to you. She will understand and will appreciate your presence immeasurably more than any gift you might send her. But if mother is too far distant, then let me urge that you send her a message of love that will fill her mother heart to the overflowing.

It is not essential to discuss at length the origin and purpose of Mother's Day. It will suffice to say that although Congress, by appropriate resolution in the year of 1914, officially designated the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, this great movement was begun many years before then. It was in the year 1904 that Frank Herring, of Indiana, then a young silver-tongued orator, began a Nation-wide movement to have one day of the year set aside for Mother's Day. About the same time Miss Anna Jarvis, then of West Virginia but now of Philadelphia, began a Nation-wide campaign to have a special day designated by Congress to be known as Mother's Day. Last Friday Miss Jarvis sat in the gallery of the House of Representatives while many beautiful tributes were paid her. I might add also the records show that many fraternal, civic, and patriotic organizations endorsed the proposal. In the year of 1910 a great Nation-wide Sunday-school convention met in this city of Washington and unanimously endorsed the proposed Mother's Day. It is significant that 10,000 Sunday-school delegates marched by the National Capitol, and that Congress recessed out of respect to this great body of men and women, and to the Mother's Day movement they were so enthusiastically sponsoring.

This Nation now observes many important anniversaries. Our people celebrate with much pride the birthday anniversary of men who have served their country with distinction. We honor and revere the names of men who have won fame on field of battle, of statesmen who have fought and won battles in the Halls of Congress, poets, artists, sculptors, and inventors, but this day is a different kind of anniversary from any of the others. Someone has said that this is a "birthday anniversary of an idea that became an impulse." But it is more than that: it is, in fact, an impulse that almost overnight became a Nation-wide movement to honor the name and blessed memory of the moulder of men and nations—our mothers.

There is no other love in all the world comparable to that of a mother's love, and there is no other day in all the year that challenges the best that is in us as does Mother's Day. The very mention of Mother's Day, my friends, makes millions of hearts beat a little faster; it revives all the precious recollections of the past; it brings before us the most beautiful visions and the sweetest memories that any son or daughter can ever have. Today, we see mother's tears, her smiles, and once again hear her laughter and sweet lullabies of long ago. It makes our eyes grow dim with tears, our voices choke with emotion, and our hearts throb with tender vibrations as we reflect upon the unfathomable love of our devoted mothers.

Today, we forget for a time our own cares, our own heartaches and troubles, actual and imaginary, and let our minds wander back to days of yore. In our mind's eye we see an old home out yonder, somewhere, in the beautiful past; a home where "love lit the flame upon the altar", and where the name of God was honored and revered. We see a home where parents were loved, honored, and respected, and where a full measure of love was returned. As we reflect back to the childhood scenes of that old home of ours we see mother constantly working for us. Often we have been made to wonder how a busy mother managed to do so much for us; how she toiled, slaved, and sacrificed so cheerfully and unstintingly that her offspring might be given every possible opportunity to meet and solve life's problems.

This day of all days each one of us is thinking of the years spent with our own dear mother. Everything else seems to sink into oblivion. We see her first as we cuddle in her arms and hear her as she hums sweet lullabies until the sandman leads us gently into realms of slumber. We see her as she tenderly tucks us away and then lifts her eyes from us long enough to utter a fervent prayer to "Him who holds in the hollow of His hand the fate of nations and, yet, who notes the sparrow's fall" to guard and protect her child through the night. We see her as she read daily from the old family Bible and taught us to say so many of her favorite scripture verses. Those winter evenings, by the old open fireplace, are so sacred to us now. It was there we learned to lisp our childish prayer of "Now I lay me down to sleep."

Again we see mother as she hustled us off to Sunday school, rain or shine, year in and year out. Mine was an old-fashioned pioneer mother who didn't believe in sending her children to Sunday school, but oh how she believed in taking them there! Excuses didn't go in our family household. The Bible, the book of all books, was honored and respected in our old home and the Biblical injunction to "remember the Sabbath Day and keep it holy" was interpreted to mean, among other things, to be at Sunday school and church every Sunday on time.

We see her again as we attended the little one-room country school, and recall how she shared with us our childish disappointments just as she rejoiced with us in our pleasures. Never was she too busy with her sewing, mending, cooking, and cleaning to solve those terrible old arithmetic problems that we had announced had the wrong answers. Nor was she too engrossed in social affairs to hear and solve any little personal problems of one of her children. Not only was she possessed of dauntless courage but she sought to imbue in her children the spirit of never say fail. She also instilled ideals and ambitions that only a loving, thoughtful mother can transmit to her children. She willingly endured countless hardships and privations that her children might have opportunities that she had been denied.

Again we see our old-fashioned mother as if it were yesterday. Another son was going away from home for the first time to college. After each of the other members of the family had given him advice, jokingly and otherwise, my mother stood there at the gate of the old farmyard and as she gave her farewell kisses said, "Good-bye, son, write your mother as often as you can. Be a good boy, and remember mother will be praying for you." This world needs more old-fashioned praying mothers.

A few years later the same dear old mother stood at the same gate to say good-bye to her soldier boy who was soon to go across the sea to engage in battle, against those whom he had never seen, in order to help "make the world safe for democracy." Vivid in my memory is the picture of my dear old, horny-handed father—God bless his memory—as he proudly took me by the hand, wished me Godspeed, and declared he was pleased that his son was giving his services for the defense of Old Glory. I can see him now as he stood there gripping my hand and bravely striving to keep back the tears as he gave assurance that it was glorious to fight for one's country in time of peril. But the most vivid scene that comes before me now, the picture that one could never forget, is that of my dear old mother. She felt that the price American mothers were called upon to pay for war was entirely too great. She felt that war was so useless, uncivilized, and barbaric; in fact, she hated war, just as all real mothers must loathe it. Though her faith in God was unbounded, she had no faith in the idea, or should I say, propaganda that it was a "war to end wars." And I might add here, incidentally, that if no future wars are ever fought by the nations of the earth until same are sanctioned by the mothers of men who must do the fighting, there will be no more wars in the land, but peace will breathe as fragrantly throughout the world as if the day of its redemption had come!

My mother, who had endured droughts, diseases, hardships, privations, pestilence, and storms, stood the ordeal of saying good-bye very bravely. As she followed her son out in the yard for her parting words one could never forget the tragic look on her angelic face. I see her now, with her lips quivering and tears trickling down the most beautiful cheeks in the world to me. Although nearly a score of years have passed since then, it seems only yesterday that mother clung to me that day, and then at the final parting smiled through her tears as she whispered once again, "My son, be a good boy, write as often as possible, and always remember that mother will be praying for you." No one can ever know what that mother's parting words in the trying days that have passed have meant, not only in the months that followed in training camps and later on those long hikes in the rain to the front, but still later during those nerve-racking days and nights up in what they called "no man's land." During all those times I could hear my mother's audible voice gently pealing out, "Be a good boy and always remember mother will be praying for you."

Although my own mother has gone to her reward, I rejoice in the thought that the power of her parting admonition has been my inspiration and comfort in every trying hour. Just as mother's prayers were a consolation to me during those long, dark, and terrifying days, it was no less consoling in the years that followed to feel that dear old mother was daily praying that her son might be remembered at the throne of mercy. May it ever be our aim and prayer that we so shape our lives and personal conduct that it would meet with mother's approbation if she were here.

What may be said of the life and character of one pioneer mother could also be said, in a large measure, of the sacrificial lives of millions of our mothers who have graced American homes. Whether that home was situated out in the country, an humble cottage in town or a lofty city mansion, the inspiration that American motherhood has been to the millions of sons and daughters of this land is utterly incalculable.

Words fail us as we endeavor to pay our tributes to those dauntless, courageous, and sacrificial souls we are so proud to call our mothers. Our words are so empty; nothing we could say could add to her glory. But we might show our respect and sincere affection for the cherished memory of mother by doing our bit to see that the crosses of other mothers are made more easy to bear.

This afternoon the annual Mother's Day program will be held yonder in the great amphitheater near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery. Eight years ago I attended my first Mother's Day program at Arlington. Never shall I forget how a sweet-faced but poorly clad mother, with shoulders stooped from many years of toil and whose hair was snowy white with the frost of many winters, made her way up to the Unknown Soldier's Tomb and placed a little bouquet of wild flowers on it, and as she looked up into my face very earnestly, she said: "Who knows, this may be my only son."

In yesterday's mail I received a brief letter from a lonely mother living in Blaine County, Oklahoma, in the district I have the honor to represent in Congress. The letter was pasted on the outside of a package containing the rose that I today wear on my coat lapel. I shall read the letter to you:

"DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In memory of the son I lost I made this rose for you and trust that you will wear it Mother's Day in memory of your mother you lost not so long ago."

The letter is signed by Mrs. Lola Cronkhite Higbee, Hitchcock, Okla. May I add that I feel highly honored to wear this beautiful white flower, not only in honor of the memory of my own mother, but also to honor the memory of the dear son of this bereaved mother.

As we revel in all the tender memories that Mother's Day brings us let us not forget those mothers whose hearts are made sad today for that son who did not return but who paid the supreme sacrifice. Then, too, there are many other good mothers who have lost their sons and daughters and whose hearts are aching today. Let us not forget the aged mother of Senator Cutting, that great stalwart progressive statesman who lost his life so tragically a few days ago and whom the entire Nation mourns today.

Not only are there mothers who are sad because of the loss of loved ones but thousands of other mothers are homeless, penniless, and hungry, through no fault of their own. On this Mother's Day in this the richest land on earth, there are literally hundreds of thousands of mothers who are wondering where the next meal will come from to give sustenance to their offspring. Beautiful poems and pleasant platitudes will not suffice for such unfortunate mothers. The humane societies take care of old horses everywhere when they get too old and poor to work, but in this land of ours there are at least 7,000,000 dependent and aged fathers and mothers who, thus far, have been ignored by this great Government.

On this Mother's Day let us reconsecrate and rededicate our own lives to the ideals that our mothers held so sacred, and for which they gave their all so unstintingly. Let us show our appreciation, our honor and respect for the memory of the motherhood of America by caring for the living. May the blessed memories of our God-fearing, self-sacrificing mothers ever be an inspiration and a guiding star in our lives, until we, that day, by the grace and mercy of God, shall meet our mothers yonder in a brighter world, where there shall be no good-byes, and we shall live forever with Him in the land where the sun never sets and from "whence no traveler shall ever return."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 1935, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Thursday, May 16, 10:30 a. m.)

Committee will hold hearings on bill (H. R. 3473) to clarify the contract laborers provision of the immigration law with regard to alien actors.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

(Thursday, May 16, 10:30 a. m.)

Committee will hold hearings on various bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

336. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend an act providing for the restoration of Fort McHenry, in the State of Maryland, and its permanent preservation as a national park and perpetual national memorial shrine as the birthplace of the immortal The Star-Spangled Banner, written by Francis Scott Key; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

337. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill amending section 304 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

338. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a proposed bill amending sections 1 and 6 of the so-called "Harrison Narcotic Law"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

339. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States the devise and bequest of real and personal property of the late Paul E. McDonnold, passed assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

340. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1934 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $100,467.04, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1935 in the amount of $64,413.86; in all, $164,880.90 (H. Doc. No. 188); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

341. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriations for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1934, in the sum of $55.50 (H. Doc. No. 187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

342. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $300,000, to carry out during the fiscal year 1936 the provisions of the act approved February 22, 1935, entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 186); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

343. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Thomas F. Gardiner against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PIERCE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6776. A bill to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. H. R. 7940. A bill to prohibit the interstate transportation of prison-made products in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 7322. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a central research and experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Salt Lake City, Utah; with amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8052. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 830. A bill for the relief of Samuel Madison Strange; with amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2421. A bill for the relief of John R. Allgood; with amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Ben D. Showalter; with amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2970. A bill for the relief of Jose Munden; with amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2974. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Childress; with amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3282. A bill for the relief of Nina Drips; with amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3762. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to determine the claim of Lewis E. Magwood; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Andrew Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Albert Gonzales; with amendment (Rept. No. 930). Refererd to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4697. A bill for the relief of Ralph Riesler; with amendment (Rept. No. 931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4829. A bill for the relief of Weymouth Kirkland and Robert N. Golding; with amendment (Rept. No. 932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4848. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Molster, disbursing clerk, Department of Commerce, and Dr. Louis H. Bauer, a former employee; with amendment (Rept. No. 933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4851. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian employees of the naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va., for the value of tools lost in a fire at Pier No. 7, at the naval operating base, on May 4, 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Maj. E. Leslie Medford, United States property and disbursing officer for Maryland; without amendment (Rept. No. 935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles F. Eikenberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5097. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Lord; with amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Alexander E. Kovner; with amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5311. A bill for the relief of John Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5635. A bill for the relief of the mayor and aldermen of Jersey City, Hudson County, N. J., a municipal corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5827. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Wyhowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7577. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William E. Smith and Clara Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. S. 780. An act for the relief of the Standard Dredging Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 925. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Danenhower; with amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1073. An act for the relief of Louis Finger; without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 1290. An act for the relief of Walter Motor Truck Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1431. An act for the relief of the Collier Manufacturing Co., of Barnesville, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1817. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claim of Squaw Island Freight Terminal Co., Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., against the United States in respect of loss of property occasioned by the breaking of a Government dike on Squaw Island; without amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. S. 2205. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Cooney; without amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2487. An act for the relief of the Western Electric Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rules XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 8073) to improve the health of the people of Puerto Rico by providing for an adequate meat supply; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 8074) to amend the act of March 3, 1925, relating to Fort McHenry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8075) to make further provision for the abatement and refund of Federal taxes on insolvent banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEVER: A bill (H. R. 8076) to provide for the creation of a series of national parks to be known as the "Western Trails National Parks", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 8077) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of Illinois at or near Montrose Harbor, Cook County, Chicago; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 8078) to repeal sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act approved February 3, 1909; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 8079) authorizing the erection of memorial statues of Maj. Frank North and Capt. Luther H. North; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the ratification of Joint Resolution No. 59 of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, approved by the Governor May 5, 1930, imposing an import duty on coffee imported into Puerto Rico", approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 291) making immediately available the appropriation for the fiscal year 1936 for construction, repair, and maintenance of Indian-reservation roads; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) to clarify the definition of total permanent disability for purpose of automatic insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 8080) to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe, Crowe allottee no. 1555; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8081) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Diemer Bathurst; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8082) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Nancy Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8083) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Deatlef C. Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 8084) for the relief of John Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8085) for the relief of John Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8086) granting a pension to Margaret Mary Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 8087) granting a pension to Mary J. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GWYNNE: A bill (H. R. 8088) for the relief of Mrs. Nahwista Carr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 8089) for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 8090) granting a pension to Catherine Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8091) for the relief of Fields B. Arthur and Arthur L. Allen, copartners, doing business as Arthur & Allen, and as assignees of Edward F. Rizer and A. B. Hoffman; also for the relief of the Colorado Culvert & Flume Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORITZ: A bill (H. R. 8092) to refund to Mary Wilkins Ogden income tax erroneously and illegally collected for the calendar year 1928; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 8093) granting a pension to Margaret Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 8094) for the relief of Dr. J. C. Blalock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8095) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and render judgment on the claims of Joliet National Bank, of Joliet, Ill., and Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, of Joliet, Ill., arising out of loans to the Joliet Forge Co., of Joliet, Ill., for the providing of additional plant facilities and material for the construction of steel forgings during the World War; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 8096) granting a pension to Margaret Teed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT: A bill (H. R. 8097) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Nobles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

8473. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York, New York City, approving the Mead shorter work-week bill (H. R. 6990) providing for a shorter work week in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

8474. Also, resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8475. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, urging the enactment of the Frazier-Lemke bill without further delay; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8476. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of board of trustees, Pulaski, N. Y., memorializing Congress to adopt October 11 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8477. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution adopted by the people of Cresskill, N. J., and citizens from neighboring communities in mass meeting assembled at Cresskill, N. J., April 25, 1935, favoring the adoption of a plan perfected by Maj. L. Alfred Jenny for linking northeastern New Jersey with New York by rapid transit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8478. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Joint resolution of the City Council of the City of Providence, petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the processing tax on cotton and to enact legislation to protect the cotton-textile industry against importations of goods manufactured by cheap labor abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8479. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and vicinity concerning the Mead shorter work-week bill (H. R. 6990); to the Committee on Labor.

8480. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Samuel B. Pierce and some 37 other residents of Bellows Falls, Vt., urging favorable action on Senate bill 1629, to regulate trucking in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8481. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, New York City, concerning the Crosser House Joint Resolution 219, Emergency Railroad Transportation Act extension; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8482. Also, petition of Common Council of the City of Pulaski and the State of New York, favoring the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8483. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Cedar Grove, W. Va., asking that Congress allow the Federal gasoline tax to expire at the end of the present fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8484. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Nye-Sweeney bill (H. R. 6382); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8485. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to taking the profits out of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8486. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the central executive body of district no. 22, U. M. W. A., of the Utah division; to the Committee on Labor.

8487. Also, petition of a mass meeting of various trade and labor unions, Canal and Claiborne Streets, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 15, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House